

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, June 11, 1964.

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

PETITION: DRAINAGE OF FIRST AND SECOND CREEKS.

Mr. DUNSTAN presented a petition signed by 412 electors residing in the local government areas of Kensington and Norwood and St. Peters requesting legislative action to provide a drainage scheme for First and Second Creeks to stop flooding and to settle public responsibility for the maintenance of the creeks.

Received and read.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Would the Premier agree to deal first with the Supplementary Estimates that were presented yesterday, and to suspend question time until the Supplementary Estimates have been disposed of?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That Standing Orders and Sessional Orders be so far suspended as to enable questions to be taken after consideration of the Orders of the Day.

This is a good suggestion and, so that there will be no misgivings, I assure honourable members that full question time will be allowed, irrespective of the time taken to dispose of the Supplementary Estimates. If the House follows this procedure one House will not be kept waiting while the other is considering the Supplementary Estimates.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We join Your Excellency in expressing our joy at the birth of the Prince to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

3. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.

4. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

(Continued from June 10. Page 13.)

In Committee of Supply.

Grand total, £734,966.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): The opening remarks by the Treasurer in introducing the Supplementary Estimates were typical of similar introductions in past years in that he informed members that the results were to vary substantially from the original Estimates presented to us. Last year he informed members that the Estimates presented anticipated that there would be a deficit for the current financial year of £492,000, but that it was subject to several provisos which could either substantially increase the deficit or reduce it. All that we have been told at this stage is that there is to be a small variation from the estimated deficit but the Treasurer did not go the step further and inform us whether the Budget prediction had been achieved or not. Perhaps it is a little too early to see what the final outcome will be other than to be informed in most general terms that the small deficit of £492,000 is now anticipated to be converted into a modest surplus. I should like to know just how modest this surplus is likely to be and whether it is expected to take care of the full amount of £734,966 we are called upon to pass in the Supplementary Estimates.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I think I can give the honourable Leader some information on that point. The modest surplus I referred to was calculated before the sums were included in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: That is the first time I have known the Treasurer to parade his modesty in this place. It would appear to me that the executive Government has attempted to use the numbers of this Committee as a rubber stamp so that it may cream off its surplus revenue, because many of the items contained in the Supplementary Estimates are not truly revenue expenditure, but appear to be afterthoughts by the Government when it has found that its coffers are overflowing. It is realized that the Government has authority to pay increased wage rates without further reference to Parliament, and therefore it is necessary for us to examine closely the Supplementary Estimates before us. The sum of £400,000 is available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund to cater for small variations from the original Estimates and one would have thought that this provided ample scope, but the variations proposed by the Government are

too great to be covered by this fund. I shall now refer to some of the items contained in the schedule.

Under "Chief Secretary and Minister of Health" an additional sum of £30,000 is sought for the ordinary annual running and maintenance costs of the mental hospital at Northfield. This increase is long overdue because on many occasions I have drawn the attention of the Government to the shoe-string budget on which it forces its mental hospitals to operate. Conditions in our mental hospitals have been deplorable for years and it is a situation about which members opposite should feel completely ashamed. However, the sum of £4,016 has been provided for the Little Sisters of the Poor, Myrtle Bank, as assistance to purchase furnishings. Representations were made to the Government to help pay for the furnishings in that institution and certain members of Parliament attended the dedication of the additions. I have already conveyed the Sisters' appreciation to the Government. These Sisters look after their patients in an excellent fashion and provide nursing services similarly to the way in which certain bodies, including Aldersgate, care for their inmates. The work of such bodies, as opposed to certain other institutions, is to be highly commended.

An item under "Minister of Lands, Miscellaneous" had me intrigued; it was the additional £85,000 required for the purchase of lands for national reserves. The Treasurer informed us that £25,000 was required for the extension of the Para Wirra reserve as well as several smaller purchases of land, and £60,000 was required for Arbury Park acquisition at Bridgewater.

As regards the Para Wirra purchase, the information contained in the expenditure Estimates presented last year was that the Government had taken the opportunity to purchase a further 702 acres to add to the Para Wirra National Reserve for which the existing 1,100 acres was purchased in 1960-61. The sum of £62,000 was provided to cover this proposal and several other small proposals. Now the Government is requesting authority to spend a further £25,000 on this project. Is this amount of money to be spent on the 702 acres to which I have just referred or is the Government proposing the acquisition of an additional tract of land to further extend the Para Wirra reserve? As regards the £60,000 for Arbury Park, I believe this is a clear example of executive control at its worst. It is an example of a State Liberal Government deciding to pay a former Liberal

Minister more than £500 an acre for his land in the Adelaide Hills because the Government desires portion of it for freeway purposes. In the planning of freeways is sufficient thought being given to the provision of alternative public transport, namely, railways? Could not railways be used to cater for newly developed areas where industrial plants and housing estates are being established? The total purchase price exceeds more than £120,000 for 230 acres, and at this stage I can see nothing but for this Parliament to rubber-stamp this transaction. However, I believe land acquisitions of this magnitude should not be undertaken in future without the prior approval of Parliament.

The next item I shall discuss concerns public works, and in particular the additional £100,000 sought for hospital buildings, equipment, etc. It certainly seems strange to me that the original appropriation, although £30,000 greater than last year, is still deficient by £100,000. This Government has a long record of a very niggardly outlook on mental health, and, on the assurance that this £100,000 is earmarked for additional furnishings and equipment for the mental hospitals, particularly Parkside, I am more than happy to endorse the proposed additional expenditure. However, at this stage I should like to issue a note of warning to the Government regarding mental health, and that is that the problems it has caused by its neglect in the past will not be solved solely by pouring colossal sums of money into a primitive system. Another line relates to the contribution of £10,000 to the Metropolitan Drainage Maintenance Fund. The metropolitan floodwaters scheme has operated at least since 1935, and, even though 30 years has elapsed, this Government appears to be no nearer to solving the problems of adequate drainage which have been caused by the congested metropolitan area that the Government has encouraged and fostered since it has been in office. Practically every suburb in Adelaide has drainage problems and they are becoming more pressing each year that they remain neglected. Even some of the long-settled areas are being inundated by additional run-off from newly developed areas, a fact that was illustrated only this afternoon by the presentation of a petition by the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan). I have no objection to this £10,000 being made available to the Metropolitan Drainage Maintenance Fund, but surely it is about time this Government grappled with the task of seeing that the areas of Adelaide and its environs are adequately drained to the sea.

Whilst the general purposes grants to the University of Adelaide and the South Australian Institute of Technology comprise substantial variations of £285,000, an examination of the Estimates presented to Parliament last year discloses that the original estimates were based on the latest information available, but it has turned out to be insufficient and this has accounted for the bulk of the variation. As this Parliament has already approved of substantial grants to these institutions, I do not see how we can deny the further grants that now become necessary because of revision of the original Estimates. However, portion of the substantial increase is due to increased salaries that have been awarded to university staff as well as to the institute staff who teach university-level work at the institute. It has been brought to my notice that there is strong dissatisfaction at the institute because some of the staff were not granted salary increases to the university level even though the lecturers considered that they were doing work of the same standard as university lecturers. As the Government is making a grant of £665,000 to this organization during the current year, could it not ensure that lecturers on comparable work receive comparable salary?

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): The Leader referred to the purchase of the Arbury Park property from Mr. Downer (the recently appointed High Commissioner in London). He said that in round figures this property cost the State about £500 an acre, and he implied that that was a high price for a property in the Adelaide Hills. However, he adroitly omitted to mention that the cost included certain radical improvements on the property. I have had the honour of being entertained in this very lovely house, and I know that it is in first-class condition, as one would expect it to be. It would be very difficult to assess what such a house would cost to build today, and it would be even more difficult to estimate what it would cost to develop such a property. The ornamental garden is one of the loveliest in the Adelaide Hills. I am a garden lover myself and I have a very nice one at my home. I would not compare it with or mention it in the same breath as the one at Arbury Park, but I know a little about what it costs to establish a garden. Whether or not such a property has any intrinsic value to the State, our successors will probably be in a better position to judge than we are. After all, gardens are joys for all time; trees are planted for posterity, and Arbury Park has

some very beautiful ones which I trust will be preserved and enjoyed for all time. This property is almost as close to the city as is Brighton, for instance, and when the new highway is put through it will probably be nearer to the city in point of time than is Brighton or Semaphore.

Mr. Riches: It will mean a general increase in land values.

Mr. SHANNON: Even though the highway has not yet been constructed, the current prices for building blocks in Crafers, Stirling and Aldgate range from £1,250 to £1,500 in the most favoured areas. Those are values the local government authorities are adopting for their assessments. Blocks are changing hands at those figures in Crafers and Stirling, and they have changed hands at up to £2,000 each on Mount Lofty Summit, where the land was cut up in the old de Crespigny estate. Those would be about half-acre blocks. The Town Planner has decided, I think wisely, that half-acre blocks are the minimum permissible size, as drainage will always be a problem and sewerage must necessarily be a very distant project. It is necessary for building blocks to be that large so that effluent and household wastes can be effectively disposed of on the individual properties. Some of the Arbury Park land is undulating, but such land presents no problem these days to the house designer, and in fact in some cases it is looked upon as an attractive feature in house designing. This makes the disposal of household waste and effluent no worry at all. Therefore, Arbury Park is not entirely non-subdivisible because of undulating country. However, I do not think it will be used for subdivision. This property was, without a doubt, an eminently good purchase for the Government and it could make a handsome profit if the land were subdivided. I have discussed this matter with representatives of two of the major property concerns in the Adelaide Hills—the chairman of a certain council and a representative of an old-established firm at Stirling. Both said that they would like to be the sole agent for the subdivision of Arbury Park.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: The valuation for Arbury Park was fixed by the Land Board and the Government did not pay a penny more.

Mr. SHANNON: That is so. However, although that is perfectly true I do not wish to stress it, but stress the fact that the Government has made an excellent purchase. I hope the property will be preserved and not cut up into building allotments. Too few of

our beauty spots in the Adelaide Hills have been preserved. The beautiful trees at Arbury Park were established by the late Mr. T. C. Wollaston, who was a garden and tree lover and spent much money in obtaining trees and shrubs from overseas. The property was not then known as Arbury Park. I was lucky to move to the Adelaide Hills, and I am one of the few that knows it. My property contained grown trees and I have enjoyed their beauty for half my lifetime. It would not have been possible for me to have enjoyed those trees had I planted them myself because they would not have reached maturity soon enough. The same applies at Arbury Park, where Mr. Downer reaped the benefit of Mr. Wollaston's work. I hope that this beautiful spot will be preserved for other people to enjoy. If it were used for building blocks, half the trees would have to be cut down to make room for houses and the beauty of the area would be destroyed.

I wish to commend the Minister of Lands for his pertinacity in advocating the provision of areas of land to be set aside for our native flora and fauna. This is another of the things that we appreciate more as we get older. The lack of opportunity to provide such areas today is largely the result of lack of foresight by past generations that were not as assiduous as they might have been in setting aside areas for this very laudable purpose. This becomes more and more important as time goes on.

Under the line, "Minister of Local Government and Minister of Roads", £22,500 is set aside for the purposes of the Public Parks Act to assist councils. I commend the Government for encouraging them. South Australia has a solid, sound, sane Government which is using the opportunities at its disposal to further the acquisition by councils of areas of land, the value of which may not be realized by this generation but will certainly be by future generations. As time passes, land that has been acquired for parks becomes more and more valuable because such areas become more and more difficult to acquire.

I realize that some members of Parliament (very few on one side, but not so few on the other) appreciate the value of acquiring breathing space in all council areas. I pay a tribute to the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) who has been, in and out of season, a strong proponent of the acquisition of land for this purpose. Although the sum of £22,500 does not sound very much, it is an encouraging sign that the Government intends to give councils an opportunity to acquire areas that will be of inestimable value to future generations. In the past people have often been

remiss in this respect and have tended to look upon the acquisition of land for parks as a non-profitable proposition. There is no immediate return, but in the long term such acquisition provides a valuable asset.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): In speaking to the first line, I want to say something about a subject to which both the previous speakers addressed themselves for some time. I appreciate the courtesy of the Treasurer in allowing me and other honourable members an opportunity to peruse the file concerning the negotiations for the purchase of Arbury Park. I do not dispute that the price paid for its purchase was fair in all the circumstances. Nobody could suggest, given the valuation of the whole property contained in the file, that this was an unfair price. In fact, of course, it was very much less than the price originally asked.

But there are, to me, some disquieting features about the negotiations. At their outset, it appears that the Commissioner of Highways was seeking to acquire a certain portion of the property to run a freeway through it. Various alternative routes were suggested. Originally, a notice to treat was given in respect of the area about which the Highways Department subsequently changed its mind because it found that the freeway could be more conveniently run in another way through the property, which would be better from the point of view of the highway. Then there were negotiations concerning different routes, because, of course, any freeway to run through the property would create considerable difficulty for its owner. It appeared that at least there would be a severance by the freeway from the property, which is normally crossable, of 90 or 230 acres and that a considerable price in compensation would have to be paid for the severance and damage to the property.

Then, after protracted negotiations concerning the route of the freeway through the property, negotiations were undertaken for the purchase of the whole property, and it is at this stage that it appears to me from the file that inadequate information was available to the Government upon which to base the decision to which it finally came. From the time that the proposal arose for the acquisition of the whole property, no valuation appears to have been obtained as to the alternative to this: that is, what price would have to be paid simply for acquiring the necessary land for the freeway to go through, the cost of severance, and the amount of compensation that would have to be paid to Mr. Downer for damage

done to his property by the freeway. Say the freeway was going to take 40 acres (and that would put it fairly high; I am not certain of the precise proposal for the number of acres to be purchased), if that were to cost, on a valuation of the land, about £15,000, that would be putting that price fairly high, too. I doubt that the land itself to be put into the freeway would have cost £15,000. In the total price of Arbury Park would be included all the improvements, which would not have been in the land to be acquired for the freeway.

Then, of course, there would have to be considered the amount that would have to be paid to Mr. Downer for the severance of a portion of his property, the damage for working that part of it as a farm, the damage to him as an individual and the overall damage to his property as well. Given the valuations that courts are prepared to allow on compulsory acquisition for that kind of thing, it would have been surprising, in my view, if Mr. Downer had been allowed more than £40,000 as compensation—and that would have been a high price, too. But this is only a guess in all the circumstances because in my experience of compulsory acquisition this would have been a very high figure. I cannot conceive it would have been more.

Then assuming the alternatives were between paying a figure of about £55,000, which would include all damage to Mr. Downer, and the £120,000 for the purchase of the property, it seems to me that those figures should have been obtained and the alternatives considered. It does not appear to me from the file that the Land Board did consider it on this basis, or that the Commissioner of Highways did. There were two reasons that I could find on the file for the decision to purchase the whole property. The first was that it would be easier to plan the freeway if the whole property were acquired and one did not have to worry about carefully plotting the freeway around the improvements that Mr. Downer had on the property. There is something in this. I do not know how much difference in price or in cost that added convenience would make. That does not appear from the file.

Also, of course, there is the view, which was taken apparently by the authorities in the Lands Department and by the Commissioner of Highways, that it was a good thing to acquire the property to avoid undesirable publicity. There may well have been undesirable publicity in this matter, but I do not think that is something that should

gravely concern us on the subject of expenditure of the public moneys. It may well have been that, after consideration of all these facets of the matter, the Government would still have decided that it was worth while to purchase the property, in that Arbury Park is a property which, as the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) has described it, could be useful for public recreation purposes. On that, all in all, the price of £120,000 was a reasonable one to pay for the additional facilities of having a public park. But I think that the alternatives in cost should have been carefully considered before that decision was made. To pay a price of this kind for a public parks area is going considerably higher than is normally gone by the Lands Department for recreation areas in the vicinity of Adelaide. It is far in excess of the price paid in acreage, for instance, for Para Wirra and it seems to me that much more care should have been exercised in this particular purchase.

As I say, I cannot dispute the price. I do not agree with the contention put forward by the member for Onkaparinga that one should look at this from the point of view of the fact that the Government has acquired land that may be desirable for subdivision.

Mr. Shannon: I think I denied that it should be subdivided.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I agree with that. I do not think that in looking at the price for a property of this kind it is proper to consider what would be the value of the land after subdivision. Indeed, the Government resolutely and properly refuses to pay money upon that basis in the acquisition of properties. The court has specifically ruled, on the compulsory acquisition of land, that that is not to be the basis of valuation, and the Government in acquiring property—for instance, in the case of the Minister of Education—has refused, and rightly refused, to consider payment for land that might be valuable for subdivision upon the basis of what would be the profit to the owner if he subdivided it. I can give some specific instances in which refusal by the Government has been upheld by the court upon this basis. There was an instance, for instance, of an acquisition of property at Modbury where it was valuable subdivisional land. If it had been subdivided by the owner and sold in subdivisional blocks, judging by the sales round about, the profit to the owner would have been far in excess of the price paid by the Minister of Education. The land had not been subdivided and it was to be acquired as a whole. The High Court has ruled, as has

the Privy Council, that land shall not be valued upon the basis of what would be the profit to the owner if he subdivided it. The land must be considered in its present state. Therefore, I do not know that one can pay a great tribute to the Government merely because it has acquired land that could be available as subdivisional land that it would not subdivide anyway. I agree with the member for Onkaparinga that, as it is now Government land, it should not be subdivided. Although a small portion may be sold for a particular purpose, it would be wise, now that the land is held, to use it as a public park.

Mr. Bywaters: It would not have been subdivided had the previous owner retained it.

Mr. DUNSTAN: No. My only protest about this is that I consider that the costs of the alternatives do not seem to have been considered adequately in this matter. I fear that in the circumstances, from my examination so far of the file, the questions of the inconvenience, the undesirability of publicity, and the fact that Mr. Downer might have been extremely difficult about the purchase if compulsory acquisition had been proceeded with (it would have been a lengthy and protracted proceeding) have weighed heavily with the Government in its decision to acquire the whole property rather than the methods it has used with so many other properties in the Adelaide Hills. In the district of the member for Onkaparinga there have been instances of the acquisition of valuable dairying property where the railway went through and there was a severance of a considerable portion of the property. It was extremely inconvenient for the person concerned, but there was no question of obtaining the whole property, only the section needed for public purposes. It does not appear that the alternatives in cost were adequately considered before the decision was made to purchase the whole of the property rather than a portion of it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): One or two matters that have been raised by honourable members concerning the purchase of Arbury Park should be clarified. I have available for perusal by honourable members an aerial photograph of Arbury Park showing the severance that would have taken place as a result of the freeway. This photograph was taken not for the purpose of this debate but for an entirely different reason. It shows what will happen to Arbury Park when the freeway passes through it. True, there has been no determination of what the court would award to Mr. Downer for

this severance, and I do not believe that any amount can be reliably quoted. Mr. Downer made it clear that he would take the matter to the ultimate court of appeal to get as much as he could if we took his property away from him. He did not want to part with it. Whatever the amount would be, it would be the ultimate amount that could be awarded. Honourable members will see that the freeway cuts this property in two. I am sure that honourable members will agree that the damages in severance and in other ways would be so great that it would be in the public interest to acquire the whole property and put it to a useful public purpose. We would have had to pay to Mr. Downer considerable damages, apart from the amount for the purchase of the property that we would need for the freeway.

South Australia lacks adequate recreation areas for its present population. This year the Government is spending much money helping district councils buy land for recreational purposes as it is clear that we must not miss the chance now of obtaining suitable recreation grounds. Any failure to obtain these areas now can only be corrected in the future at a much greater cost than need now be provided. In the State's early days the conception of the Education Department was that all it had to do for a school was to have enough land upon which to place the school building. As a result of that lack of foresight 50 or 60 years ago, we are today purchasing land at fabulous prices.

The Government could sell a considerable portion of Arbury Park and already overtures have been made for the purchase of the property at a price over the cost per acre to the Government. I have not checked that because, frankly, the Government does not propose to sell the property. One feature of this property is giving the Government considerable concern: it would have been much happier if Arbury Park had not had a home upon it. This home does not fit in well if the property is to be used for recreational purposes. A beautiful home has not been established at the National Park, but at Arbury Park the home was there and the road had to pass it. We would have had to pay compensation for the land on the basis that it is supporting the home and the park lands in which it is established.

Several suggestions have been made, some of them good. The Director of the Tourist Bureau has made one which I consider has considerable merit. At present our National

Gallery has many excellent works of art that cannot be displayed because of the lack of accommodation for display purposes. Perhaps the home at Arbury Park could be put under the control of the National Gallery, as this would give it additional scope for exhibiting some of its beautiful works of art that are at present locked away because of the lack of accommodation required to exhibit them. If honourable members peruse the docket (and I was pleased to make it available to an honourable member yesterday) they will notice that the Government's advisers were prepared to recommend a purchase price in excess of the Land Board's valuation, and the Land Board itself was prepared to recommend a purchase price in excess of its own valuation. It would have been better for the Government to pay this amount rather than take the question of compensation to court. However, the Government remained adamant on the Land Board's valuation, and the initial valuation of the Land Board was the price the Government paid. As the docket shows, the Highways Commissioner recommended to the Government that the purchase take place at a price in excess of the Land Board valuation, but the Government considered that the Land Board valuation was the price it should pay, that it would not have any conditions imposed on it, and that the property would be available for public purposes. Members will agree that the proper purpose for this land is as recreation grounds for the use of the public.

Since the property has been purchased, I have received numerous letters from people in the metropolitan area asking when the grounds will be thrown open, as they wish to be able to visit them and use them for pleasure. Although I must admit that, if the road were not involved, the Government would not have spent so much money in buying the grounds, I do not think we should always buy second-grade properties for recreational purposes. If members have any doubt about whether the Government would be paying heavy compensation for acquiring land for the road, I invite them to inspect the aerial photograph and see from it the severance that would take place, and also to look at the standard of the property. I should hate to have the honourable member who has just resumed his seat putting forward an argument for compensation, as I think he could make out a strong case for a tremendous sum because the road completely severs the property in a way which, from the point of view of adjoinment of the type Mr. Downer had, would alter the purpose of the property from his point of view.

Mr. Riches: Have you always been satisfied that there is no other route?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, and I am glad that the honourable member has asked that. A tremendous amount of criticism has appeared in the press because the Government has had to take the road through this property. For three years the department has been trying to get some alternative proposal for the road, but there is no effective alternative. At the time when a considerable amount of criticism was being made publicly by Mr. Downer that his property was to be cut in two, we had in this State an adviser who had been brought from the United States of America to advise the Government on some of our problems in the development of our roadway system. This man's name was Mr. Dondanville. This matter was submitted to him, and he said that the South Australian Government would not be justified even in diverting the road through the property, pointing out that this would be the main arterial road to Melbourne and that it would be used for thousands of years. He said that in the United States or any country public interest must be paramount and that a road must be constructed in the most convenient place for the public and the road.

Although perhaps it was a hard decision to make because it involved someone's personal property, I think the public interest is the only basis upon which this matter can be intelligently considered if a long-term view is taken. It is true that if the road is diverted each motorist may have to travel only half a mile extra, but when one remembers how many thousands of people will travel over it and how long it will be used one can appreciate the cost involved.

Mr. Shannon: Do not forget that somebody else will have the road through his property if the Government does not take this property.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the road is diverted, it must go through some other property, and anyone who has any knowledge of the congestion that is already taking place on the hills highway will appreciate that the road is inevitable and urgently necessary. I do not think anyone who travels through the Adelaide Hills can have any doubt that a modern highway is necessary there, and it stands to reason that if a highway is to be constructed it must cut somebody else's property in two if it does not cut through Arbury Park. In one instance, a road unfortunately had to go through a property and a house in which a person had been living all her life had to be demolished. This matter was considered from the point of view of public interest, and

no more than a regret was expressed that the property had to be sacrificed for a road. Be that as it may, Arbury Park was bought on conditions set out by the Land Board in its valuations. The Land Board even gave a certificate and used these words:

They are the terms which, if claimed by any owner of a similar property, the Board would be prepared to recommend.

We cannot get anything more definite than that; the Land Board valuation was strictly applied in this instance. Incidentally, Mr. Downer wanted substantially more than the Land Board valuation, and the board negotiated with him for a considerable time before he accepted the valuation.

Mr. Bywaters: He would be no orphan, would he? Most people want more.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, I am not saying anything derogatory of Mr. Downer. Everyone does the best he can when dealing with the Government, and people usually do fairly well. It seems to me that there is always a big disparity between the price at which the Government sells property and the price at which it buys it.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: We have plenty before the court now.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, we have many cases where the Land Board valuation has not been accepted by the purchaser. It is necessary to acquire Arbury Park in the public interest. The Government naturally wanted to spend the money in the best way possible. The spending of a large sum on compensation would not give anyone very much satisfaction, whereas acquisition will, I hope, make this property available in perpetuity for public enjoyment.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): This debate has been most interesting, and two things referred to by the Treasurer are, I think, most important. He said that there were not sufficient recreation areas—and I took it that he meant open areas too—for the public, and I believe most people would agree wholeheartedly with that statement. I have been saying this for some time and I know that certain other honourable members share these sentiments. I was pleased to note that there seems to be a change in Government policy in acquiring land for this important purpose. Areas suitable for recreation have previously been brought to Parliament's notice but they seem to have been passed over and forgotten. One particular area which has been mentioned in this Chamber and which, so far,

has not received the Government's attention to my knowledge is the Deep Creek area on the south coast which, once it is cleared, will be lost for ever as possible recreation space for the public. This would be a great shame and should not be tolerated in a country which is crying out for land to be conserved as recreation areas.

I was pleased to hear the Treasurer say that the Government was aware that there was insufficient land available for recreational purposes. The Government's change of policy in acquiring land—and I have noticed quite a few areas that have been acquired recently—is pleasing, not only to honourable members and myself but the public generally. It is gratifying to realize that the Government is not only not satisfied that the area of land to be used as recreation areas is sufficient to cater for our growing population but acknowledges the need to conserve more areas for future generations. It is also gratifying to hear the Treasurer say that he believes that second-rate properties should not be acquired for this purpose. The area suitable for recreation is rapidly diminishing; we have only to look at the Adelaide Hills areas to see the subdivisions taking place there. Indeed, in many parts of the State subdivisions are going ahead and land is being cleared which will eventually be lost for ever. The Kyeema property could have been lost had it not been for the actions of certain interested parties, including the National Fitness Council, in urging the Government to utilize this important piece of country as a national reserve. I believe it had been the Government's intention to allocate that land to nearby farms. This land is now becoming an important recreation area. I am pleased that the Treasurer realizes the State's need for these areas and that the Government aims to conserve land for recreational purposes in the future.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I rise merely to mention that I notice that Executive Council decided this morning to change the name of the Northfield Mental Hospital to Hillcrest Hospital. I am glad that the stigma that stems from the term "mental hospital" will disappear in this case. I applaud the change of name because, among other things, it is sometimes difficult for people to explain that a relative is in a mental hospital. The Hillcrest Hospital is in my electorate just as much as Northfield Mental Hospital was and it will receive just as much of my attention in the future as it did by another name in the past.

First line (Chief Secretary and Minister of Health, Hospitals Department, £40,000)—passed.

Miscellaneous, £10,516—passed.

MINISTER OF LANDS AND MINISTER OF
REPATRIATION.

Lands Department, £4,550—passed.

Miscellaneous, £96,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): Earlier when I spoke about Arbury Park I said that I considered that Parliament should have been consulted about its purchase. I do not complain about the cost but I consider that this is an important matter. I have always said that this Government is guilty of too much executive control, whereas there should be more Parliamentary control. This matter could have been dealt with in Parliament earlier this year rather than brought on so suddenly this week. I have read press announcements on the subject with some interest although I do not know whether the answer supplied by the Director of the Government Tourist Bureau is the best solution. I have also read of the suggestion by the Treasurer that this property be used for public purposes such as the establishment of a golf course. Undoubtedly it would provide for congenial entertainment. In ventilating this matter I merely wish to express my views for I believe that Parliament should have been given the information when it was in session earlier rather than action being taken when it was not in session.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF WORKS AND MINISTER OF
ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS.

Public Works, £145,000; Miscellaneous, £10,000—passed.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION.

Education Department, £50,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I am concerned about the sum provided for equipment, materials, services, etc. Some schools in the metropolitan area, particularly in my district, have been told that gas-heating equipment would be installed in classrooms, but I know that a number of classrooms do not yet have this equipment. I am concerned about this matter, because it is not very pleasant for children in unheated classrooms on these frosty mornings. Will the installation of this equipment be speeded up?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): The Leader's comments should have been directed to the previous item "Public Works, £145,000", for equipment of the type he referred to would be provided as part of a building itself. The present line is provided to meet expense occasioned by the fact that the number of students this year was greater than we had expected and we had additional payments for book allowances and that type of thing. However, I will have a look at the problem mentioned by the Leader, and if he will put a note in my bag I will have a reply for him, I hope tomorrow.

Mr. RICHES: Representations have been made to the Minister of Education through the normal channels in relation to the position of Principal of the Adult Education Centre at Port Augusta. The situation that has developed is, I think, unacceptable to the people there, and there is a feeling that the only approach now left is to the Minister himself, seeking his good offices in the matter. The Principal who was appointed has been loaned to Nigeria, where he has remained for a couple of years. Subsequently, an acting Principal was appointed but was then transferred, and the work has been carried on by an overworked senior master to such good effect that at the beginning of this year the department considered that it was necessary to have not only a Principal but a Vice-Principal. The Vice-Principal who was then appointed carried on for one term as acting Principal, but now he has been transferred to Port Lincoln; he has not been replaced, and the administration is still carried on under difficulty by the senior master.

We know that the transfer to Port Lincoln of Mr. Wood has been brought about by appointments taking place at top level in the department, and we also know that it is the policy of the department not to make appointments during the school year where they can be avoided, because schools can be upset by that process. However, in the case of Port Lincoln, Renmark and Mount Gambier these appointments have been made during the school year, and the appointees have taken their places; it stops only when it comes to Port Augusta. I submit that if there is any place where that transfer should not have taken place, surely it is at the centre where the Principal is already engaged overseas. It is more than two years since Port Augusta had a Principal, and the centre feels very strongly that this position should be looked into and corrected as a matter of urgency.

I have not taken this matter up personally at any level because I have asked that the council of the centre itself make representations through the appropriate channels. I understand that the centre has been in touch with the department and that it has also written to the Minister, but we are still in the same position and there does not appear to be any redress. Will the Minister look into this situation as a matter of urgency and let us know just what the department can do in order to speedily attend to these appointments?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): I will take this matter up with the Director of Education immediately. As the honourable member knows, all appointments and transfers of teaching staff are made by the Minister of Education but they are made only on the recommendation of the Director. It will be necessary, therefore, for me to consult him on these matters. I will see what steps can be taken urgently to deal with the position. I am grateful to the honourable member and the members of the Adult Education Centre for their interest in this matter. I think the present position has been brought about by a most unfortunate combination of circumstances; if I remember rightly, the previous Principal was loaned to Nigeria as a result of a direct request by the Prime Minister to the Premier that certain of these officers should be released for this service. I have no doubt that when applications were called for the position at Port Lincoln the acting Principal applied for it and was considered to be the most suitable person. However, I consider that we have gone on too long now without an appointment to the highly-important position at Port Augusta, and I assure my honourable friend again that I will give the matter my personal and urgent attention and will consult with the Director of Education immediately.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £285,000.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Certain officers have been trained in South Australia under bond to the Education Department and have then taken posts with the South Australian Institute of Technology either immediately or after a short break in employment, which in each case has involved the improved technical knowledge of the officer concerned. Some of these officers have been required to repay to the Education Department the amount of their bonds because they are not directly employed by the Minister. I understand that the Minister has now ruled that where officers take employment with the

University of Adelaide, although they are not directly under the Minister, the bonds are not insisted on. It seems to me that if an officer has been trained in South Australia by the Government and then takes a teaching post with an institution not directly under the Minister, but undoubtedly of benefit to the public of South Australia, he should not be required to repay his bond as the public of South Australia benefits from his training. As I believe that the Minister has been reconsidering this matter, I ask him whether he could not now seek a ruling that these bonds be not insisted on where officers properly take employment in South Australia in teaching posts of use to the public and the public then benefits from the moneys that have been spent upon the training of the officer.

Many disturbances of staff have occurred at the institute because of the matter referred to by the Leader. A considerable upset has taken place in the university itself because the full range of salaries applicable in Melbourne, to which Adelaide university had previously brought its staff, was not applied in some instances to the local university staff and, in the case of the South Australian Institute of Technology, the members of the staff were not paid salaries commensurate with those paid to occupants of similar posts in the university. The excuse given for this, in some instances, was that these officers were not doing work entirely of university standard. Frankly, on examination of these cases I find that this has been something of a quibble.

Mr. Frank Walsh: But they were instructing on the same basis in some subjects?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly. In many cases they were teaching in degree and diploma courses of a proper tertiary standard. I have seen the press advertisements by the institute that they answered when they sought employment with the institute. Also, they were employed on a basis which led them to believe that university conditions would apply to them. They are not enjoying these conditions, however, and it is not surprising, in the circumstances, that there have been many resignations from the staff of the institute.

I believe that some action should be taken to see that proper conditions are applied to these officers because a difficulty will face South Australia unless we are prepared to give these officers fair conditions commensurate with the employment they were led to believe they were undertaking. The difficulty will arise because there is a shortage of tertiary teaching staff, not only in Australia but throughout the world.

If we wish to obtain adequate staff for our tertiary institutions, we have to satisfy the staff that they will get fair conditions—the conditions that they thought they were getting when appointed. If we develop the reputation at the institute that officers there are not going to be treated as they were led to understand, when appointed, that they would be, I believe there will be some difficulty in obtaining and retaining staff.

I have seen some of these cases and the advertisements and I can only say that the dissatisfaction is not entirely surprising. I do not know whether this matter has been brought to the Minister's attention, but if it has not I shall be glad if he will investigate the matter because I believe that, if he does not, a serious situation could arise.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The point the honourable member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) has mentioned concerning teachers is not very remarkable. We try to make every department responsible for its own organization and provision for the future. When one department is allowed to encroach upon another department's plans, all kinds of problem immediately arise. For instance, we do not allow the Highways Commissioner to take over, willy-nilly, land belonging to the Engineer-in-Chief which he may have provided for sewerage or drainage. Each department must plan for the fulfilment of its particular function, and the Education Department, in training teachers at the Teachers Training College, is equipped for this work and the teachers are recruited for its own use. If, without let or hindrance, we allowed these teachers to transfer to any public work they wished to transfer to after training, that could only be done with resultant disadvantage to the organization set up by the Education Department. The training of teachers costs the Education Department a substantial sum. If the university or the institute, for example, wish to take over somebody who has been trained at the expense of the Education Department there is nothing to stop their doing so provided they pay the moderate amount of the bond to enable the person to transfer. Speaking as Treasurer of the State and bearing in mind the need to keep accounts of the department in proper order, I consider that the public accounts of the Education Department should not have to bear costs that are not recouped by it, and I think the honourable member for Norwood should look at the matter from that point of view. If an officer wishes to transfer after he has completed his training

there is nothing to stop his doing so other than the repayment of a certain proportion of his training costs. If some other authority believes that it can employ him more usefully as a result of his qualifications, there is nothing to stop its putting up £300 or £400 (or whatever the sum may be) to enable him to transfer without any trouble. As a result of the honourable member's query, I will have the whole question examined again by Treasury officers. If necessary, they may consult the Auditor-General's Department on procedure. In general terms, however, the Education Department must be organized to provide for the necessary fulfilment of its role without having to rely on adventitious circumstances to enable it to get an officer from somewhere else. One of the long standing disputes between State and Commonwealth arose out of the fact that, too frequently, Commonwealth departments wait for the State to train some person and then come along and proceed to offer him some inducement to leave the job for which he has been trained by the State. We have always maintained (and it has been maintained, too, by other States at Premiers' Conferences) that, if the Commonwealth wants a function to be performed that requires some persons to perform it and they require special training, it is the proper function of the Commonwealth Government to see that provision is made for them to be trained because, if the key personnel are taken from a State's organization, that organization can be seriously disrupted. However, I will have the matter examined again and see whether any useful alterations can be made to present procedure—which, incidentally, is not very harsh.

With regard to the second part of the question, I was rather surprised when I heard the Leader of the Opposition say today that comparable salaries were not being paid in the institute, because the institute does come under the Australian Universities Commission's investigation in exactly the same way as the university does. The university has been following closely, and the Government provides the money for it to follow, the recommendations of the Australian Universities Commission. It is a matter, of course, for the university to decide; it is within the authority of the university to accept the Commonwealth suggestion or not. All the Commonwealth does is to say, "If you pay salaries of this order, we will make matching grants. You can please yourself, of course, whether you pay them or not. If you pay higher salaries than those, you

must know that no matching money will come back from the Australian Universities Commission."

I believe it is true that the commission so far has fixed only the salaries of professors, but there has been an accepted ratio of salaries from professors downwards. I understand that that has always been an accepted formula and I should have thought that that formula would automatically apply to the institute. From what honourable members have said here today, it is obvious that there is some doubt whether it does apply. In those circumstances, I will take up the matter with my officers who study this problem and who on occasions have been asked by the Commonwealth Government and the Australian Universities Commission to assist. Some of our Treasury officers have been requested by the Commonwealth Government from time to time to assist in this matter. I will ask them to make a study of the salaries to see whether there are any grounds for the claim made by honourable members opposite, and report back in due course on the result of the investigation.

These matters of comparative salaries are always difficult because, while it is true that the institute does have a course which is of university standard for a degree in technology, there are, of course, many matters in which the institute provides courses that are not comparable with a university degree. The institute actually teaches domestic science and many other things not to be compared with university standards. However, I will have the matter examined and, if there is any ground for complaint when the examination takes place, I will pass on the remarks of honourable members to the appropriate authorities.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I understand that if teachers in the institute are not engaged full-time in teaching the subjects that can be compared with university standards, they may be engaged on some other teaching work for a portion of their time. Is there to be any line of demarcation? I have always considered that the higher-grade teachers should be paid for the higher duties performed.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF MINES.

Mines Department, £71,400—passed.

MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND MINISTER OF ROADS.

Miscellaneous, £22,500.

Mr. LAUCKE: I wish at this stage to pay a tribute to the Government for what it has done in the last five years in the provision of lands for recreational purposes in areas under

local government jurisdiction. I refer particularly to the Tea Tree Gully District Council area. I am happy that the Government did not hesitate to agree to provide this sum of £22,500 to enable certain lands to be purchased at Tea Tree Gully for the purpose of providing playing areas. Even though the moneys had been allotted, money was made available to meet necessary requirements there. Had the Government not said yea to this request, the land now being developed for recreational purposes would have undoubtedly been subdivided for housing. So, it is the timely action of the Government that I appreciate in this matter.

Collectively, in this financial year £232,000 has been devoted to the provision of open spaces. That is a magnificent acceptance of a major challenge in our growing population that we should obtain lands whilst they are available to ensure that they meet current and future requirements for present and future population. There is a difficulty associated with rapidly growing areas in respect of the great demands being made for many things other than aesthetic things. We have firm requirements in road construction, footpaths and that type of thing, and it might well be that, if councils were at all short-sighted, they would not meet the demands for things that will be enjoyed possibly more by posterity than by us. When I note the Government's acceptance of a responsibility to assist councils to do that which they desire to do—namely, to ensure that there shall be no shortage of recreation areas in the future—then I say that we have reached a stage where we are meeting the major challenge of doing certain things now that will benefit the whole State in the future. Five years ago when Beefaeres was sought to be purchased by the Government for recreational purposes, the proposal was rejected. Shortly afterwards, the Government introduced the new system of subsidizing, pound-for-pound, amounts used for this purpose. I regard that decision as one of the finest this Government has ever made and one that posterity will acclaim. This year, £82,500 has been distributed under "public parks" for this laudable purpose, and £147,000 has been granted to the Lands Department. The Minister of Lands is showing a keen interest in the provision of national reserves. I hope that people in given areas, where they have the ability to purchase land for recreational purposes or to recommend the purchase for national reserves, will not hesitate to bring these matters to the Government's notice, because now is the time to do these things. I pay high tribute to the Government

for what it is doing in the important matter of providing adequate playing space and national reserves in this State.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Has the Treasurer any information about the development of the proposed oval to be established in the bed of the River Torrens? This is an urgent measure in my district. The mayors of St. Peters and Walkerville have seen the Premier about this matter and negotiations have proceeded between the two councils about the transfer of the land. Certain notices have been given to the owners of the rubbish dump to be transferred. The only playing area in St. Peters available for the general public is to be lost to them. St. Peters College, which has been extremely generous to the young people in the area by allowing them to use the ovals at the rear of the college, will shortly require the ovals entirely for the use of the expanded school. The East Adelaide school and the College Park Football Club will not have playing grounds, and an alternative area must be developed as soon as possible. Can the Treasurer say what progress has been made with this work?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I received from the councils concerned a letter that posed three or four questions concerning this project. First, what subsidy did the Government provide for the purchase of the land? I had a valuation made by the Land Board and submitted it to the councils. Many small properties are involved in this matter. When submitting the valuation I told the councils that the Government would be prepared to recommend to Parliament a grant to the councils of 50 per cent of the Land Board's valuation. Secondly, what assistance would the Government give in the work of diverting the River Torrens to make the use of the land effective? I asked the councils to bring their plans and costing up to date so that I would have something tangible on which to reply and I have been informed that they will do this. Thirdly, the councils asked whether it would be possible for me to sponsor the borrowing of money to enable them to undertake the obligation. I told them that I would obtain Loan Council approval for the borrowing of the money and, if necessary, that I would arrange the loan for them. The last letter I had from the councils, about six days ago, was entirely satisfactory. They thanked me for the assistance given and said they would give me an up-to-date estimate of the cost of the diversion of the River Torrens as soon as possible.

∴ Line passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1).

The Supplementary Estimates were adopted by the House and an Appropriation Bill for £734,966 was founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is based upon Supplementary Estimates which have been dealt with by the House. Clause 2 authorizes the issue of a further £734,966 from the general revenue. Clause 3 appropriates that sum and sets out the amount to be provided under each department or activity. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall have available to spend only such amounts as are authorized by a warrant from His Excellency the Governor, and that the receipts of the payees shall be accepted as evidence that the payments have been duly made. Clause 5 gives power to issue money out of Loan Funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Commonwealth Government and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to meet the payments authorized by this Bill. This is a normal clause and the authority is not expected to be required this year. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1963, or at a rate in excess of the rate that was in force under any return, award or determination. This likewise is a normal clause.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I do not wish to delay this Bill, as the discussion on the individual lines of the Supplementary Estimates has amply covered the subject matter contained therein.

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

Later, the Bill was returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

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

That during the present session, unless otherwise ordered, the House meet on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday in each week, at two o'clock.

Motion carried.

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

That during the present session, on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and after the six o'clock adjournment on Wednesdays, Government business take precedence over other business, except questions.

Motion carried.

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH ROAD JUNCTION.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: At page 4 of His Excellency's Speech the sum of £13,000,000 is referred to as expenditure on roads during the coming financial year. However, until the junction of South Road, Ayliffe Road and Shepherds Hill Road is widened in order to make it safer for traffic, no bridge will be provided on Ayliffe Road and no work will be done on Shepherds Hill Road, which will therefore probably become one of the most unsafe roads in the metropolitan area. Shepherds Hill Road proceeds from my district to Blackwood, which is represented by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). The bus operator has provided a good service along that road, but he is confronted with heavy maintenance expenditure because of its condition. Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague, the Minister of Roads, how soon work on the widening of the junction can be undertaken in order to afford greater safety for the people at Tonsley Park and for those travelling to the hills area?

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

WARREN RESERVOIR.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Following the abnormally dry seasonal conditions, can the Minister of Works say whether there has been a marked drain on the State's water supplies and whether that has necessitated the pumping of water from the River Murray? Secondly, I understand that the level of the Warren reservoir, which serves my district and a large part of the State, is very low. Can the Minister assure me that it will be possible to pump sufficient water from the River Murray into that reservoir to enable the areas normally served by it to receive ample water for their requirements?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: True, the lack of rain through the catchment areas in the State generally so far has meant that we have received no appreciable intakes into the reservoirs anywhere in the State. However, the Engineer-in-Chief has not yet raised the question with me, so I naturally assume that he is not unduly concerned at this stage. We did pump from the River Murray to the metropolitan systems until comparatively recently on a short-time basis, but that has been discontinued. I presume that the honourable member is particularly concerned, naturally, with the Warren reservoir and with his own district. I do not have before me the present

holding in the Warren reservoir, but the fact that it has been dry in these last six weeks has not resulted in a heavy drawdown on our reservoir supplies because the weather has been cool; indeed some people tell me that it has been cold on occasion! The normal draw in the metropolitan area, for instance, on a winter's day is about 35,000,000 to 40,000,000 gallons, whereas the draw-off on a hot summer's day is nearly 200,000,000 gallons, so a spell of dry weather at this stage of the year does not result in anything like the drawdown in our reservoirs that occurs in the summer. I am sure that the Engineer-in-Chief will report to me as soon as he has any concern about any part of the State. Action can then be taken to meet the need well in advance of any problem arising.

OFF-COURSE BETTING.

Mr. CASEY: The Governor's Speech yesterday referred to provision of off-course betting facilities. Has the Premier asked the Betting Control Board to provide a plan that will give people the right to invest legally without creating betting shops as we knew them in the past? Further, does the Government intend to implement this type of off-course betting with the licensing of bookmakers and agencies rather than a system of totalizator agency board betting?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Speaking from memory, I think paragraph 31 of the Governor's Speech dealt with this matter: His Excellency indicated that no decision had yet been made upon it.

GIDGEALPA GAS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Premier say whether the natural gas discoveries at Gidgealpa are of sufficient proportions to justify a pipeline to the metropolitan area and, if they are, whether the actual route of the pipeline has been determined?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Speaker, the position regarding Gidgealpa is not yet completely determined. The flow of gas from the few bores that have been drilled has been extremely good. The sands are very porous in the gas-producing area, and the flow rate of the No. 2 well, particularly, has been extremely good: I think it flowed at a rate of about 10,000,000 cub. ft. a day. I think the present gas requirement of the metropolitan area is 20,000,000 cub. ft. a day, but as the gas at Gidgealpa has a higher b.t.u. value it would be about equivalent to what is being used

at present in the metropolitan area. Whether a pipeline is justified will be determined ultimately by whether there are sufficient reserves to warrant a long period of use of a pipeline. I have seen some figures regarding this matter, and although I would not say they are completely accurate they do give some idea of the sort of thing we would have to contemplate. I am told that a pipeline would be justified if there was a proven supply of gas for 25 years at 100,000,000 cub. ft. a day. Honourable members will see that a pipeline, costing probably about £20,000,000, could not be undertaken with only relatively short reserves. At the field another bore is now down about 5,000ft. and will probably enter the vital zone next week. However, I understand that the two companies associated in exploring this field now intend to introduce another boring plant on to the field in order to help give an authoritative reply to a letter I wrote some time ago asking whether they could inform us by the end of this year about the available reserves, as then we have to plan for additional large-scale electrical expansion, and obviously we would want to use our own fuel rather than imported fuel. The answer to the honourable member's question is that it would appear that the present deposits are most significant and that they will ultimately prove to be sufficient to warrant a pipeline. However, this will probably not be conclusively known until another six months has elapsed and at least six more drill holes have been put down.

FLORA AND FAUNA.

Mr. CURREN: In the *Advertiser* of May 27 this year appeared a statement by the Director of Fisheries and Game, Mr. A. C. Bogg, in which he said:

... the proposed new legislation would provide for the conservation of fauna, for the management of game species and for the control of domestic breeding of protected fauna. Other provisions would relate to investigations and research into native fauna and for the setting up of fauna reserves, fauna sanctuaries and game reserves.

Has the Minister of Agriculture accepted the principle that game reserves can serve a useful purpose in the overall system of fauna preservation and propagation, and would suggestions on the proposed legislation be welcomed from the South Australian Field Sportsmen's Association?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot say yet whether I expect any new principles on fauna conservation management. However, last year a large conference was organized

to deal with fauna conservation and I hoped that all interested organizations were represented at the conference. We did our best to have a wide representation at the conference with particular emphasis on the attendance of landholders generally. Following that conference the Flora and Fauna Advisory Committee worked hard to sort out the results of the conference and put forward its ideas to the Director of Fisheries and Game. The Director is now making recommendations for a new or radically amended Act as the old Act is quite out of date for a State with the large population South Australia has now. At present the Director is working with the former Parliamentary Draftsman (Sir Edgar Bean) and before they have finished their work they will discuss details with me. However, the stage has not yet been reached where I can answer the honourable member's first question. Dealing with his second question, I may say that suggestions from people interested in game reserves will be welcomed. I have met such people previously and I would be happy to meet them again with the Director of Fisheries and Game so that we may discuss their suggestions.

ABATTOIRS FACILITIES.

Mr. HARDING: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the facilities at the Gepps Cross abattoirs have been brought up to the standard required by the American and Japanese health authorities?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board is spending much money in bringing its works to the required standard for the American market. Honourable members will recall that the United States Health Department has insisted on a wide-spread change in killing methods here for meat to be acceptable in America, and the abattoir at Gepps Cross is one abattoir that will have to make extensive alterations. The alterations the board will have to make are not as far-reaching, by any means, as those needed by many other abattoirs. I would think that every abattoir in Australia would have had to make alterations and a programme of alterations is being put into effect at present. There has been no interference with the board's right to kill for the American market and it is holding authority at present to kill, but it is only able to do so conditionally on its completing its programme. It is in the process of altering its works and

I assume that when the programme is completed it will have an unconditional right to continue to kill for the American market.

WOODVILLE LAND.

Mr. RYAN: During November last year I introduced a deputation from the Woodville council to the Minister of Works. Members of the deputation were very much concerned over a lease of land or sale of land, owned by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, to an engineering firm in Kilkenny. On February 17 this year, the Premier wrote to the Woodville council seeking certain information and the council replied on February 26. On April 30 the council again wrote to the Premier seeking a reply to that letter. As the lease of this land expired in January this year, the council, at its meeting last Monday night, was perturbed that this matter had been left in abeyance for such a long time. Can the Premier say whether finality has been reached in this matter and can he inform the council accordingly?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am rather surprised to hear that the council has not been informed. My recollection of the docket is that there was a problem because the land required by the council, or part of it, was said to be important to an industry that had previously leased it. The industry claimed that it was in its interests to continue to occupy the land. I would have thought that both parties had been informed that a part of the land had been made available at the Land Board valuation. My belief is confirmed by the Minister whose department is concerned. It is some months since I last saw the docket and, as far as I can remember, after considering the matter carefully Cabinet decided to offer part of the land to the council for road widening and part of it to the industry concerned, both parts at Land Board valuation. However, I will ascertain the position and inform the honourable member.

FORESHORE IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. HALL: In common with other members representing areas containing portion of the sea coast of South Australia, I am concerned with the development of beach and foreshore areas. I have, in the past, been associated with moves from Port Broughton, Port Wakefield and the latest one from the St. Kilda area, where suggestions have been made by local people that are being considered by the council representing that area. I believe that much work is necessary not only in considering building additions and improvements at these fore-

shores but in investigating the possibilities, so that local progress associations and councils may know in which direction to channel their efforts. Has the Premier envisaged any increase in Government assistance to councils in building up and improving foreshore and beach areas?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As the honourable member has said, from time to time the Government receives requests for assistance from seaside councils. This matter has been discussed in Cabinet. Difficulties arose over a request that came from one of the South-East councils (Beachport, I think) for assistance in establishing a groyne. Unfortunately, the Government has not available unlimited technical officers to advise councils on problems associated with this matter. I submit this proposal to the honourable member and to the House with some diffidence, because at present the Estimates have not been compiled. What I was hoping to do was to provide on the Estimates, probably under the Tourist Bureau, a sum that would be available for subsidizing beach improvements in much the same way as money is used to subsidize the establishment of swimming pools through the Tourist Bureau funds. I cannot take the matter much further at present, but if I can stretch the finances enough to do it, I intend to provide an adequate sum to be able to subsidize local authorities, perhaps on a pound-for-pound basis, for approved beach improvements. The local council will have to be responsible for the oversight of the work, subject to some agreement about the class of work to be done by the council. I will have the matter further investigated and will inform the honourable member as soon as further information is available.

DIABETIC FOODS.

Mr. CUMBE: Is the Premier aware that some time ago complaints were made about the prices being charged to the public for diabetic foods? Has he obtained a report from the Prices Commissioner on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Most commodities required by sufferers from diabetes are under control in one form or another. I have a report from the Prices Commissioner and it is available to the House. It contains a schedule of prices of commodities and a comparison of the changes that have taken place. I ask permission to have the report incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

DIABETIC FOODS.

As above, there have been a number of statements in the press recently to the effect that prices for diabetic foods are excessive.

The following diabetic foods are controlled items under the category of "Infants and Invalid Foods." Retail prices four to five years ago and current prices are as follows:

	1959.	1964.
Diabetic Bread, Etc.—	s. d.	s. d.
Slimming bread, 8oz.	1 2	1 4
Diabetic rolls, 12oz.	3 11	3 11
Diabetic meal, 10oz.	1 10½	1 10½
Gluten biscuits, 1 lb.	3 10	3 10
Gluten meal, 1 lb.	2 8½	2 8½
Diabetic Jams, Fruit, and Sauces, Etc.—	s. d.	s. d.
Jams—tins: some types, 5½oz.	1 8	4¾oz. 1 9½
other types, 5½oz.	1 11	4¾oz. 2 2
Jams—tumblers: some types, 6½oz.	2 5	5½oz. 2 9
other types, 6½oz.	2 11	5½oz. 3 1½
Canned fruit, 10oz.	1 10½	2 3
Tomato soup, 5oz.	1 0½	1 1½
Tomato sauce, 6½oz.	1 11½	1 11½
Fruit chutney, 6½oz.	1 11½	1 11½
Mustard pickles, 4½oz.	1 7	1 8
Jelly crystals, ½ pint	0 11	0 11
Fruit juice—pineapple, 20oz.	1 8	1 9
Fruit juice—grapefruit, 12oz.	2 1	2 1
Diabetic Aerated Waters—(Not controlled but prices subject to agreement)—Per bottle, 26oz.	1 3	1 6
Diabetic Imported Chocolate—	s. d.	s. d.
Plain, ¼ lb.	4 6	3 6
Almond, ¼ lb.	5 0	4 0

The reduction in price of 1s. per ¼ lb. block is due to 6d. reduction by manufacturer and exemption from sales tax of 6d.

Pastilles are not subject to control. Prices are as follows:—

	First sold	Current price
	1962.	1964.
	s. d.	s. d.
Sanitarium, 4oz. packet	3 11	3 11
	1955.	1964.
	s. d.	s. d.
Sweetex (imported), 2½oz. packet	4 3	4 3

It can be seen that the department has watched the interest of diabetics as regards prices. What is generally lost sight of is that diabetic foods are only produced in limited quantities and manufacturers are therefore not afforded the opportunity of cost savings which are normally made on food items mass produced for the normal requirements of the public. Diabetic food prices will continue to be watched.

PORT PIRIE DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. McKEE: Yesterday I asked the Premier a question about development at Port Pirie and in his reply he said that, although he was hoping that some assistance would be received from the Commonwealth Government, he had been informed by the Prime Minister that the Commonwealth Government was not prepared to support the project. As the Premier said, an industry with an export potential of £3,000,000 a year would be not only an advantage to the State but a great boost to Port Pirie. As the Premier knows, this is badly

needed at present. Can the Premier say whether negotiations are finished with the Commonwealth Government and, if so, does he intend to continue negotiations elsewhere regarding this industry which is so important to the State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The matter has been submitted to the Commonwealth Government on two occasions over a period, and the request has been declined both times. I consider that no useful purpose can be served by writing or seeing the Prime Minister again, because I think the result

would be the same. I know of no reason why the project was turned down and, until I am informed of something that will remove the obstacle to its success, I doubt whether there is much point in taking up the matter with the Commonwealth Government at this stage. However, this does not mean there is no hope of obtaining the industry. We do not give up quite so easily as that when a good industry can be acquired. As soon as I can I will arrange a conference with the company to see whether the problem can be approached from another angle. I will inform the honourable member if I have any success with these negotiations.

As the honourable member knows, one of the problems in connection with the Broken Hill Associated Smelters is that the company is really a co-operative controlling the smelting of the ore by several authorities. These authorities do not necessarily have the same policy. However, this does not mean that the Government has abandoned the attempt to obtain the industry; quite the opposite. If the Government believes that the industry should be obtained it will do everything possible to get it, and I will continue, in another way, to negotiate for the successful establishment of this industry. The honourable member need not think that efforts have been abandoned because the Commonwealth Government will not come to the party. If that Government had come to the party it would have been easier to obtain the industry, but I hope I will still have some success.

OLD BELAIR ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On several occasions I have raised the question of improving the Old Belair Road, and on September 4, 1962, the Minister said:

My colleague, the Minister of Roads, states that an investigation has been carried out by the traffic section of the Highways Department and certain recommendations have been made which are now being taken up with the Mitcham council. A further report will be made when any proposed action has been decided upon.

Since then, so far as I am aware, nothing has been done. The Old Belair Road carries a heavy volume of traffic: I would not say that volume was heavier than that on the main Belair Road, but it would certainly equal it, because it is a quicker and shorter route than the main road. Unfortunately it is narrow, winding and dangerous. On November 4, 1963, the Works Manager of the Mitcham council wrote to the Secretary of the Belair Men's Society, and I desire to quote from part of that letter:

I am directed to inform you that it is not the policy of the Highways and Local Government Department to encourage more traffic on to this roadway by widening and improving the road surface, as the main Belair Road is considered adequate for the heavy traffic to the Blackwood-Belair district.

It is not a matter of encouraging or discouraging more traffic on the roadway: it is simply a matter of coping with the traffic that already uses it. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads ask his colleague to consider again the desirability of widening and improving this road in the interests of safety?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will bring the matter to my colleague's notice and get a report.

SALISBURY INFANTS SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK: In September 1963, following complaints to the Education Department by the Salisbury Primary School Committee, the Health Inspector of the Salisbury and Elizabeth council furnished a report to the department stating that toilets at the Salisbury Infants School were entirely unsatisfactory and needed urgent attention. After an inspection by a departmental officer, the school committee was informed that the infant boys' toilets would have to be demolished and rebuilt and that repairs would also be made to the girls' toilets. The unsatisfactory condition of these toilets has now further deteriorated to the extent that the infant boys are reluctant to use the school toilets at all. I understand that tenders were to be called for this work in early May but as yet the work has not been commenced. I stress again the urgency of this matter and ask the Minister of Education to see whether this necessary work could be commenced as soon as possible?

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

ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM.

Mr. JENNINGS: Will the Minister of Works kindly amplify his statement made, I think, last session about the future use of the Islington sewage farm? I do not know whether he is able to say much more than he said then but I find that I am being plagued (and I suppose he and his department are being plagued too) by speculators. Can the Minister say anything that will end this speculation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not able to say much more than I previously said about this matter. However, I think the position is gradually becoming clearer. I refer, for example, to the statement made by the Premier

to this House yesterday in reply to a member opposite on the standardization of the railways in South Australia, in particular that section of the line between Adelaide and Merriton and also possibly the new line from Port Augusta to Whyalla. The Premier said it would be necessary when bringing standardized lines into Adelaide to lay certain ancillary lines to vital service points within the areas of Dry Creek, Port Adelaide, Mile End, etc. I think that draws attention to the fact that the Railways Commissioner himself will probably receive the highest priority on the land.

It will be necessary to give a priority for such works and land as he desires in order to implement those standardization proposals. Similarly, there will possibly be other departments interested in this land; for example, the Engineer-in-Chief has a drainage problem in the north-western corner of the city of Prospect where the drainage from that area enters the sewage farm and is dispersed. I think the honourable member at least is well aware of that situation because he brought a deputation to me concerning it. Undertakings of that kind will obviously have to have priority in the allocation of this land. As I have said before, many people have constructive ideas about the use of this land, and such suggestions are appreciated. I was rather attracted to the honourable member's comment that speculators may be interested in securing this land. Although I do not know what kind of speculator he means, I assure him that it is not Government policy to provide the opportunity for speculators to make profits on land purchased from the Government. This land will not be disposed of in such a way as to enable speculators (as we shall term them generally) to profit. There are ample public and Government requirements, as well as industrial and recreation area requirements, for this land which, I am sure, will receive close attention and which could well fully occupy the whole of the land made available.

OCCUPATION CENTRES.

Mr. LAUCKE: Will the Minister of Education say whether a decision has yet been made on the possible establishment of an occupation centre at Greenock, which has been advocated and worked for by the Barossa and Light branch of the Mentally Retarded Children's Association for some time?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The prospects are, unfortunately, not very favourable. On November 21 last in reply to a question by the honourable member I said:

I share the opinion of the honourable member that the centralization of all types of educational facilities in Gawler is wrong from several points of view. At present a psychologist is investigating the number of children in the Gawler district who may be possible candidates for placement in an occupation centre. She will now be asked to investigate children in Kapunda, Truro, Nuriootpa, Angaston, and other towns in the Barossa and Light district for a similar purpose. As soon as her report is received, it will be examined by the Chief Psychologist and the Superintendent of Primary Schools, who will submit their recommendations to me through the Deputy Director of Education.

The psychologist did visit all those towns named and she reports:

A more extensive survey in the Barossa Valley recently carried out, indicates that there are still only five children in the Barossa Valley who are both suitable for, and whose parents are interested in the establishment of an occupation centre at Greenock. This survey involved writing to all doctors and headmasters in the area, followed by visits to schools and interviews with some parents.

I received a further report, dated June 8, of the survey of the Gawler district which showed that 13 children would be likely to enrol. This would constitute an occupation centre of about the same size as those at Berri and Whyalla, and that could be conducted quite satisfactorily. I have not come to any decision on the matter, but it would seem impracticable to establish an occupation centre at Greenock. Of the five children who would have been located, I am informed that four could and would attend a centre at Gawler, so it seems that it is desirable and, in fact, necessary to establish an occupation centre at Gawler as soon as possible.

Mr. BURDON: Unfortunately, we have enough handicapped children at Mount Gambier to warrant an occupation centre, and after a long period of time and negotiations the building of such a centre has commenced. Will the Minister say when the centre is expected to be completed, and whether it is hoped to commence activities later this year?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have been informed by the Public Buildings Department that erection of the new occupation centre on a site of nearly two acres commenced on the first of this month and that the building should be completed and ready for occupation early in October, provided suitable local labour is available for the plumbing work. The centre will consist of two classrooms, assembly room, dining room, staff room and offices, kitchen, sick room, store room, entrance foyer, staff toilets and toilets for

children, including shower facilities. The Education Department is anxious to take the building into use as soon as possible. Applications, to close on July 3, were invited in this month's *Education Gazette* for the positions of Head Teacher and an Assistant. Provided suitable teachers are available for appointment, and it is expected that they will be, the building will come into use shortly after its completion.

QUESTION TIME.

Mr. HUGHES: Before the House meets again would you, Mr. Speaker, consider using a different method of calling on members at question time? This afternoon when you asked for questions various members on this side of the House put up their hands, which you acknowledged, and then later in the afternoon you sent a messenger to ask one member who had not even put his hand up whether he had a question to ask. That member asked his question some time ago, and he has now left the Chamber. It appears that some members receive the call at the very end of questions each day, and I consider that if a member receives a call late in the day, which somebody must of necessity do, he could receive an earlier call the next day. Will you consider this matter?

The SPEAKER: There is no need whatever to do so: what the honourable member suggests is being done all the time. If the honourable member follows closely he will notice that when a member gets an early question one day he is invariably late in the list the next day. If the honourable member confers with some honourable members on his side of the House he will realize that that is so.

WIRRABARA POLICE STATION.

Mr. HEASLIP: Some time ago the police officer at Wirrabara was removed (I understand because his residence was condemned) and since then the town has been without a police officer. I understand that the residence was to be rebuilt and that when that had been done a police officer would again be stationed at Wirrabara. Can the Minister representing the Chief Secretary say whether the Government intends to build such a residence at Wirrabara and whether, in that event, a police officer will be stationed there?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will take the matter up with the Chief Secretary for the attention of the Commissioner of Police. Normally, this matter would come within my own knowledge as Minister of Works, because altera-

tions and repairs to residences would be referred by the Chief Secretary or the Commissioner of Police to my department. I do not recall such a request, although it is a comparatively minor matter and I may not have remembered it. I will check up through both avenues to see what information I can give the honourable member on this question.

MANNUM FERRY.

Mr. BYWATERS: The Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, is aware that I have previously raised the question of a second ferry for Mannum. The Chamber of Commerce at Mannum considers that a bridge should be built across the River Murray at that town. At any rate a second ferry is most essential. On weekends and holidays in the summer there is always a long queue of vehicles on both sides of the river, and the position is becoming worse as time goes on. I have again had representations made to me on this matter by the Chamber of Commerce at Mannum and also by the Mannum District Council, and a recent meeting of the Murray Valley Development League at Murray Bridge stressed the urgency of additional facilities at Mannum. During the recess I wrote to the Minister of Roads on this subject and received an acknowledgment. However, I consider that the need is so urgent that I ask the Minister to take the matter up with his colleague as a matter of urgency so that the difficulty can be alleviated before next summer. Will the Minister do this?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

FRUIT FLY.

Mr. RICHES: Yesterday I asked the Minister of Agriculture about statements that have been made in my district regarding the quarantining of oranges and other citrus fruits. I referred particularly to the fruit grown on a householder's own property. I asked whether the department could arrange that at least the fruit grown in Port Augusta could be consumed there and not necessarily have to be destroyed. Can the Minister of Agriculture make a statement on this matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have not been able to discuss this question in detail with the Chief Horticulturist but I discussed it with him briefly. We can deal with cases as individual cases, and if applications are made for the sale or disposal of fruit we can do something about it. However, in general we will have to retain the restrictions for several months yet. It could be said that every time

an outbreak of fruit fly occurs the restrictions must last for 12 months (or at any rate for a period very close to it) to allow for a complete round of seasons. The outbreak in Port Augusta occurred in November, 1963, so restrictions will still be required until the spring of this year. However, we may be able to do something in individual instances where perhaps a commercial or semi-commercial orchard is involved. The question of whether a householder can consume fruit grown on his property is one that I have not had time to discuss, and the honourable member will appreciate that it is not easy to get that answer overnight. However, I will let him know something further as soon as possible. I believe South Australia's fruit fly precautions can be said to lead Australia as regards their carefulness: we have spent more money than any other State on fruit fly eradication. However, we are conscious that eyes are watching us to see that our restrictions are not relaxed. The markets to which fruit is sent are always on the lookout for any danger signs and, even though South Australia does not have fruit fly, the markets would be immediately alerted if our precautions were relaxed. Therefore, it is necessary to be careful from that point of view, apart from what is needed in the way of ordinary restrictions. I will give the honourable member a more complete reply to his question in a few days' time.

BEACHPORT WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CORCORAN: During December last year, the Minister of Works informed me that tests would be carried out on freshwater springs located near Beachport in order to ascertain if there was a sufficient flow of water to provide the township of Beachport with a reticulated water supply. Can the Minister say whether these tests have been carried out, and, if they have, what result has been achieved?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member was good enough to inform my office that he desired to ask this question and I have been able to obtain information on it. Investigations into a water supply for the township of Beachport have, as yet, failed to locate a suitable source of supply. The springs in section 179, hundred of Symon, have been tested and although the salinity of the water is satisfactory the supply has been found to be inadequate for a township reticulation system.

An alternative source of supply is the Beachport oil well which was drilled by a private company. However, the Director of Mines has advised that the water in this bore is

obtained from the Knight Sands at a depth of approximately 900ft. and that the recorded salinity is 2,600 p.p.m., which would be about 350 grains. Although there is some doubt as to the accuracy of this salinity as it may have been contaminated with salt water, it is obvious that the development of the bore as a township supply would be a very costly proposition. Other alternatives would be deep drilling to the Knight Sands or shallow drilling near the township. The latter proposal, of course, would be far less costly but there is always the risk of contamination of the water. However, if a satisfactory supply can be obtained by this method and the bacteriological quality can be made satisfactory by chlorination it should be possible to put forward a scheme within the financial resources of the residents. The Engineer for Water Supply suggests that the Director of Mines be asked to submit the estimated costs of test drilling shallow bores near the township to determine whether a suitable township supply can be obtained. If the results are favourable a report could also be obtained on the bacteriological quality of the water.

I know that the matter has gone further than that, although I just do not see the note that I want to find in the docket. However, I can say that the investigation will continue as rapidly as possible in the hope that a sufficient supply of suitable quality can be found at a more favourable depth than 900ft., which, as the honourable member will appreciate, is a costly matter, and, indeed, the salinity of the water at that depth is doubtful. If I have missed any point in replying to the honourable member, I shall convey it to him at the earliest opportunity.

LAND SPEED RECORD ATTEMPT.

Mr. HUGHES: In the temporary absence of the Premier, I address my question to the Minister of Works. I understand that on April 23 members of the Police Force joined in the establishment of a base camp at Lake Eyre in connection with the world land speed record attempt. Despite a statement reported to have been made by the British driver that attempting a record over the soft salt course was asking the car to do something it was not designed to do, police support was still promised for the continuation of the attempt. Will the Minister of Works say whether, if an attempt should be made again later in the year, it is intended that members of the Police Force will return to the project, or does the Minister think that they should be more usefully engaged elsewhere?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot answer the question categorically because I am not the Minister in charge of that department. However, I know that the Chief Secretary regards it as being the normal responsibility of the police to carry out certain functions wherever their services may be logically required. Apparently the honourable member is of the opinion that Lake Eyre is a place where their services could not be logically required, which I take it is the import of his question. I cannot take the matter further, but I will refer the question to the Chief Secretary for consideration.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE LIFTS.

Mr. LAWN: My question is directed to you, Mr. Speaker, in the temporary absence of the Premier. My complaint is about the lifts at Parliament House that sometimes work and sometimes do not work, and, as the member for Port Adelaide has just suggested, more often than not do not work. On two occasions last year members were caught for several hours in those lifts, and luckily no division occurred during those times. Not only have members been inconvenienced when the lifts have jammed but often they cannot use the lift at the back of the House in the morning because it is stopped for maintenance, and the front lift is sometimes working one day but not the next. Yesterday I came into Parliament House at about 10 o'clock and found that the front lift was not working. The main part of the session is approaching and, as you know, Sir, we have many divisions each session. Bearing this in mind, will you use your influence to have the lifts modernized? The Opposition wrote to the Government last year asking that the lifts be replaced with modern lifts, but all that has been done is that the inner doors have been changed. Will you consider this matter and exert your influence to have efficient lifts installed in Parliament House?

The SPEAKER: I know this matter requires some attention, and I shall certainly take it up with the Government to see if something can be done.

TEMPORARY RELEASE OF TEACHERS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: My question concerns teachers who desire either to transfer or to be released temporarily from their duties to continue their profession with the Department of Territories. Will the Minister of Education say whether the Government has agreed to observe the forms of reciprocation

which I believe have been adopted by the Education Departments of other States and the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I think the question is rather in general form. South Australia does much more than other States because it supplies a large number of highly qualified teachers for the Northern Territory, and it does the best it can to assist the Commonwealth Government in relation to other territories and friendly countries. The member for Stuart was rather claiming in an earlier question that we were doing too much in this regard. However, I shall be pleased to answer the Leader in more detail if he can give any specific instance, but by and large we comply with the requests of the Commonwealth and I think we do more than any other State in Australia.

FERRY OPERATORS.

Mr. RICHES: Statements were made to me about the operation of the ferries at Blanchetown immediately prior to the opening of the bridge that men engaged in that work were working for a man who was a contractor to the Government. Will the Minister of Works obtain from his colleague in another place information relating to that contract, particularly on whether the contractor was obliged to pay the living wage to the people working for him? I have been told that the operators worked seven days a week for four or five years without a holiday of any kind, that they did not receive any overtime payment, and that they were paid £16 a week. That statement was published in a section of the press, and the wives of some of the men who approached me assured me that it was correct. They claimed that because there were fewer than 20 men engaged in this work it was impossible for any union to obtain an award for them and that not only had they been dealt with harshly but that some of the families were suffering hardship as a result. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether the department requires any undertaking from ferry contractors about wages to be paid to operators, and can he obtain any information for me about the truth or otherwise of the reports made to me and printed in the press?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will direct the honourable member's query to my colleague and ask for a report on the matter.

PROBATE DELAYS.

Mr. CORCORAN: Many members have complained recently about delays in probate being completed in cases handled by the

Public Trustee, particularly where hardship occurs to dependants of the deceased. Will the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, ask his colleague whether it is possible to increase the staff of the Public Trustee's office so that the delays can be minimized?

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

ROAD TRAFFIC CODE.

Mrs. STEELE: My question was to have been addressed to the Premier, but in his absence I address it to the Minister of Works. I read in the press a few days ago that the Victorian Government had authorized the publication of a booklet containing the rules of the road, and that it would be sent to motorists with new driving licences or renewals. This is being done as part of the Victorian Government's plan to reduce its tragic road toll. I understand that some years ago in South Australia a Road Traffic Code booklet was presented by the Motor Vehicles Department to every holder of a driver's licence, but that practice lapsed with the appointment of the Road Traffic Board, which assumed the responsibility for such functions. I find, as I am sure other members do, that many people are ignorant of the elementary rules of the road and that this in many instances leads to road accidents and all too often to road fatalities. Can the Minister say whether the publication of the road code has ceased or whether it is being reviewed and will be redistributed, in the interests of public safety, to all motorists soon?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask for a report and inform the honourable member.

DRAINAGE SCHEMES.

Mr. FRED WALSH: During the last three months the Public Works Committee has had referred to it, and has approved, two projects in my electorate, namely, the drainage scheme for Fulham Gardens, Henley Beach East, Grange East, and Seaton, and a sewerage scheme for the same locality and Kidman Park South. The people residing in those areas have suffered considerable inconvenience for several years. This has been recognized by members of the Public Works Committee and it seems that they will have to put up with it for a year or two longer. As I will probably be inundated with inquiries during the forthcoming winter, can the Minister of Works say when work will commence on these two projects? If he cannot reply today, will he inform me at an early date by letter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I expected that there would be inquiries from the honourable member on these matters because I know he is concerned about them, and so am I. I have information that I am sure will be helpful to him. One scheme he mentioned (at Grange, Henley Beach and Fulham Gardens) is listed in the proposed new works at an estimated cost of £583,000. The scheme has been submitted to and recommended by the Public Works Committee, and subject to financial approval work is expected to commence in October. Surveys are in hand. Although it will not be possible to give relief to those residential areas suffering from septic tank effluent disposal problems, the work should be far enough advanced to alleviate the nuisance in some areas before next winter. This scheme will serve a large area owned by the South Australian Housing Trust. Expenditure has not yet been approved by Cabinet as Estimates for next year's expenditure are only now being compiled. Obviously, this is a matter that will be submitted to me for Cabinet approval in regard to next year's financial requirements. Although I speak before Cabinet has approved the scheme, I am sure the honourable member will understand that I am endeavouring to forecast the decision as accurately as I can for his benefit and that of his constituents. I think he can take it that unless something crippling is done by the Loan Council we should be able to start the work next year. I do not have the information about the other scheme he mentioned, but I will obtain a report on this matter and let him have it.

EDITHBURGH BOAT HAVEN.

Mr. FERGUSON: Early in 1963 those engaged in the fishing industry at Edithburgh were given to understand that something would be done to provide a new fishermen's haven and jetty. Can the Minister of Agriculture say what progress has been made in this matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: There are many other projects, some of which become more elaborate as planning continues and consultations with the fishermen are held. I am keen to see that proper facilities are provided at Edithburgh, and the Director of the Fisheries and Game Department and officials of the Harbors Board are at present considering this matter so that a proper and complete project will be available. It will then be my job to find the money from Loan funds to have this work carried out. Needless to say, I am anxious to see a satisfactory conclusion to this matter.

EAST ADELAIDE SCHOOL.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Education kindly consented to inspect the East Adelaide school with me a short time ago, and there were two matters I raised with him. The first concerned the urgent repairs needed to the old original main school building, and associated with that the regrading of the yard which, unfortunately, in heavy rains collects large lakes inches deep. Many children have to play in that area. The other matter was the acquisition of a property adjoining the school to make a larger school site. Can the Minister say what progress has been made in the acquisition of the property, and as the repairs to the school have not yet been carried out, is it possible that they will be carried out soon?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The honourable member knows that the Director of Education accompanied us on the visit and made notes on the state of conditions at the school and of the grounds. I have no doubt that he considered the matter immediately thereafter but, as I have not yet received any up-to-date report, I will take it up immediately. Dealing with the larger question, my understanding of the price that the owner of the adjoining property sought (I am speaking from memory) was more than double the figure that I had had in mind. I think it was about more than double the valuation of the Land Board. The Property Officer of the Education Department was still negotiating with the owner's agents to see whether a more reasonable price could be offered. I shall inquire into the present position and see whether the matter can be brought to completion.

CADELL IRRIGATION SETTLEMENT.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Several months ago the Minister of Irrigation received a deputation from the Cadell settlers consisting of Mr. Dunk, an early settler in the area, and Mr. Tiller, a councillor for the Cadell irrigation ward. The deputation was concerned with the unsatisfactory seepage drainage in the settlement which the Minister generously agreed to remedy. Is he able to make a report on this?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: More work will be necessary than was at first indicated. The survey of the main drains system has been completed and a report and plans have been prepared which indicate that some timber sumps need replacing with concrete structures, whilst two sections of open-jointed drain line should be replaced with sealed concrete pipes, in order to improve the efficiency of the system. Proposals put forward by the Resident

Engineer in this regard are being examined and estimates of cost are to be worked out before a decision can be reached on the actual work to be carried out.

DRIVERS' LICENCES.

Mr. BYWATERS: I have been approached by several of my constituents on the policing of drivers' licences. As we are all aware, every now and again a police check is made in the suburbs and in country areas of drivers' licences. On one particular occasion a constituent did not have his licence with him and was told to produce it within 24 hours. This person lives about 30 miles from the main shopping centre at Murray Bridge and comes into the town only once a week. He had to make a special trip into the town on this occasion to produce his driving licence. We know that many people do not carry their driving licences all the time, but usually they are able to produce the licence at a police station within 24 hours of being asked because of the comparatively short distances involved. There could be many people living an appreciable distance from a country town who would have to make a special trip to produce their licences, which would create some hardship for them. Will the Premier take this matter up with his colleague and see whether any special instruction can be given to the police so that these people will not be subjected to any hardship in having to produce a licence within 24 hours? I refer to people who are well known in an area but who live well outside the main centre. Could some exception be made in their cases and, say, a week be given to produce a licence?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The position is, of course, that the onus to produce a licence within 24 hours represents a concession already. The law does not provide that a driver must have his licence with him at all times. I shall have this matter examined, but I should think that in such a case as the one illustrated by the honourable member the remedy would be for the person concerned to carry his licence with him at any time he is likely to be asked to produce it.

DENTISTS ACT.

Mr. LOVEDAY: In 1960 the Dentists Act was amended but at the time there was an oversight in respect of one section. A consequential amendment was needed to section 48 and I asked a question of the Premier about it in 1961. He said it would be tidied up on some future occasion. I have asked subsequent

questions. Will the Premier have a Bill introduced this session so that this section can be amended in the correct way? It is a purely consequential amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If I remember rightly, it was in connection with the right of a person to act in connection with dentistry although not being a fully qualified person. I do not remember the precise problem but will look at the matter for the honourable member.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. JENNINGS: My question concerns the method of appointing justices of the peace. As the Minister of Education and every other honourable member know, before a nomination for a commission of the peace goes to the Attorney-General it must be sent through the member of Parliament for the electoral district. Arising from this, I draw the attention of the Minister to the last lot of appointments.

On April 24, I received two letters saying that two applicants were not going to be recommended, it being stated that "this, of course, is no reflection on his ability or qualifications". I need go no further than that. I received that letter at 2.50 p.m. on April 30. This can be verified by two most eminent justices of the peace—Mr. R. R. Loveday, M.P., and Mr. A. J. Shard, M.L.C., who saw me take it out of my letter-box. I then rang the Secretary to the Attorney-General and said, "Thank you very much for telling me that these two men are not going to be made justices of the peace, but I am more interested in knowing who is going to be appointed."

Then I received a letter dated May 4 informing me that the Attorney-General had agreed to add these names to the names of those persons who were to have a commission of the peace in South Australia. I received that on May 4. It must have been sent down pretty quickly. The Minister of Education may have some sympathy with my position and the position of all other members of Parliament in this matter, because I vividly remember a few years ago (I think it was) the member for West Torrens directed a similar question to him and the Minister representing the Attorney-General said, "Well, yes; I will refer that matter to my colleague the Attorney-General because I remember when I was a private member I suffered some embarrassment from the same thing."

First, it is most refreshing to hear from a Minister that he remembers when he was a private member. Many Ministers seem to forget that they were ever private members.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is starting to debate the question.

Mr. JENNINGS: Oh no, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is expressing opinions.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think they are very good opinions, Sir, and I think you would agree with them.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order in expressing opinions when asking a question.

Mr. JENNINGS: Very well. I ask the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, whether he will take up with his colleague the way in which justices of the peace in South Australia are appointed, and might he make this suggestion at my request (and I think at the request of all other members of this House for whom I speak, and that includes the whole 39 of us), that if the Attorney-General is going to inform the successful applicants, let him also inform the unsuccessful ones.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to take up the matter with my colleague.

MILITARY PAY.

Mr. CASEY: It has been brought to my notice that many employees who join the Commonwealth Military Forces are placed at a great financial disadvantage when they enter camp for training purposes. I understand that many employers make up pay, but many do not do so; for example, the South Australian Railways. According to reports, the Commonwealth Government wishes to increase our armed forces because of the conflict that exists in the South-East Asia and the Malaysia areas. Will the Premier take up with the Commonwealth authorities the question of the wage deficiency that occurs when employees enter C.M.F. camps for training?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is a question that has some problems, because there are, of course, certain categories which in the event of a war would immediately be detailed for duties on the home front. Members will recall that in the last war certain categories became manpowered categories, and these people could get away from their jobs only with the greatest difficulty. We are building up a military force with people who may not be available in the event of a war, and I have often wondered whether we should not look at this question before we take that step, because obviously many people in the community would not be able to go to a war, and if they are trained now in peacetime and

have their names put down as being in training they are really only taking up training positions without ever being likely to become of very great advantage ultimately to the country.

The South Australian Government is not in quite the same position as some of the other State Governments; I think we are in line with Tasmania, but I do not believe our State Government is precisely in line with some of the other States and with some parts of the Commonwealth Service. I am not quite sure whether the whole of the Commonwealth Service is actually the same. However, the decision here has been that where a person goes away for military training he gets leave and we make up his pay to what it would have been if he were still in the Government service. If, however, his military pay is greater than his civil pay he is allowed to keep the difference. If during his period of training he would have got £20 a week from the State Government, whereas he receives only, say, £15 a week from the Army, we make up his pay to £20 a week. Some States, I think without justification, give leave on full pay, which means that an employee gets double pay while he is doing military service. We have never believed that that is correct policy; it could have tremendous anomalies for the forces themselves. For instance, if a man were on a relatively low wage of, say, £20 a week and joined the services he would get his military pay plus the £20, but if he were on a high salary, such as that received by the Assistant Under Treasurer, of £60 a week or more, he would receive that as well as his military pay. Therefore, the position is created of two people side by side, certainly on the same military pay, but under totally different circumstances. We have made up the military pay to the civil pay or, if the civil pay is less than the military pay, a man is allowed to keep the extra military pay. I do not know the position regarding the Commonwealth Railways, but I will inquire and inform the honourable member.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. McKEE: My question follows that asked by the honourable member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) yesterday. The Premier explained that the new track from Port Pirie to Adelaide would run through Merriton and Crystal Brook. Can the Premier say whether a decision has been made regarding the junction site? Several hundred railway employees in Port Pirie are concerned and some of them are young people who are planning to marry

and build homes. They are concerned about their future and I am wondering whether the authorities have any plans in view. If they have not, has the Premier any idea of what effect standardization would have on Port Pirie and, if there are any plans, can he inform the House about them?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member is posing a rather difficult question. However, I believe that there will not be break-of-gauge work if there are standardized gauges at Port Pirie. Obviously, the break-of-gauge work would cease to be necessary. If it were to take place it would be transferred to Adelaide in respect of freight going through to Victoria. On the other hand, (and this is an important consideration) if the standardization takes place, I believe that the volume of railway communication will rise steeply. When the break of gauge between the Victorian and New South Wales railways was eliminated because of standardization the effect in South Australia was an immediate increase in railway traffic by about 1,000 tons a week. Even a remote break of gauge as far away as Albury had that immediate effect on our railways. I believe that both Port Augusta and Port Pirie will become major transport towns as a result of standardization. When I say that (and I have said it in Port Augusta), I emphasize that the statement is purely speculative. However, I believe that Port Augusta and Port Pirie will increase materially in importance as transport towns rather than decrease, though they will lose a little break-of-gauge transport. In my opinion, probably three times the present traffic will ultimately be handled, because much of the traffic which, of necessity, now goes by road will then go by rail.

BEDFORD PARK PIGS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a report in reply to a question I asked yesterday about pigs at Bedford Park?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have a report from the Chairman of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board in which he states:

The activities of this department at Bedford Park are being progressively curtailed and reorganized as the property is developed for university purposes. Having regard to breeding arrangements at Bedford Park and elsewhere, it is anticipated that it will be possible to discontinue the keeping of pigs at Bedford Park within the next three months. In the meantime, the piggery will be maintained in its present clean condition.

The full report is available for perusal if desired.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Minister of Works give any information about progress towards getting a water supply for the township of Watervale?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Recently the honourable member brought a deputation to me which suggested that, instead of attempting to supply the township of Watervale by bores located to the north and north-west of the town, attempts should be made to obtain a source of supply to the south of the town to serve areas being developed as vineyard properties and for other closer settlement purposes. I have not had time yet to get much done in regard to the project but I can say that the suggestions put forward by the deputation have not been discarded by the department but are being actively pursued. The Director of Mines is being asked to investigate a likely source of supply to the south of the town, and, if he can indicate such a site, drilling operations will be put in hand to test it. If it proves successful, a scheme can be developed and costed, as the deputation desired.

FOSTER CLARK (S.A.) LIMITED.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Several questions have been asked in the House from time to time about what was to be done with the industry that was for a period run by Foster Clark (S.A.) Limited following on its taking over the industry from Brookers (Australia) Limited. I can appreciate that other members, particularly country members, are concerned that there should be industries able to process the produce of country districts, but I am particularly concerned that under the management of Foster Clark this particular concern was used for dumping produce on the South Australian market, which adversely affected the market for the products of other firms in this State that did not have the Government assistance through the State Bank that Foster Clark was given. This affected industries in my district in which many of my constituents were employed. Will the Premier ensure that under the new set-up of this particular industry care will be taken by Treasury officials and the State Government to see that, where any assistance is granted to the company, that assistance will be on condition that nothing of the kind of dumping on the market that was done by Foster Clark will be allowed to occur in South Australia to the harm of the company's quite proper competitors in the State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe that the honourable member is correct when he says that Foster Clark did some

dumping, but I would be correct in saying that at that time that company was only indulging in what other companies were doing. A determined effort was being made by a co-operative company to establish a bigger base on the local market because export sales at that time were unprofitable, and there was intense competition to try to capture the local market. About the future, the position is that the Foster Clark project has been sold to a co-operative company (a co-operative of growers throughout the Hills area and the Lower Murray districts), and I am sure they will be as equally concerned as the honourable member to see that there is no cut-throat competition that would ultimately destroy their own market. A fruitgrowers' company has taken over the project.

At present the company is not being financed by the Government from the point of view of working management. It is being financed by the Government for a long-term payment for the factory assets, but the company is mainly concerned with export fruit and, I understand, is being largely financed from overseas. This company has overseas arrangements that enable it to receive immediate finance for products as they are completed. I believe that this company will carry out its obligations in a thoroughly reliable and responsible manner. The company has been successful during the period it has operated this year, and that will be its continued policy. For the information of the honourable member, since Foster Clark failed a Commonwealth plan has been operating for the stabilization of the Australian fruit market, and a tax is being charged on all fruit sold for local consumption. There is not now the intense competition to get into the Australian market because the processor receives an equal price for the product whether sold on the local or the export market.

SCHOOL MILK.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: I understand that arrangements are being made for a certain firm to supply milk to schoolchildren on Eyre Peninsula. Can the Minister of Education name the schools in the District of Eyre that are being supplied with free milk?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I will inform the honourable member next week.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT.

Mr. CORCORAN: Many people have approached me for clarification regarding controlled routes when this Act comes into force

They are not sure whether there will be a continuance of the present control or whether it will be in a different form. Can the Premier say what action will be taken in this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is the Government's desire that, as soon as existing licences expire, controlled routes should cease to be controlled. However, at present I believe there are a large number of licences in force, some of which do not expire until 1968. I expect that legislation will be introduced fairly early in the session to resolve the matter.

HOUSING LOAN REDEMPTION FUND.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Premier indicate the extent of popularity of the housing loan redemption fund provided by Parliament in 1962?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. The legislation did not function very well for a start as it was not regarded very seriously by many house purchasers. However, I believe that when a certain insured person died rather suddenly, with only one payment having been made, the cost of the house was redeemed to the extent of the loan. That suddenly made people sit up and take notice and there is now an increasing demand from people to insure under this scheme. I think that at present 300 or 400 persons are insured under the scheme and every week a considerable number of people are taking out a policy.

BOAT SURVEYS.

Mr. McANANEY: Commercial fishermen at Victor Harbour are concerned about part-time fishermen using boats for a number of days

each week but not being required by the regulations to have their boats surveyed or to pay the rate of footage prescribed. These people outside the regulations undercut the commercial fishermen, who feel that they should be covered by the regulations. At present the regulations provide that anybody selling fish should have his boat surveyed. Can the Minister of Marine comment?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Wherever one draws the line in legislation by setting limits, either upward or downward, one invariably finds a number of people who are perhaps favourably situated, and one cannot avoid some semblance of an anomaly. The figure of 25ft. was adopted as the smallest size of boat which would require registration and survey, for the simple reason that it was considered that boats of that size and upwards ventured into dangerous waters as a matter of practice and habit, and were subjected to more hazardous conditions. Therefore, the limit was set at 25ft., which I think was fair and which should prove practicable. At any rate, I suggest to the honourable member that we await some trial period before we set about making alterations to that regulation.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, July 28, at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 28, at 2 p.m.