

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, August 18, 1964.

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

QUESTIONS.**METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In view of the extra cost of unforeseen work on the south-western suburbs drainage scheme, such as the proposed widening and straightening of the Sturt River, which was not included in the original estimate, can the Premier say whether the Government intends to meet that cost?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A conference was held with the metropolitan councils at which I put forward certain proposals for a metropolitan drainage board to be established. I think those proposals have now been considered by the councils concerned and I fancy that, with the probable exception of one, the councils have agreed—

Mr. Jennings: The Adelaide City Council did not agree.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD:—to the board's establishment. I informed the conference that, in the event of a metropolitan drainage board being established, the Government would be prepared to meet the cost of certain south-western suburbs drainage works which was not allocated under the original agreement. Of course, if agreement is not reached on the general question of a drainage board for the metropolitan area, the matter will have to be considered by Cabinet and by this House.

Mr. JENNINGS: My district is greatly concerned in this matter. If the Adelaide City Council decided not to participate in the scheme, would that affect the Government's intention to proceed with the appointment of this authority?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter is one on which Cabinet will have to decide but, personally, I do not regard as vital the fact that one council will not participate in the scheme. Perhaps a council that is contributing water to the other councils may not want to participate in the scheme because it does not want to be obliged to pay. If a drainage board were set up, it would, fundamentally, have the power to levy all areas contributing to the problem. I consider that, if one council held out while the remainder accepted the proposal (or a substantial number wished to proceed with it), Cabinet would

approve the introduction of a Bill, and the council, or councils, not coming into this scheme would not necessarily be relieved of paying a fair share of the cost of the work to be undertaken. I should think that that would be a logical conclusion. Incidentally, it has been the result of a recommendation of the Public Works Committee in the past. That committee has always examined problems to ascertain who contributes to that problem, as well as to see who receives the excess water, and it has made a determination of benefit accordingly. I do not think it is material to the success of the scheme whether the Adelaide corporation comes into it or not. It would certainly not relieve the corporation of any obligation that it should rightly bear if it were to stay out.

EGG MARKETING.

Mr. LAUCKE: The inadequacy of the present State Egg Board system to provide necessary stability in the egg industry is underlined in an article appearing in this morning's press headed "Protest on South Australian Eggs", in which reference is made to eggs entering Victoria levy-free, with a consequent depressing effect on the industry there. As that which applies to Victoria today could easily apply in this State tomorrow, and could prevail until orderly marketing on an all-States basis was introduced, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether developments have recently taken place towards an all-Australian egg industry stabilization scheme?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I saw that article this morning and, to say the least, it expressed a rather one-sided point of view. Anybody can buy in Adelaide shops Victorian eggs bearing the Victorian Egg Board's stamp. In addition, in the South-East in particular, it would be easy to buy plenty of unstamped eggs that come directly from producers in Victoria. The honourable member says that it might apply to South Australia tomorrow, but I can say that it has applied here for many years now. Although the South Australian Egg Board does not send eggs to Victoria, not only the authorities but the private farmers trade with the other States to quite a degree. Regarding the possibility of a Commonwealth scheme to overcome this, honourable members are well aware of the position up to a week or two ago when I think I said I had written to the Chairman of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities of Australia setting out objections to the proposed scheme as it applied in this State. Since then the Chairman has spoken to me on the telephone

about one or two matters I mentioned, and at present the council is considering the letter, but I have not received a firm reply and until I receive one I have nothing further to add. I reiterate that I believe a Commonwealth marketing scheme for eggs will be good if it can be made to work, but I do not favour jumping into a scheme that is either impracticable or is not going to succeed in some way or another. First, I should like to see that any scheme will do what it sets out to do, which is to assist the egg industry in Australia.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last year, in dealing with the marketing of eggs, the Auditor-General suggested that the most profitable market for producers was in South Australia, and he recommended that there should be more advertising during the flush season to increase local sales. Will the Minister of Agriculture inquire of the South Australian Egg Board whether it intends to follow the Auditor-General's recommendation?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask the Chairman of the Egg Board.

STUDENT-TEACHER ALLOWANCES.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Can the Minister of Education say whether the allowance of student-teachers will be increased to permit them to retain a standard of living in keeping with the noble profession for which they are training, and can he say how such allowances here compare with those for student teachers in other parts of Australia?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The information desired by the honourable member is being collated and the whole position is being examined. As soon as I am able to do so I shall let the honourable member have a definite reply. However, this may take a little time, because any decision will be at Government level and must take into account the Budget figures generally.

SHOWGROUNDS TRAFFIC.

Mr. HEASLIP: Last week I asked the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, whether the show-time railway service from North Terrace to the Showgrounds had been discontinued. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a report from the Minister of Railways, who states that the reason for the removal of the siding to the Showgrounds at Keswick is that its continuance would have had a detrimental effect on the layout of the new bridge to be constructed by the Highways Department at Keswick.

However, it will still be possible to issue Showgrounds tickets at Adelaide and other stations during Royal Show week, also a railway ticket from Adelaide. The railway ticket would be for travel to either Keswick or Goodwood, at the special Showgrounds fare. If patronage warranted it, the Commissioner could run some additional trains to supplement the normal service, but as they could not reverse at Keswick or Goodwood it would be necessary to run them as far as Mitcham or Edwardstown.

MURRAY BRIDGE SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. BYWATERS: The Minister of Education will recall that earlier this year, when opening a new primary school at Murray Bridge, he referred to the proposed Murray Bridge South High School, which would be some distance from the present high school. People were pleased to hear this announcement, which has since been often discussed by the Murray Bridge High School Council. The council now desires to know where the buildings will be situated and whether a plan could be drawn up showing the locations of ovals and other facilities so that preliminary work could commence when the site is fully acquired and progress be made to minimize any delay when the buildings are completed. The council hopes to sow the lawn for the ovals and perhaps plant trees around this rather windy area, and it would be better if the trees could be planted soon. Can the Minister of Education say what has transpired since he made his announcement? If he cannot do so today, will he tell me soon whether preliminary planning could take place?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: When the honourable member introduced a deputation to me at Parliament House some time ago, I had examined the position at large and made a general statement as to the departmental policy and my own policy regarding a new high school for Murray Bridge but, at that stage, I wanted to further consider the details of what would be provided and where it would be provided. The Superintendent of High Schools, the Superintendent of Technical High Schools, and the Deputy Director of Education subsequently visited Murray Bridge and came to certain conclusions, which they embodied in a recommendation. However, later the Director of Education (who, naturally, is my principal adviser), having doubts as to some details, went to Murray Bridge and examined the position, and the differences of opinion were resolved. We concluded, after all these difficulties had been resolved, that I should make the announcement that I subsequently

made when opening the primary school. It is not usual to supply ground plans beforehand, but I think that in the unusual circumstances of this case it would be eminently desirable that this be done. I shall consult with the Director of Education and the Director of the Public Buildings Department on whether a plan can be prepared as soon as possible for transmission through the honourable member to the interested parties.

PYRITES.

Mr. HARDING: Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Mines, say whether an adequate known quantity of pyrites is available in the Nairne district for the production of sulphuric acid to assist with the manufacture of sufficient superphosphate for the future requirements of primary producers in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As the honourable member told me he would ask this question, I have been able to get a report. The reserves of pyritic ore at Nairne are very large, and there is little likelihood that they will be exhausted in the near future. The present production is running at 380,000 tons a year. Although recent ore reserve estimates are not available, the original published estimate was 19,000,000 tons. About 2,500,000 tons of ore has been mined since the project commenced.

CROSSING GUARD RAILS.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the erection of light tubular steel guard rails at rail crossings?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, has informed me that the matter raised has again been carefully considered, but it cannot reasonably be contended that there is any practical form of fence which will remain unscathed when struck by a moving road vehicle, nor any vehicle which will not sustain some damage in such event. The relative damage tends to be judged by the effects of spectacular accidents. In fact, there are many more accidents involving road vehicles and wing fences than are reported publicly. In most cases, departmental officers have no knowledge of the circumstances and are unable to trace the vehicles concerned. The necessary repairs to fences are carried out by the Railways Commissioner's forces. There is a clear implication, in such instances, of carelessness or neglect on the part of the driver of the road vehicle. In respect of accidents at level crossings involving collisions between road vehicles

and trains, wing fences are not invariably involved. Collision between the road vehicle and the fence, in any case, is secondary to the main impact with the train. If there were no fence it is tolerably certain that secondary collision would take place with some other obstacle adjacent to the crossing. In the circumstances, the Commissioner cannot agree that the proposal to replace crossing guard rails with lighter structures would give any assurance against injury and damage caused in accidents.

CEDUNA COURTHOUSE.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Will the Minister of Education ascertain from his colleague, the Attorney-General, what progress has been made in the building of the courthouse and Government offices at Ceduna?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do so and to inform the honourable member as soon as possible.

COMPUTERS.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say what investigations have been carried out by the Public Service Commissioner's Department on the use of computers in the Public Service, according to modern business practices? Is the Government purchasing computers apart from those in use in the Electricity Trust and the Railways Department? What steps are being taken to train public servants to use computers? Is the Public Service Commissioner's Department co-operating with the university's computer centre in the training of these officers?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government has investigated this matter. A competent committee investigated it and, as a result of its recommendations, the Government has ordered a computer. I am not sure when it will come into use but steps are being taken to train people to use it. The computer will probably be established in the Public Service Commissioner's Department, and its first work will be in connection with the Engineering and Water Supply Department's accounts. As soon as it is working, and a system has been evolved, it is expected that the computer will be used in or for other departments. For instance, one suggestion is that it should be used in the Agriculture Department in connection with the tremendous amount of work involved in assessing results of milk tests for the various herd-testing activities of the department.

Mr. Lawn: It could assess the results of general elections, too.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, I should think it would be most useful there.

Mr. Lawn: It would do a better job than the Government does.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It would enable me to conclusively reply to some of the honourable member's suggestions.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: However, my answer to all the questions of the member for Torrens is "Yes".

GOVERNMENT BANKING.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Can the Premier say whether any financial arrangement has been made with the Commonwealth Government (or whether any financial benefit accrues to South Australia under the system) by which State undertakings, which function either as Government departments or independently, such as the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board, the Railways Commissioner, the Conservator of Forests and the Housing Trust, bank with the Commonwealth Reserve Bank?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not sure that I appreciate the implications in the honourable member's question. There is nothing in the present set-up that compels the State Government to bank with the Commonwealth Reserve Bank. South Australia is one of the States (and I think there is only one other State) that probably completely banks with that bank. Many of our departments bank with the Commonwealth Reserve Bank but, on the other hand, I do not think an agreement exists with the Commonwealth Government that would compel the Government to use that bank. The State Government uses that bank because it receives extremely good service from it. I believe it receives better terms from the Reserve Bank than it would from a private bank. Long before I was associated with the Treasury it was always the practice to bank with the Commonwealth Bank, and that practice has been maintained up to the present. I have no intention of changing that policy.

EDIACARA ORE.

Mr. CASEY: On the evening of October 18, 1962, the Premier referred to the Ediacara mineral field (situated west of Beltana which is, of course, in my district) over ADS7. During the course of his remarks he said that the field had great potential because it contained lead ore which, although of low grade, showed a significant quantity of silver and copper. I know that in the past two years extensive

drilling has taken place at Ediacara. There is about 50,000,000 tons of low-grade ore in that area. However, recently when in the area I found that the Mines Department was moving out and, indeed, little activity exists on the field at the moment. Will the Premier ask his colleague, the Minister of Mines, for a report on the Ediacara field and see whether any significant mining will be carried out there in the future?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall get a report for the honourable member from the Director of Mines. As far as I know, the field has not lived up to expectations and we have not been able to locate a sufficient volume of ore, in the nature of a mineable asset, to warrant opening the field. Much work is being done there; a big deposit exists, but it does not appear to be sufficiently rich to justify a commercial undertaking.

PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS.

Mr. LAWN: Last week I asked the Premier a question about pedestrian crossings and he promised to take the matter up and get a reply as soon as possible. A statement was published in the press, with the result that this matter was discussed at a recent meeting of the Kensington and Norwood council. One councillor said that the Prospect council had been waiting for seven years for a Road Traffic Board decision on a pedestrian crossing and that councils were too readily blamed for these delays. The last paragraph states:

The council decided to tell the Premier that pedestrian crossings should be a Road Traffic Board work paid for by the Government.

Will the Premier ascertain whether the Road Traffic Board is taking seven years to give such decisions, and will he inform the board that the member for Adelaide hopes there will be a much quicker reply in this instance. If the board is taking so long on such matters will the Premier see that replies are given much more expeditiously? What is the Premier's view of the last paragraph, in which the council suggests that pedestrian crossings, as distinct from other crossings, should be paid for by the Government?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Answering the last part of the question first, I think that comment applies to everything: everybody is in favour of the Government's paying for everything. These crossings are designed to meet a local requirement and I do not believe that they constitute a Government obligation. I do not know under what heading we would tax people to supply these

crossings: I believe they are a local government obligation. I know that some councils accept the obligation very cheerfully and take the necessary steps, while others do not. Quite frankly, I do not agree that it is a Government obligation. A report which I have regarding the particular crossing referred to by the honourable member states that the problem of providing pedestrian protection at the shopping centre on Marion Road at North Richmond has been a matter for investigation by both board and council officers. Bearing in mind that experience has shown that installation of pedestrian crossings at locations where there is insufficient justification for them has resulted in non-observance of the crossing by both motorists and pedestrians, it was considered by the board that traffic conditions did not meet the warrant for a pedestrian crossing at that time. However, the matter has been kept under review, and as traffic activity has been increasing in the area due to the changing traffic pattern at the intersection of Anzac Highway and Marion Road, it has been decided to re-investigate the problem. This will be done at the earliest opportunity.

GOODWOOD TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently I informed the Minister of Education that I was concerned at the situation and type of toilets under construction at the Goodwood Boys Technical High School, which school caters also for adult education classes. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No, Mr. Speaker. I took this matter up again with the Deputy Director of Education and also the Secretary of the Education Department. I think there is a case for a different type of building from what was envisaged, and those officers in turn also are convinced and have made representations to the Director of the Public Buildings Department. I have not yet received a reply, but as soon as I receive one I shall let the honourable member know.

BERRI EVAPORATION BASIN.

Mr. OURREN: On several occasions I have raised with the Minister of Lands the question of odours from the evaporation basin at Berri. Can the Minister say what investigations have been carried out in respect of this problem and the result of such investigations?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: This is one of those places known wherever they exist as the local lily pond. This basin at Berri takes effluent from such big works as the Berri

Co-operative Packing Union Limited, the Berri Co-operative Winery and Distillery Limited, and the Tarac Manufacturing Company Limited. Admittedly, the basin does not smell too nicely sometimes. However, the matter has been taken in hand to see if we can remove any odours from the effluent. I am not certain yet how that can be done, but intensive tests are being made to see if that can be achieved, and if it can it will be most beneficial to many other places in the State. Investigations have been carried out by officers of the Water and Sewage Treatment Division, Engineering and Water Supply Department. The investigation to date has included the analysis of samples of the effluent being contributed by the organizations I have mentioned, together with samples of mud from the floor of the evaporation basin and samples taken at monthly intervals across the evaporation basin. It is understood that an interim report on the investigation so far will be submitted in the near future and that such report will indicate that:

(1) Further investigation is required and it will be at least two months before a final recommendation as to what should be done to overcome the problem can be considered.

(2) Results to date suggest that a reorganization of the treatment of the effluent at the factory site will be necessary in at least one case.

(3) The evaporation basin as a whole has sufficient capacity to absorb properly treated effluent without causing a nuisance but the distribution of the effluent throughout the basin to obtain the necessary dilution is expected to present difficulties.

MILLICENT TANKS.

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the ground surrounding the water tanks of the Engineering and Water Supply Department at Millicent?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer-in-Chief states that the reinforced concrete elevated tank and the surface storage tank at Millicent are now complete and the scheme is in operation. However, a relief pumping plant has yet to be installed in the area near the tanks and the plant will be housed in a small building of solid construction. As the plant is not essential for the initial stage of the township water supply, the work of constructing the building has been deferred until after the winter, owing to the wet condition of the area. As soon as conditions become more suitable the building and installation will be completed

and the whole area tidied up. In the course of the excavation of the tanks, a certain amount of topsoil has been retained in heaps for the purpose of soiling and grassing the area. Shrubs and trees will also be planted in order to make the area as attractive as possible, and it is anticipated that the whole area will be cleaned up by the end of this year.

PORT PIRIE RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the construction of coaches for use on the Port Pirie rail service?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Railways reports that of the nine cars being constructed the progress is as under:

No. of Car.	Complete.
1	99 per cent.
2	90 per cent.
3	75 per cent.
4	70 per cent.
5	40 per cent.
6	35 per cent.
7	assembling the under-frames.

The first two cars are held up on account of delay in the delivery of the power equipment for the air-conditioning. It is expected that this equipment will come to hand next month.

ANZAC HIGHWAY.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question concerning the lighting of the median strip on the Anzac Highway?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that the present form of kerbing used along the median strip is quite unsuitable for the use of retro-reflective material. However, even if the kerbing is changed to the standard cross section now in use, the advantages of retro-reflective material will be of only a very temporary nature due to the accumulation of dirt, and so on. The reason for the difficulty in driving along the median lane at night is the sub-standard street lighting which is not sufficient to illuminate half the middle lane as well as the median lane—the half of the road that carries both the heavier and the faster traffic. It would be necessary to double the existing number of street lighting lamps along the highway if the standard of lighting is to be raised to a satisfactory level and the total pavement width satisfactorily illuminated. This is considered to be the only practicable and worthwhile solution to the problem of night driving along the median lane of the highway.

HONEY.

Mr. HARDING: Because of the effluxion of time, the South Australian Honey Board ceased operations on June 30, 1964, and no provisions at present exist for the disbursement of funds owing to beekeepers. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Government will bring down legislation to make it possible for the final payment to be made to suppliers of honey and beeswax delivered to the Honey Board in the year 1963-64?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: A Bill will be introduced into Parliament shortly.

FINES FOR OVERLOADING.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, a reply to my question of July 30 regarding fines for overloading?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have been informed by my colleague, the Attorney-General, that all fines for overloading are paid into general revenue along with fines for other offences. It is therefore not possible to supply the figure requested by the honourable member.

TOWN PLANNING.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Has the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, a reply to my question of August 4 regarding the resignation of the Assistant Town Planner, Mr. Westerman, and the filling of this vacancy?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The matter of filling the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Assistant Town Planner is being examined by the Government to see whether a suitable person is available.

KEILIRA SCHOOL.

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of August 11 regarding the construction of toilets at the Keilira Primary School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Public Buildings Department reports that tenders for the construction of the proposed toilets at Keilira Primary School are expected to be called in about two months' time. Time of the commencement of the work will depend on tenders received.

SCHOOL CANTEENS.

Mr. CLARK (on notice):

1. How many school canteens are in operation in departmental schools in South Australia?
2. What were the costs of electricity and gas respectively, for these canteens in the last financial year?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The replies are:

1. There are now 116 school canteens in operation and another 14 are being established, but in the last financial year there were 108.

2. The only school canteen with a separate meter is Glossop High School. The total cost for electricity consumed at that school in the last financial year was £726 of which £186 was recorded through the canteen meter. The total cost for electricity and gas consumed in the last financial year at the 108 schools where canteens were in operation was about £51,000. In the absence of separate meters, it is impossible to state how much of this total cost is attributable to the canteens.

HIRE-PURCHASE.

Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice):

1. What was the total outstanding hire-purchase debt in South Australia at March 31, 1964?

2. How many contracts were involved?

3. How many hire-purchase contracts were entered into from July 1, 1963, to March 31, 1964?

4. What was the sum so involved?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1. £44,000,000.

2. This information is not available.

3. 104,411.

4. £21,400,000.

CLEAN AIR COMMITTEE.

Mr. Jennings, for Mr. RYAN (on notice):

1. Has the Clean Air Committee commenced duties?

2. Has the committee recommended any regulations required to implement decisions of the committee?

3. How many complaints have been considered by the committee?

4. How many complaints are still awaiting consideration by the committee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1. The Clean Air Committee has met on three occasions and a fourth meeting is arranged.

2. The committee has not yet recommended any regulations but this matter is receiving consideration.

3. The committee has been apprised of a least 15 complaints.

4. Complaints are investigated by the Public Health Department and reports furnished to members of the committee. The committee's functions as laid down in the Health Act

Amendment Act, 1963, are to investigate problems of air pollution and air impurities and report to the Minister thereon, and to advise and make recommendations to the Minister as to the making of regulations. There are so many aspects of air pollution to be considered that it may be some considerable time before composite regulations are formulated. In the meantime, work is being continued and expanded within the Public Health Department to gather as much detail and information as may be required to give full consideration to the implementation of regulations.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Clean Air Committee been appointed pursuant to section 94b of the Health Act, 1935-1963?

2. If so, who are the members and has the committee yet reported to the Minister as provided by section 94b (11) of the said Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1. Yes—*vide Government Gazette*, January 30, 1964.

2. The committee has not yet furnished a formal report to the Minister of Health but the Minister is kept informed by the Chairman of the committee. The members of the committee are:

Dr. P. S. Woodruff, Director-General of Public Health (Chairman),

Dr. G. H. McQueen, Principal Medical Officer (Public Health),

Mr. F. E. Roberts, Chief Inspector of Boilers and Factories, and

Mr. H. S. Dean, Consulting Engineer, Department of Labour and Industry.

Nominated members are:

Mr. L. H. Johns, Secretary, the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia,

Mr. A. W. C. Crossman, Chief Mechanical Engineer, South Australian Railways,

Mr. K. H. Milne, Chief Engineer, the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

Professor J. H. Carver, Elder Professor of Physics, University of Adelaide,

Mr. J. P. Burnside, Chief Engineer, South Australian Gas Company.

Mr. E. M. Schroder, President, South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated, and

Mr. A. A. Weir, analytical chemist (representative of local government interests).

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS.

The Legislative Council intimated its concurrence in the appointment of the committee.

LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 13. Page 441.)

Grand total, £36,540,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): The Loan Estimates presented to us this year bear a marked resemblance to similar renditions in previous years, but I was pleased to see that in many cases more information was included so that members will be better able to assess how the particular projects or public works are progressing. However, several instances have occurred where major projects extend over long periods, and I maintain that the correct procedure to adopt with these cases is to show the total estimated cost, the expenditure to date, the proportion of the project completed together with the proposed expenditure for the coming year. I do not wish to deal with matters out of sequence but by way of example, under "Electricity Trust", the Treasurer, in relation to 1964-65, said, "£2,806,000 will be required for construction work for Torrens Island." I am sure all members would be vitally interested to know how much the Government has spent on this project since the appropriate legislation was passed in 1962, because at the present rate of progress it will be 50 years or more before this grandiose £150,000,000 project for the future will be a reality. After two years, the design of the project appears to be under consideration for change, and it seems to me doubtful whether this Playford prediction will become a reality in its original form.

We have had a governmental and semi-governmental programme placed before us totalling £52,500,000 made up of £36,500,000 ordinary State works, £10,600,000 Housing Agreement funds, and £5,400,000 from semi-governmental borrowings and the use of internal funds. The proposed expenditure of more than £52,500,000 is a colossal sum of money for a State with a 1,000,000 population, and it places a heavy burden upon members of Parliament to ensure that the money is spent as wisely as possible. Therefore, I believe it is not satisfactory for the Treasurer to indicate, in a general way, how the money is to be spent. It also becomes particularly important for this Parliament when it is realized that once an item is included in the Loan Estimates and passed the Government is empowered to spend the money as it thinks fit. I believe this to be a great weakness with the legislation covering our Loan expenditure as I will illustrate later.

In July this year, the Australian Loan Council approved a total new borrowing programme of £290,000,000, of which South Australia's share was £39,760,000, an increase of £2,468,000 over the new borrowing programme of last financial year. This is not a substantial increase when one considers the serious shortages apparent in so many of our essential public services, and, before we allow ourselves to be carried away by the eloquence of the Treasurer, we should assess how much the Government promised last year and how much it achieved of its programme before we move to the final step and assess how much it is likely to achieve during the current financial year. As will be gathered from my remarks, many weaknesses exist in the Government Loan programme which indicate that the State in its present buoyant condition is advancing in spite of the Government's manoeuvrings and financial sleight of hand. As in years past, the Government, when it becomes embarrassed by surplus funds, passes a book entry which shows a substantial Government expenditure, but in reality, the funds are still held in a trust or deposit account of the Government from a semi-government organization.

The State Bank was the activity selected this year for this manoeuvre, because last year, under the heading "Advances to State Bank", Parliament approved of £250,000 being paid to the State Bank out of Loan funds, whereas the Government saw fit to pay over £1,000,000. However, over the twelve months, the surplus on Loan Account moved from £405,000 to £1,698,000, which indicates that this Government was adopting a deflationary programme in accordance with policy directives from Canberra. I have no doubt that at the end of June, the bulk of the funds transferred to the State Bank remained unspent because the Treasurer in the Loan Estimates stated:

Proposals are now in hand for major developments in the processing of the softwood resources of the South-East of the State, and I anticipate that the State Bank will be responsible for providing a part of the finance required by the undertakings which will carry out the processing. It was mainly for this reason an advance of £1,000,000 was made to the bank late last year, and a further advance of £500,000 is proposed this financial year.

Surely it would have been courteous to inform Parliament of the transfer of this substantial sum of money prior to the transaction being carried out.

In any case, I am firmly convinced that, as in the past, the Government has attempted to show expenditure that did not occur and that

the funds transferred will be shown as expenditure during 1964-65. I believe that my criticism is strengthened when the Treasurer has admitted himself that the statutory bodies have internal funds and reserves, which they can draw on, to the extent of £12,000,000 during the current financial year. I have strongly criticized this procedure because the Government can easily destroy business confidence by this financial manoeuvring, particularly if business leaders cannot be certain that the Government accounts do not present the true picture. It would be better in the long run to give the correct picture instead of going to all sorts of lengths to make the estimates of expenditure agree with the financial result.

I now turn my attention to some of the specific lines in the Loan Estimates to show how the Government predictions compare with practical results and what is anticipated for the coming year. An amount of £250,000 is provided under "Advances for Homes". In regard to this the Treasurer said:

The bank is likely to have available for lending in 1964-65, Housing Agreement moneys, State Loan Funds, carry-over funds from June, 1964, and repayments of previous advances, adequate to carry out a lending programme of about £5,700,000, some £240,000 more than the level of advances in 1963-64.

I should like to know what carry-over of funds was involved on this account and when the Government is going to carry out the provisions of the Homes Act and make available money for the purchase of existing houses with reasonable equity. Some of the houses I have in mind come from deceased estates whilst others are occupied by people whose children have grown up and have married, and the home has become too big for the couple to care for it properly. These houses would be admirable accommodation for young couples with large families in already established areas close to schools, churches, hospitals and all facilities, but sufficient bank finance is not available to purchase these houses. Another factor is that difficulties occur when persons desire to carry out improvements to their houses, but the restrictions in the Homes Act are more than rigidly enforced. I believe that if the State Bank were informed by the Government that it could advance money on existing homes, much better use could be made of them than is made at present. It would be most interesting to ascertain at this juncture the sum that was made available from the State Bank for additions last year.

The sum of £500,000 is to be made available under "Advances to State Bank". I have

already explained why I was dissatisfied with this item, namely because of the manoeuvrings by the Government last year and I would appreciate information from the Treasurer as to what balance was still held by the State Bank at the end of June out of last year's allocation. For roads and bridges, £200,000 is provided. Concerning the Highways Department, last Saturday's press referred to a railway overpass to straighten the South Road. It also referred to South Road No. 3 (Yankalilla Road) at Pedlar Creek, and the Minister of Agriculture, who represents the district, said that as a first step tenders would be called for the bridge across the Willunga railway line. The Minister of Roads had told him that approval had been given for the tenders to be called. The bridge would consist of two 22ft. spans and one 19ft. span, giving a total length of 63ft. The deck would be 30ft. 6in. wide to allow for an effective road width of 26ft. between kerb faces. Other factors were associated with the bridge in addition to the Highways Department investigating the best type of crossing over the creek, and the press reported that it might not be possible to start the actual roadworks until next financial year. If I could prevent the commencement it would not start for another two or three years. I have taken that information from the press and if the Ministers wish to correct me, let them do so either now or at the appropriate time.

I give a fair warning to the Government on this matter. Admittedly a number of bottlenecks exist on the South Road, but with the area of vacant land that is at the junction of the South Road, Shepherds Hill Road and Ayliffe Road, I consider that this is a first priority compared with this proposal of the Government and its rail over-pass. According to railway time tables, one train passes each way over this crossing at Pedlar Creek each week as against a busy thoroughfare at the intersection to which I have already referred, and instead of allocating money for something in the distant future, let some of these highways funds be spent on, in the first instance, this South Road junction, and let there be a further provision for the Highways Department to make available sufficient funds to straighten the serious bottlenecks and bad condition of the Shepherds Hill Road to Blackwood.

I admit that it is the intention to make available a sum to reconstruct the Shepherds Hill Road from the Blackwood roundabout to a point near to the entrance to the high school

at Blackwood. Indeed, I know that is very necessary, but the question of the transport which is provided by the Edwardstown bus service is also important. The service is for 12 buses each way daily on the Shepherds Hill Road carrying a total of between 1,000 and 1,200 passengers and 500 schoolchildren, and the children are mostly collected *en route* from the point near the Women's Memorial Playing Grounds, to attend either the Blackwood Primary School or the Blackwood High School, and it is necessary to have a good road. At present buses are unable to pull in close to the left side of the road for stopping purposes because of the condition of the road. In fact in many places, if they did, they would have to obtain assistance to be removed out of the deep gutters that exist, and when proceeding on the return journey they must reduce speed to three to five miles an hour to pass over the junction of the Sturt and Shepherds Hill Roads, otherwise a serious accident would be caused. Yet the Government asks this Parliament to approve an expenditure on a rail over-pass for one train a week each way as against a bus service that is providing an essential service to the people not only in the district of Edwardstown but also in Mitcham.

I recommend for the consideration of the Treasurer that this matter be given serious thought prior to the Loan Estimates being finalized. I would not know what was likely to happen under the administration of the Railways Department in 12 months' time. Already we find only one train a week servicing Willunga residents. Goodness knows what will happen under the present set-up! The department might even consider that it was not necessary to provide an over-pass because of the present rail service. A real attempt should be made not only by the Railways Commissioner but by this Government to establish an adequate rail system, to encourage people to use the railways. Instead, the Government is neglecting the railways entirely.

The sum of £240,000 is to be provided for irrigation and reclamation of swamp lands. On this line last year, the Government was granted £240,000 but only £149,000 was spent. In regard to the major item included in that estimate the Treasurer stated:

The sum of £132,000 is required for the completion of the electrification and reconstruction of the pumping station at Waikerie. Apparently, the efficiency of the Government permitted it to carry out only 50 per cent of the programme, for the Government is seeking a further £240,000 under this line, and the major item on this occasion reads:

The sum of £66,000 is required for the completion of the electrification and reconstruction of the pumping station at Waikerie.

Under "South-Eastern Drainage" £500,000 is sought. In regard to the drains north of Drains K and L in the Western Division, the Treasurer said:

... It is estimated a further £506,000 will be required for its ultimate completion; £23,000 is provided to continue this work during 1964-65.

At this rate of progress, it will be more than 20 years before this scheme is completed. A similar criticism applies to the drains in the Eastern Division, except that £440,000 is being sought for this year, which will mean that it will be a further five years before these drains are completed, even if the same rate of progress is maintained.

The sum of £1,100,000 is sought under "Afforestation and Timber Milling". Each year the output from State forests continues to increase, and the size and quality of the log timber is improving. As funds are made available for improvements to the sawmills at Mount Burr, Mount Gambier and Nangwarry, perhaps it is opportune for the Government to seriously consider the suggestion made by Labor members on many occasions that more use should be made of the local timber in the building industry. I believe that, with the development taking place regarding sizes, this timber lends itself admirably to use by the South Australian Housing Trust, which is the authority building most houses today. The trust should be building at a greater rate, and my query is whether this Government is allowing the trust to achieve its potential output, or whether some halt is being made. This timber now lends itself to construction work, and I believe that better use should be made of it. I believe that more of this timber will be specified and used, particularly if the Government is able to provide houses in the South-East which may require this timber. I believe it should also be used extensively in the metropolitan area.

The sum of £3,000,000 is sought under "Railways Accommodation". Let us look at some things that are happening in the railway services. The Treasurer stated that £458,000 was required this year to complete the construction of nine air-conditioned passenger cars for the Adelaide to Port Pirie service and that £12,000 was required to commence the construction of six motor inspection cars. The Minister of Works was good enough this afternoon to give me certain information, portion of which bears repeating.

The Minister said that two of these nine air-conditioned cars are almost completed, and naturally I do not complain about that. He went on to say that the third car was 75 per cent complete, the fourth 70 per cent complete, the fifth 40 per cent complete, and the sixth 35 per cent complete, while in respect of the seventh the under-frames were being assembled. A sum was set aside last year in respect of these nine passenger cars, but according to the Minister two of them have not even been started, 12 months later. Little progress seems to have been made in this matter.

Let us look further at the situation concerning the railways. Dining cars should be provided for all long-distance trains. These trains should not have to stop at stations where refreshment services may or may not be available. I am most disappointed at the lack of provision for refreshments on the Port Pirie service. The Treasurer went on to say that £790,000 was provided for progress payments under contracts for the construction of 21 diesel-electric locomotives and spares. I shall require some information on that matter. He then said:

Also, £13,000 is required to complete a project for the construction of 100 open waggons . . . and £100,000 is proposed to commence work on a further 11 steel brake vans, with £60,000 for a further 15 workmen's sleeping vans and £110,000 towards the construction of 30 motor body transport waggons.

The Treasurer then went on to mention the construction of the nine air-conditioned passenger cars and six motor inspection cars. I maintain that it is desirable to finish one project at a time. I am inclined to the view that we will not this year see the other of the nine proposed air-conditioned cars, despite the fact that further provision is made for this matter on another line.

There seems to be a complete lack of continuity on these projects. I should like the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, to reply to the matters I raised in the Address in Reply debate. I understand that the Chief Mechanical Engineer has to report to the Commissioner, but there must be another source of supply of material and other responsible persons to see that the supply is maintained. Discontent seems to exist amongst certain sections of employees at the Islington workshops, and it may do some good to carry out a real examination of the position there to find out what is going on. I believe that the men there are capable of doing the necessary work and that they desire to do it, but I doubt whether they are getting all the

assistance they deserve. A constant supply of materials is necessary for good efficient working, for the men lag behind and become a little discontented when they are taken off a project to do something else and then some time later are recalled to do further work on that project. This is not good enough. When funds are made available the officers responsible for the supply should see that those materials are forthcoming. This Parliament should take up the matter and insist that more competent supervision is exercised over the supply of materials.

The Loan Estimates provide £72,000 for the Tonsley Park spur line. Undoubtedly this will mean a level crossing at Daws Road. A need exists, too, for a statement whether there will also be a level crossing at Adelaide Terrace where the spur line will branch off the main line, near the Ascot Park railway station. Is there any likelihood of this terrace becoming a dead-end because of the spur line? At the crossing over Daws Road, will all the necessary safety precautions, such as warning devices, be installed? Is it likely that this spur line will be used at weekends, because the Treasurer has told members that the line will not proceed beyond Tonsley Park? These matters are of great interest to my constituents. Many people using Daws Road want to know what form the railway crossing over that road will take. Will there be a separation of the grade?

Regarding "Harbours Accommodation, £1,600,000", the variation on this line last year was 30 per cent, and we have been advised bluntly that actual payments from Loan Account in 1963-64 were £1,220,000. As £1,740,000 was provided, there was a variation of £520,000—a variation of more than £500,000 and not one satisfactory word of explanation! I hope the Minister may have the information before this debate is completed.

Regarding "Waterworks and Sewers, £13,250,000", I am pleased to see that it is proposed to make a substantial increase in the allocation of funds for water and sewer works and that it is intended to spend £13,250,000 this year, because adequate water and sewer services are essential to the advancement of our community. However, in keeping with many other departments under the administration of the present Government, this department has not been able to keep in step with the publicity programme. For example, in regard to the Bolivar treatment works, we were told by the Government that the estimated cost was approximately £11,000,000 and that the planned programme

of construction would be over a period of five years. Nearly four years has elapsed, and to the end of June last only £2,897,000 had been spent on this project. For the current year a further £2,239,000 is proposed. Thus, at the end of this financial year the predicted five years will have elapsed, yet this major project will be less than half completed. This is a sorry picture of achievement by the Government. Apparently, because of the delay at Bolivar, we are to have plenty of time to decide what to do with the land made available from the Islington sewage farm.

Regarding sewers and ancillary matters, I am particularly interested in that part of Burbank adjoining the Bedford Park university site. This is a matter of great concern in the area because the soil is unsuitable for soakage, and the use of septic tanks will probably lead to obnoxious conditions next summer. Although it may be said that there are many vacant allotments in the area, the problem is growing because health is endangered. I trust the Minister will supply me with information on this matter by correspondence soon.

Another major omission in the Treasurer's explanation was the lack of explanation about the Chowilla dam on the Murray River. In view of the previous publicity, I should have expected some mention of this major proposal, or does the Government intend to approach the Commonwealth for additional financial assistance before proceeding with this scheme? As members will gather from my comments, I am unable to agree with the Treasurer's remarks about this line, when he said: "During 1963-64, satisfactory progress was made on many large projects . . ."

Regarding "Government Buildings and Land, £10,650,000; Hospital Buildings, £2,500,000", this section of the Loan Estimates contains more than its fair share of Government propaganda, but the veneer wears a little thin when one examines how far the funds have been stretched. For example, stages 1 and 2 of the Royal Adelaide Hospital rebuilding scheme are expected to cost a total of £8,581,000, but the Government intends to spend only £825,000, or less than 10 per cent, on this project this year. All members are aware of the antiquated conditions under which the mentally sick are cared for in this State, but throughout the remarks about the items proposed for expenditure on mental hospitals and clinics no explanation is given as to whether the Government achieved what it set out to do last year. I think I can claim without fear of contradiction that it did not and earlier this year I pointed out

to the Government some unsatisfactory features of mental health treatment.

During the year, we were subjected to a fairly intensive campaign in the press to the effect that the Government intended to spend several million pounds at O'Halloran Hill and Northfield to establish hospital centres for the care of the mentally retarded. We have been hearing for more than 10 years what this Government is going to do for the mentally sick, but the plans, for some reason, do not reach fruition. Apparently, the O'Halloran Hill project has been shelved for the time being because the only new major project mentioned is that at Northfield, which is being referred to the Public Works Committee and estimated to cost £3,250,000. Until I see bricks and mortar I shall remain unconvinced that the Government is effectively grappling with the task of getting rid of some of the antiquated structures that are called mental hospitals. In concluding my comments on this line, I stress that the Government lost to this State more than £150,000 because of reduced grants from the Commonwealth Government on account of tardy action. I also stress that the new Commonwealth legislation passed applies only for three years as from July 1, 1964, and therefore this Government should make every endeavour to make quick progress and attempt to remedy some of its past errors.

I am pleased to note that £187,000 is provided on the Estimates for the South Road Primary School. The sum of £5,800,000 has been provided for school buildings. With education, as with most other endeavours by the Government, we have had plenty of boasting from members opposite of what has been accomplished, but nine out of the 30 major works promised to be commenced this year were promised by the Government last year. Until the Government can achieve a satisfactory rate of progress on school buildings, we do not have any chance of rectifying the lack of classrooms and over-large classes. I offered some criticism during the Address in Reply debate, and I quote a report from the Minister of Education about teaching conditions at Forbes:

Although Forbes is a school well above the optimum size it is the considered opinion of officers of this department, including Mr. R. B. Davis, Acting Assistant Superintendent of Primary Schools, who paid a special visit to the school on July 31, 1964, that teaching conditions are by no means unfavourable. In the infants school, for instance, in which there is a large activity room 64ft. x 31ft., temporary use is being made of two classrooms for special purposes—one as a library and the other for

art and craftwork. As it is not the policy to provide rooms, additional to the activity room for these purposes in infants schools, the two rooms must be considered as available for ordinary classroom use whenever required. The fact is that there is no shortage of classrooms at Forbes. It is true that 21 classes are accommodated in timber classrooms, but with 10 rooms in the brick building at the primary school and 15 rooms in the precast infants building, the Forbes school is well situated compared with a number of schools elsewhere.

It was considered that 10 rooms would be sufficient at Forbes school when the school was first suggested. Many children were turned away on the opening day because they could not be accommodated. Some returned to Ascot Park and others to Morphettville Park. The Government decided to erect an infants school, and in fairness, this school is a credit to all concerned. Surely the Minister would agree that children should not be sent from the primary section to the infants school to use rooms that are available there. The administration is different and different conditions have to be considered. The infants school is used to keep the toddlers away from those older children so that they will not be knocked about: a different discipline exists, and the infants are under the administration of an infant mistress. If a primary class moved into the infant section the teacher would become isolated and under the administration of the infant mistress. It seems that the original estimate of the attendances at this school was incorrect. Will 1,800 children attend it in the future? I hope that that does not happen.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: Can the Leader find me another area on which to build a new school?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Why should a new school be built within a quarter of a mile of another? Children from one district should not be separated. I believe that at Forbes the original foundations were designed to carry a multi-storey building. If the foundations were put in for that purpose, or they are capable of carrying that type of building, for Heaven's sake put it there, and do away with the temporary buildings.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: Personally, I agree with the Leader. I think that is the solution to the problem.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: If the foundations will not permit another storey to be added, a new multi-storey building should be erected at the western end to form a quadrangle to be used for assemblies. It is not in the best interests of the school for most classrooms to be timber frame. Obviously, the Minister

agrees that it is not desirable to have primary classes in the infants section, and we should not consider purchasing another block. Perhaps I should mention the cost of the land it was suggested should be purchased, so that members will know that we are dealing with people who do not give much away. There is no sentiment when it comes to hard cash. If the Minister agrees that a multi-storey building should be erected or an additional storey placed on the existing building, action should be taken to see that this is done immediately. I am pleased that the South Road Primary School is to have a new building and hope that this will not be delayed. I pay a tribute to the people responsible for the administration of the school. The headmaster is still on sick leave but I hope he will return soon.

An amount of £135,000 is provided for a new office building in Victoria Square. This expenditure is long overdue. We on this side of the House have continually advocated improved office accommodation, but for at least 30 years the Government has not been prepared to do anything. It made some stop-gap measures by acquiring or leasing various unsuitable buildings in Adelaide, for example, Foy's building in Pulteney Street and Simpsons building in Gawler Place. The first was an emporium; it is over-crowded and a fire hazard. The second was a factory and is completely unsuitable for office accommodation, but at the present rate of expenditure it will be a further 20 years before the office block is available in Victoria Square. I hope that forecast is not true. Indeed, I hope that the Government will effect a distinct improvement on what has been occurring over the years. I would not insist on all glass and aluminium, but I think it should be a building worthy of this State and erected in a reasonable time, instead of involving a long drawn-out programme.

In my view the Housing Trust officers do a magnificent job under trying conditions in attempting to satisfy as many housing applicants as possible. However, the trust is certainly in the doldrums as far as housing completions are concerned. Last year, it completed 2,858 houses, and this figure compares most unfavourably with 3,314 completions in 1960-61, since which year house completions by the Housing Trust have shown a downward trend. In addition, I notice that the Government extended itself too far last year, because at the end of the year 2,589 houses were unde-

construction, which means that substantial sums of money were tied up in houses that were not earning revenue for the Government. Whether that delay concerned sewerage work or some such thing, I do not know. However, one phase of the trust's activities must be reconsidered. We were at one stage getting a fair deal as a result of the trust's methods in erecting substantial houses. We were also able to train a reasonable number of tradesmen for the building industry to work with contractors under that set-up. However, from a policy of ruthless cutting, the present system has grown. I referred to this in the Address in Reply debate last year. Brickwork was carried out on Housing Trust houses at Port Stanvac at a cost of £13 a thousand for labour. The trust estimated that it could get the same work done for £15 a thousand at Angle Park or an adjacent district but, in fact, it could not get bricks laid even for £19 a thousand. That system is neither good for the Housing Trust nor for the housing position generally.

If I asked the Premier a question tomorrow, however, regarding the daily paid employees and their conditions, he would say that he supported the appropriate tribunal which fixed rates and conditions for those workers. Then if it is good enough in that case, it should be good enough to see that tenders for this work provide that not less than appropriate award rates shall be paid, and that builders desiring to observe awards should be given the work, so as to provide for a continuity of work under the provisions of such awards. Until the Government gives such lead, how can we expect private employers to honour the obligations for which the Government professes so much support?

The Electricity Trust of South Australia is to receive £3,000,000. It is noted that the Port Augusta power station, costing approximately £35,000,000, took about 15 years to build—in other words an expenditure of about £2,500,000 each year. A similar picture is becoming apparent with the Torrens Island project, where an expenditure of £2,806,000 is proposed for this year, but I have already mentioned that at this rate of progress it will be 50 years before this proposition becomes a practical reality. Page 16 of the Treasurer's explanation of the Loan Estimates stated that £3,250,000 was to be raised by the trust from financial institutions and the public. Is this sum to be raised by the same method as was used for the Loan last year when the small investors were excluded from subscribing to the loan. I

believe that those people who desire to have a £100 financial interest in the Electricity Trust should be given the same opportunity as those who are paying in substantial amounts. If we believe that the little man should be encouraged to invest, then let him invest! Even if it necessitates a little more book work, he should still be so encouraged, because the more of these little people who are encouraged to take part in State affairs, the better it will be for the State generally.

The sum of £630,000 is provided for work under the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. Of this scheme the Treasurer said:

The drainage scheme was commenced in 1960-61 to carry floodwaters from the south-western suburbs to the sea. It was estimated originally that the scheme would cost approximately £2,200,000 and would take some eight years to complete, but efforts are being made to shorten the construction period.

This scheme is taking far too long. We provided £500,000 last year but the Government expended only £276,000. Even though we are asked for a further £630,000 this year, there is no guarantee that the Government will be able to carry out the work to this extent. It is useless putting amounts on the Estimates if the Government has no intention of carrying out the work, and it will certainly have to get a move on if it is to shorten the construction period of eight years, which was the original estimate. The sum of £2,200,000 was for modified drainage works as recommended by the Public Works Committee and included the impounding dam, but, as can be seen from the October 1959 report, the total cost of the whole scheme was then estimated to be £3,407,000. This expenditure was for appropriate drains to be provided on the western side of the Sturt River so that floodwaters from that area would drain into the sea. It was proposed also that all the area on the eastern side of the river would drain into it.

Last year it was said that the University of Adelaide was carrying out tests into run-off and other things; it was also suggested that a further delay had been caused because design engineers were not available. Now it is proposed that the matter will go to the Public Works Committee. Last year I understood that the bottom end of the Sturt River near the Patawalonga would be cleared and that the river would be deepened in some places, widened in others, and straightened in others, but we are still waiting for this to be done. Surely it is not necessary to wait until all plans are finalized before a start is made. It will probably be 12 months before the impounding

dam is completed but, even so, why cannot the drainage at Daws Road be proceeded with immediately so that, when the drain in the Patawalonga area is finished, this work will have been completed? We should get on with this work even if it cannot be used straight away.

I agree with the Treasurer that the development of this State will, as in the past, depend to a very large extent on the provision of basic works and services. However, this is as far as I can reconcile my views with his, because the impression I have gained from these Loan Estimates is that they are a list of schemes and unless there is an improvement they will become rather doubtful schemes that may or may not see the light of day; therefore, I believe the leaders of industry and the public in general will have to look somewhere other than to this Government if we are to obtain the increasing number of basic works and services that are so necessary for our vigorous and expanding community.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I support the first line. I listened with much interest to some remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition, who is entitled, as we all are, to have his say, and before going any further I should like to answer his criticism of the Railways Department, which I thought was rather niggly and puerile. My district adjoins the district represented by the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), and the Islington railway workshop is situated in both districts. I greatly appreciate the work being given to the workshops; it creates much employment for many of my constituents. I am extremely pleased that the programme is being expanded, the vote for the Railways Department being £500,000 greater than last year's expenditure. Although not the whole of this will be spent at Islington, many people living in my district who derive their livelihood from the programme will welcome its continuation and expansion. This work creates employment in my district and in others, and it creates much work for subcontractors and suppliers of raw materials.

In considering the Loan Estimates, we are faced with a *fait accompli* in that the total is decided in Canberra at meetings of the Loan Council. Although we can criticize and comment, we can deal only with the way the allocation is carved up between the various departments. We can say, for instance, that department A should get more than department B. I believe the Treasurer has done a good job in stretching the resources available to the full and giving each department a fair

allocation, bearing in mind that the spread of funds available is occurring at a time when the State's population is growing rapidly because of both the natural increase and the increasing number of migrants coming here. For these reasons the demand for services is growing day by day. Because of the increasing needs, we must keep abreast of latest advances. Although community demands are increasing, our total Loan funds from the Commonwealth Government have not increased proportionately. In other words, a graph line of the demand is steeper than a graph line of the allocation.

I suggest that the Commonwealth Government has restrained State spending on capital works to a figure below the amount that every member would like to see. This has restrained this State from spending what I believe it should be spending on an expanding programme to meet the rising demand for services. Because of this, I think it would be fair to ask whether the Commonwealth Government has restrained its own public works programme. I suggest it has not. I shall now refer to the Budget speech given last week in the Commonwealth Parliament and to the appendices attached to it. Whereas last year the total allocation to the Commonwealth Government for capital works and services was about £176,000,000, the programme for this year as announced last week will cost about £201,000,000—an increase of about £25,000,000 to be used by the Commonwealth on its own capital works programme. It is not restraining its programme. This £25,000,000 excludes capital expenditures on the Department of Territories, which have been considerable, the Post Office and the Australian Broadcasting Commission. The figure of £201,000,000 is the only one that I can find in this document; the other figures it is impossible at this stage to trace.

Mr. Bywaters: Aren't they business undertakings?

Mr. CUMBE: They are, and some of ours are, too. For instance, in these Loan Estimates there is an allocation to the Woods and Forests Department. Does not that department sell timber to the trade just as the Postmaster-General provides services and receives revenue for them? We can only guess what this £25,000,000 increase would be if it included all the departments: it would be considerable. I am disappointed that the Commonwealth Government has seen fit not to make the States a greater allocation and at the same time not to restrain its own spending. I am not suggesting that we should embark on a period of

inflation or that the Commonwealth Government is wrong in trying to stabilize the economy, but at least we should be fair: if the Commonwealth is to increase its spending, why should we not increase ours? If we are to restrain our spending, why should it not restrain its spending. I am disappointed that we have not received more money but, having got a certain amount, we shall now have to determine how it is to be carved up for the benefit of the various departments, the Public Service, and the people of this State.

The total expenditures and amounts allocated under the Loan Estimates over the years have shown a gradual and constant rise. In 1962 our Loan Estimates programme totalled about £29,800,000; last year it totalled £32,900,000, and this year it totals £36,500,000. So we have a steady rise of about £3,000,000 a year. But that does not allow for expansion, and I would assume that we should have had to increase the amounts by a greater ratio if it did. This expansion is following a straight line on the graph. Our total expenditure (the amount we receive from the Loan Estimates, the amount we get under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, and the moneys we draw from internal sources—profits from undertakings, rents from the Housing Trust, depreciation accounts and the like) has risen considerably over the last few years. In 1962 the gross total was £44,500,000; last year it was almost £60,000,000, and this year the new peak is £66,500,000. That is the total to be carved up between the various State undertakings, but it is the £36,500,000 that we are particularly concerned about, the allocation between the various departments.

It is interesting to do a little exercise to see how this £36,500,000 is to be spent within the departments. Obviously, most of it has gone to what we call the service or utility departments, the departments that provide services for the people of this State, whether they be private individuals or people working in commerce and industry. The Engineering and Water Supply Department heads the list. Its allocation is the same as it was last year—37 per cent. In other words, more than one-third of the total Loan Estimates this year, as was the case last year, is going to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I do not cavil at that carve-up, for this department has a great expenditure ahead of it. It has a tremendous influence on the development of this State and on our standard of living. If we cannot provide water and

sewerage in the metropolitan area for the fast-growing suburbs—for instance, Tea Tree Gully in the area of the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), Elizabeth in the area of the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) and in the south towards Christies Beach in the area of the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman)—we shall be in trouble, considering also the extensions taking place today in a remarkable way in some country areas. In the district of the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) the housing programme to be undertaken could not proceed were it not for an allocation of funds for water reticulation in that area and the money to be made available shortly for sewer extension in Whyalla. It is right that this department should have 37 per cent of the money. This allocation demonstrates the importance attached by this Government to the development needs of the State.

The allocation to the Public Buildings Department has increased. Last year it was 27 per cent of the total Loan Estimates; that has been increased this year to 29.3 per cent. Some large buildings are provided for in these Estimates; they are not small by any means. Most of these projects have been investigated by the Public Works Committee. They are big and urgently needed. Proportionately, the big increases are in the allocations to the hospitals. Last year hospitals accounted for some 3.3 per cent of the total allocations. That has more than doubled this year to 6.85 per cent, the amount increasing from £1,100,000 to £2,500,000, which again shows that the Government is anxious to press ahead vigorously and as rapidly as possible with a hospital building programme. One of the biggest projects for which money is provided is the first stage of the rebuilding and reconstruction of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. If any honourable member cares to go along North Terrace to that place, he will see one of the biggest holes in the ground that he has ever seen; it is tremendous. The one in Victoria Square for the Commonwealth Reserve Bank is tiny by comparison. Some money was put on the Loan Estimates last year for work on the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It has commenced, and this money is for the continuation of the first stage and the subsequent stages of this building.

Schools account for 16 per cent of the total allocations, about the same percentage as last year. From the size of the allocations being made to certain departments, it can be appreciated that the emphasis is laid time and time again, year after year, upon the utility or service departments that provide services to the

people and help the State to expand. If these allocations were not made, our standard of living would not rise; it would remain static, if it did not decline; and the general expansion and level of employment that we are so eagerly and avidly enjoying these days would not be enjoyed by most people.

Turning to the housing resources of the State (a matter touched on briefly by the Leader of the Opposition), the total funds used by the Housing Trust last year amounted to just over £12,500,000. This year the total will be almost £13,500,000. The significant fact is that no provision has been made for the trust in the Loan Estimates since £50,000 was allocated in 1962-63. The trust is receiving its total resources either from the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement or by public borrowing—as we say, “raising its money down the street.”

Mr. Jennings: And building fewer houses each year.

Mr. CUMBE: If the honourable member cares to look at the Treasurer's statement he will find that that is not so. The Treasurer said:

The number of houses under construction at the end of 1963-64 exceeded by 566 the number under construction at the end of 1962-63.

How does the honourable member reconcile his statement with those facts?

Mr. Corcoran: That is the number under construction all the time: it is not the number built for the year.

Mr. Jennings: Have a look at the Housing Trust's report.

Mr. CUMBE: I have read the report. I have said that about £13,500,000 will be spent on houses to be built this financial year. The trust's housing programme for Millicent, Whyalla and other districts has been announced in this Parliament and elsewhere, and I know the member for Millicent is pleased to know about this activity in his district. The trust commenced operations some years before the war as a result of an Act of this Parliament, and it has provided many houses for the people of this State at reasonable rentals and, of recent years, houses for purchase at reasonable prices. The total expenditure by that organization up to June, 1963 (the latest figure available to me) is about £47,500,000. It is rather interesting to look at what the other States have done concerning Government housing. The nearest figure that I can see approaching this is about £20,000,000 in Queensland and about £7,000,000 in New South Wales. We in South Australia have the one

Government-sponsored organization that has spent this large sum on housing, and it may well be that the trust has been operating longer than any other State's Government housing authority. However, that does not alter the fact that the trust has done a wonderful job in spending this sum on the provision of housing, for it compares more than favourably with what the other States have spent governmentally on housing. Apart from the higher gross amount spent, this State has spent much more per capita than any other State on housing; in fact, in this respect it puts all other States way behind. The low-deposit scheme introduced not so long ago is now included in the programme that we have before us, and it is proving a real boon to the people who take advantage of it.

The Loan Estimates before us total £36,540,000. I heard the Treasurer the other night asking people to support the Commonwealth Loan, which is now open. Other loans will be called during the year to raise the money that we are now voting upon. The interest rate for these loans will be from 4½ to 5 per cent. We know from statements made in this Parliament that we get our housing money at a 1 per cent lower rate under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, so this money will be available to us at about 4 per cent. We in South Australia take a greater proportion of Loan funds per capita at this rate than do the other States. The other States raise more than we do in semi-governmental loans, whereas we raise only a modest amount in that way. Semi-governmental loans usually run at about ¾ per cent higher than those from which we get our Loan funds, and in addition to that we get the benefit of the 5s. (about ¼ per cent) of the sinking fund repayment. Therefore, we in this State benefit by the way we organize our financial arrangements.

A table set out in the latest available report of the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, under “(Part I, Public and Private Finance, June 30, 1961)” shows that the amount spent per capita on net loan funds in South Australia in 1961 was £27 14s. 8d., compared with £15 10s. in New South Wales. I admit that New South Wales uses much semi-governmental loan money; that is the way New South Wales wants it, and that is that State's business. It has been the policy in South Australia for some years, however, to raise as much money as possible through the Loan Estimates and to cut semi-governmental borrowing to a minimum, and in that way we get the benefits to which I

referred earlier. This is not merely a matter of academic exercise: it is one of real importance. I suggest that a substantial proportion of our expansion programme this year is made possible by the use of internal funds that we can obtain without incurring the additional capital interest charge. In other words, our public finance system here carries lower interest charges than the systems used in some other States, and therefore we can carry out more capital works with the money available. This is not criticism of the other States in any way. Other States have different ideas on how to run their affairs, and it may be that there is some historical significance in this and that those States cannot alter their systems. It may well be that we ourselves at some time will want to raise more money by way of semi-governmental borrowing.

The net Loan expenditure per capita in South Australia for 1961 (£27 14s. 8d.), was by far the greatest figure achieved by any State except Tasmania, which, of course, has peculiar problems because of its isolation and small population. Of the mainland States, South Australia was a long way ahead. On looking at the sums that have been allocated by the Treasurer for member's consideration and, I take it, their approval, it can be seen that the allocation has been fair. One of my first remarks was that, in some ways, the sum put before us is a *fait accompli*. Members are presented with the sum allocated and can do nothing about changing it. All they can say is that one department has more than another and that, perhaps, it should have been the other way around. Also, they can discuss the way the total sum has been carved up and whether the Treasurer has done this job adequately.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think members opposite take any notice of what we say?

Mr. COUMBE: That is a matter of opinion. The Loan Estimates come before members every year and must be passed by them. In some ways, this debate is a formality, but I would hate to see the opportunity of debating the separate lines disappear. I believe that the Treasurer is to be commended for doing a pretty good job in allocating the particular sums so as to promote the expansion programme that is so necessary to a State that is expanding year by year. The aim of this Government is to create a high standard of living in South Australia, and the Treasurer's allocations are concerned with this objective.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): Before speaking at length on a matter that causes me much concern, I shall refer to one or two matters concerning my district. First, the situation at Mypolonga river settlement near Murray Bridge has caused me concern for many years. This is the only district with reclaimed swamp areas that does not have a reticulated water scheme for its dairies. I thank the Minister of Irrigation for visiting this area recently. I believe we turned on the coldest day of the year for him—a bleak day—and the Minister had a heavy cold, which, I was sorry to hear, worsened because of his visit. I hope this will not jeopardize in any way the possibility of these people getting what they so urgently require. I wish to draw the attention of the House to this matter because it has been long-standing. Some years ago, £20,000 was made available in the Loan Estimates to provide for the initial investigation and commencement of a reticulated water scheme for Mypolonga settlement. Unfortunately this line did not appear in the following year's Estimates and I had much to say about its not being there. I criticized the Government, and the Treasurer and I clashed on the subject. However, those days are gone, and we hope that the visit of the Minister to the settlement will have enabled him to see the need for a reticulated water system. I hope that in next year's Estimates a large sum will be made available for the work to be continued and completed.

Mypolonga settlement is rich and is devoted mainly to orchards and dairying. In a week or two weeks' time the settlement will celebrate its 50th jubilee. This will be a happy occasion for the residents and it would have been pleasant if the Government could have told them that the scheme for the area had at last been approved. However, this was not to be, and I hope that at the start of the settlement's next 50 years the scheme will have eventuated. The settlement provides much of the produce of this State in milk for the metropolitan area and fresh fruit (oranges) and soft fruit for the markets of South Australia and of other States. Originally at Mypolonga the orchards and dairies were combined, but this no longer applies. Over the years these avenues of production have been divorced and now orchardists are entirely orchardists and the dairymen are attending to their line of business. This means that the original water supply by way of tanks to the orchards, which was used by the dairies, does not now operate.

In addition to this, a greater need now exists for water than previously. Most of the reclaimed swamps are suitable only for dairying and because of that, they needed a reticulated water scheme from the outset. However, as Mypolonga was somewhat different, this was not the case and the scheme was not applied in the first instance. Now, with the dairies supplying milk to the metropolitan area, the utmost need for cleanliness is necessary and hence a reticulated water service is urgently required. I trust that my remarks will at least encourage the Cabinet and I hope that it will support any move made by the Minister of Irrigation in this regard, because I am sure that he must have been impressed by the need he saw for this service on his visit.

I was pleased to read in the Loan Estimates that £509,000 is provided for the commencement of the Tailem Bend to Keith water supply. This has been talked about for some years. In 1959, I think, in his election speech, the Treasurer said that this scheme had been approved. Now, in 1964, the work is about to commence. However, we know that these things take time and it is pleasing to see that the scheme will commence. The sum of £509,000 is a start towards what will be a large scheme; probably the third largest in the State. When the new Murray Bridge to Adelaide main has been completed, this scheme may be the fourth largest, but before that it will be the third largest after the Mannum to Adelaide and the Morgan to Whyalla schemes. When it is extended to serve land nearby it will finally cost about £8,000,000. I understand that about 200,000 square miles of farming and grazing lands will eventually be served by the scheme. I am particularly interested from the point of view of farmers who reside near Tailem Bend and Cooke Plains as they were instrumental in the scheme's being initiated. I had the honour to introduce an earlier deputation to the then Minister (the late Sir Malcolm McIntosh) about this scheme and the prospects then did not look very promising. However, with the passing of time and with the people of Keith becoming interested, the two schemes have been amalgamated and the work is about to commence. This is most gratifying.

I am concerned also with a scheme that was devised many years ago. I know that the Minister of Works and officers of his department will read my remarks when the time comes for them to study the Loan Estimates debate, and I hope that notice will be taken of my comments. The proposed Palmer-Sedan water supply is a large scheme serving

land somewhat isolated and scattered between farms, and consequently the cost is high. The scheme was devised and an estimate submitted. Farmers were asked to accept a rating but, as it proved prohibitive to them, other schemes were devised. Recently, in answer to the member for Angas, the Minister said that Mr. Campbell of the Engineering and Water Supply Department would visit the area and discuss the situation with local councils. I am pleased to hear that he did this. I am perturbed about one aspect of this matter. The people at Milendella, which is close to the Palmer main, being of a co-operative nature, agreed to support the larger scheme. Had they embarked on the small scheme they would have had water some years ago. However, they agreed that with a small scheme operating people at the end of the line would not receive water, and decided to join with them in the larger scheme.

The Milendella people were prepared to pay a higher rating to assist the people farther along the line, although the smaller scheme would be provided at a lower rating for them. They have waited patiently for eight years, but now something should be decided about the larger scheme so that these people will know what to do. Last year I asked the Minister whether he would divorce the smaller group from the larger scheme if it were impracticable to proceed with that scheme, but he said that he did not want to do this because he hoped this would not be necessary. One can have hopes, but one can hope for a long time and achieve nothing. A decision should be made. If it were decided to proceed with the larger scheme the people would be happy. If this were impracticable, and it was necessary to supply Sedan from another area, that scheme should be investigated immediately. I hope, for the sake of the people at Milendella, that action will be taken soon to ensure that they have a water supply: obviously they should have had it some time ago.

We heard a speech in another debate about sewerage at Gawler. I commend the member for the district for his attitude and the strong approach he made to the Government about this problem. It is a problem that exists in many country towns. The advent of compulsory septic tank installation in country areas has created a problem in disposing effluent. The effect has been worse in areas with a clay subsoil close to the surface, such as at Mannum and Murray Bridge. Recently I visited Mannum and was appalled to see a green slime running down the gutters from the disposal of effluent. That is not healthy; in

one case it was close to the school, and that is worse. Recently, an engineer from the Engineering and Water Supply Department visited the town and I understand he has now submitted a report. I have not seen it but I am anxious to know what he has recommended.

It is evident that if something is not done an epidemic could break out in the area, and in many other country towns. The same problem existed in Murray Bridge and in some places deep bores have been sunk to take away some of the effluent. This is a temporary arrangement, and both towns would like to see deep drainage installed much quicker than it is being done at present. The delays in other country schemes have been much longer than were expected: the work at Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln and other places has been continuing for some time, and work has not yet started at Gawler. I understand that installation at Murray Bridge will begin after the Gawler scheme has been completed. Three years ago I was told that in five years Murray Bridge and Mannum would receive this facility, but it seems just as far away today as it did then. These urgent matters should be considered by the Government.

The problem of small boat control should receive more publicity because it concerns many people. In this State, and in other States, the increasing popularity of small boats is evident. Every summer when the boating season commences, many complaints of improper practices are received from other water users when these pleasure craft take to the water. Some control will have to be exercised to prevent serious accidents. Accidents have already occurred but little publicity has been given them. I understand that last year a skier had an accident whereby he took off from the water and was injured by the nearby willows, which gouged large lumps of flesh from his face requiring plastic surgery. No publicity was given to this accident and the matter did not reach the press. This is one accident of which we have heard little. Unless proper and effective control is exercised over the use of waterways in South Australia further accidents will occur. Although I do not want to be a killjoy, I believe that all people can use the waterways without accident provided there is effective control. Unfortunately, a minority of selfish people make it unpleasant for other people. This happens on our roads and much trouble is caused by selfishness. Users of small craft, and particularly the high-powered craft towing

skiers, seem to want to show off and let people know how clever they are. Controlled water skiing is worth watching, and is an active and healthy sport that should be encouraged, but other people use the river and coastal waters, perhaps in a quieter way, and are being subjected to the annoyances caused by this minority. Naturally, many complaints are made. This sport is growing: at present there are 21,000 small craft in South Australian waters, and 94 per cent of them are for pleasure use. In a few weeks' time at the commencement of the summer season when a boating exhibition will be held, more sales will take place with a corresponding increase in the number of craft. We have only to travel on the roads on weekends or public holidays to realize how many motor boats are being towed by cars. On such days we find that the Murray River is almost as busy as Rundle and King William Streets. Although it is refreshing to see such activity, there are always some who abuse their privileges. Local councils have endeavoured to see that these people are discouraged, but that is difficult when one considers the nature of the district that I represent. Several councils are directly concerned with activities on the river.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: What about setting up a branch of the water police?

Mr. BYWATERS: The water police should take an active part, but no provision is made for that at the moment. I intended to make that point.

Mr. Ryan: There is a Water Police Department, of course.

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes, but it applies only to coastal waters and not to areas in my district. The Murray Bridge, Mobilong, Mannum, Meningie and Marne councils control the river in their respective areas and, unless one uniform set of laws prevails, no solution to the problem is possible. One of these high-powered boats could travel 40 miles along the river through several council districts in a short time. Another matter of some concern is the fact that, whereas the driver of a motor car must pass a test to obtain a licence, no test exists for a person who drives a high-powered craft on a river or the sea. In fact, no age limit exists for a person driving a motor boat, and children as young as eight years frequently drive boats while towing adult skiers. This should not be allowed, for children have not the stability that adults possess. Members of the Surfers Paradise water ski team, who visited the river on a picnic

on one occasion earlier in the year, were heard to comment that such a thing would not be allowed in Queensland. This matter has been reported in the press frequently, and the public should be well aware of it. I received a letter from a lady I know who often goes from Beulah Park to a shack on the river and who, for many years with her family, has enjoyed quiet recreation along the banks of the river. The letter reads:

I hope you will not think I am taking too much on myself writing to you We have the shack 2 at Sunny Side We have been wondering if there are any rules regarding ski boats, such as, whether they have to stay away from rushing along in front of shacks, etc. We are getting a little anxious as we have four little ones and the boys spend most of their time in the water. We are afraid that if it gets much worse we may have a tragedy there. Some will stay over the other side and try to do the right thing for safety. The holiday brought a different crowd and I am afraid they were not so thoughtful. Why I have written to you is that if there are no rules and we cannot do anything we will just have to take it and hope for the best. The river in front of reserves is not so wide

I have heard of this sort of thing on many occasions. In fact, the Leader referred to me a person who was concerned about this matter. He and his family, who also had a holiday shack on the Murray River, were most concerned at the recklessness of some people taking part in water sport. We see constant complaints in the local paper and often hear of people complaining to their councils about the problem. It is time that we had some measure of control, which I will suggest presently and which I have advocated in the past. Only today I received an agenda from the Murray Lands District Council Association's meeting to be held next Thursday at Murray Bridge, in which the control of speed boats is referred to three times, so here is just one instance of the council's concern. Last year at the opening of the Mannum Show by the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister was approached by councillors stressing the need for some form of control. Their views differed considerably from the Minister's. Indeed, it is evident that the Government is generally not in favour of the forms of control that have been suggested by the councils. Earlier this year a series of articles was published in the press, which I think I should read. The first one was written by Peter Michelmores of the *Advertiser* on January 25 and was headed "Go-Slow with Boat Menace". It states:

Something like 1,500 powerful ski boats take to the water these summer weekends, causing a chaos along the beaches and rivers that is matched only by the way officialdom is tackling the problem. There is no adequate legislation covering safety conduct on South Australian public waters, nor is any planned. Official policy, expressed by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Pearson) is to encourage local beach and river councils to adopt by-laws aimed at curbing irresponsible behaviour by power boat drivers. By-laws could also zone certain areas for the exclusive use of power boats and water skiers.

"We don't favour the registration of boats or the licensing of drivers," said Mr. Pearson. "We feel that this would be unnecessarily bureaucratic. It is proper behaviour by the drivers of motor boats that is important." In this respect, policy is similar to that concerning the roads—namely, that safety is primarily the responsibility of the individual, and that enforcement tends more towards "education, compliance and understanding than strictness." In full agreement with the Government attitude is Mr. J. S. Freeman, who is President both of the South Australian Council of the Australian Powerboats Association and the South Australian Water Ski Association. These clubs have a membership between them of 600.

I commend the South Australian Water Ski Association for doing the right thing in this regard. It exercises control over its members and does more to foster at least some degree of care in this sport than any other group of motor boat enthusiasts. The association considers that it is definitely to its advantage that this should be so. The boats owned by members of the association must be numbered, and members must do the right thing or they will not be accepted by this club. Unfortunately, many boat owners will not join clubs and are therefore not subject to this regimentation. The article continues:

"Education in boat safety is the answer," said Mr. Freeman. Mr. Freeman agrees with Mr. Pearson that local government by-laws can help the situation. Both cite model by-law 44 of the Brighton council, which imposes a speed limit of not more than five miles an hour within 300 yards of the Esplanade building alignment. With water skiers in mind, there is also an unrestricted zone extending right to the shore line. Public feeling against power boats prompted this by-law in March, 1962, but it was not gazetted until September, 1963. Even then the Brighton Town Clerk (Mr. Jack Chaston) was convinced of its effectiveness only because he was already armed with another by-law making it mandatory for a person to get a licence to take a vehicle and boat trailer across the Brighton beach. As a condition for getting the licence, the boat owner had to paint an identifying number on both sides of his boat. Any boat committing a breach can be easily identified from the beach.

Research into the problem emphasizes the lack of a co-ordinated approach. There is a

multiplicity of rules and suggestions that can only confuse the boatmen. Seeking a more uniform rule, the Murray Lands District Councils Association prepared the tentative draft of a by-law that would establish speed zones along the river and require the users of motor boats to be licensed. The suggested by-law was sent to the Harbors Board for reaction some months ago, but the association secretary (Mr. M. C. Jenkins) has not yet been informed of the board's reaction. The board's reaction is negative because of Government policy about licensing. The board, however, did not explain this to the River Murray people. It is Government policy for the board to co-operate fully with local government on this issue and to encourage councils to prepare suitable by-laws. The debate over power boats and water skiing is most heated in the Harbors Board backyard, the Port River. People travel miles every Sunday to watch the bedlam at Snowden Beach. Port Adelaide policemen patrolling the Port River use the Police Offences Act to pick up some of the wild men for offensive behaviour in a public place. Others can be arrested for not carrying an observer when water skiers are strung out behind. But nobody gets prosecuted for speeding.

Upstream of Luff Point, opposite Snowden Beach, there is a speed limit of four knots, but the Harbors Board does not feel it is a realistic limit because some big boats are not able to go as slowly as that. It cannot penalize one group of boats and let another group go free. The speed limit was set 50 years ago.

In this chaotic situation the Harbors Board is seeking an alternative site to Snowden Beach for speed boat capers. "Until we reach an agreement on this with the boat owners we will not be banishing people from Snowden Beach," said Mr. Pearson. The idea, of course, is to get the motor boats out of the navigation channel of the Port River, and the talk around Port Adelaide is that they will be moved into the North Arm, a branch of water near Snowden Beach. The discussions are marked by the vacillation that has become typical of the entire speed boat picture.

Although the Minister of Marine said that the model by-law of the Brighton council could be successful, the Town Clerk of Brighton said that it would be no use if the by-law compelling boat owners to be licensed were not in existence. The only persons who must become licensed are those who cross over the sands under the jurisdiction of the Brighton council; people going from other beaches in speed boats who do not have to cross the beach at Brighton can do as they please. These people do not have to be licensed or have an identification number. There is no uniformity of control in South Australian waters, and this is causing much concern. The Secretary-Manager of the South Australian Boat Owners Association apparently read this and on January 28, under the heading of "Laws needed for Boating", the following article appeared in the *Advertiser*:

Legislation was necessary to control boating and ensure reasonable safety, Mr. D. D. Holloway said last night. Secretary-Manager of the South Australian Boat Owners Association, Mr. Holloway was commenting on an article in last Saturday's issue of the *Advertiser* referring to chaos caused by boats in towing water skiers in South Australian waters. Mr. Holloway said, "It is all very well to talk of educating the boat owner, but how can this be done without basic requirements having first been determined by some responsible authority? If the boat owner is aware in the first instance of what he may or may not do he is in a far better position to handle his craft with greater consideration for others and a consequent rise in safety for all concerned. The South Australian Boat Owners Association is very keenly aware of the situation and has already made an approach to the Municipal and Local Government Associations for a conference on this important matter. One form of legislation long overdue covers the use of life jackets. It should be mandatory for life jackets to be worn, not just carried. Recent happenings show the need for this—non-swimmers have been rescued in the past few weeks who were not equipped with life jackets. But for the fact that help was very close at hand the situations could have been tragic. Boating is a sport and one that can suffer greatly if some of these problems are not speedily resolved. This is something which the Minister of Marine's department must want to see happen if it is to operate for the best interests of all parties. Boat owners themselves can do much to help by sticking together and requesting that some order be brought from the confused mess of rule and counter-rule that at the moment surrounds them."

That is another opinion bearing out what I have been saying. I know that Mr. Holloway is vitally concerned about safety. He has been to see me on several occasions to see what can be worked out, but unfortunately while the Government will not register boats or exercise some degree of control over them nothing can be done. On the day when this last article appeared I had a telephone call from a reporter at the *Advertiser* who, knowing that I was interested in this matter, asked me if I would comment, which I did. Apparently the Minister of Works was also approached, and he had the bold leader in the next day's issue of the *Advertiser*. The report, under the heading of "Policy on Boats Defined", stated:

It was definitely wrong to say that chaos was caused on South Australia's beaches and waterways by speed boats, the Minister of Marine (Mr. Pearson) said yesterday. Commenting on a special article in the *Advertiser* on Saturday, Mr. Pearson said that the Government's policy was clear cut and well defined. Boat owners and others concerned had been told of it in writing. Mr. Pearson said, "Councils which took action have succeeded in bringing the matter under control and there have been no complaints about the activities of speed boats in those areas."

Apparently the Minister's experience was different from mine, as I had had many complaints, and I noticed many in the papers. The article continued:

Mr. Pearson said, "The question of introducing by-laws is definitely one for councils who know their coastline and rivers better than other authorities and are in the best position to make domestic arrangements for the proper use of their waterways." He did not think that a system for registering boats and licensing drivers was necessary or desirable.

Then followed a report of a statement made by me:

Mr. Bywaters, M.P., Labor member for Murray, said yesterday that speed boats should be registered and compelled to display the registration number prominently on each side. This was not purely my idea; it was submitted at every Local Government Association meeting I had attended. The Murray Valley Development League had urged this, and people had constantly suggested that the only way to control speed boats operating in our waters was by some form of registration. I think this should be done, but unfortunately the Minister does not agree with me. The article continued:

He was commenting on a statement by the secretary-manager of the South Australian Boat Owners Association (Mr. D. D. Holloway) that legislation was necessary to control boating and ensure reasonable safety. Mr. Bywaters said that on the River Murray particularly—

and this is where the Minister of Lands' suggestion comes in—

a police boat should be made available at least during holiday weekends. "Boating is a big sport here and there is constant argument between speedboat owners and those who want to go more quietly," he said.

"The few irresponsible could spell tragedy on the river if this sort of thing is allowed to go uncontrolled." Although reaches of the river had been declared closed for the holiday regattas at Mannum and Murray Bridge, the unauthorized entry of speedboats had caused difficulty for the oarsmen taking part, he said. No action could be taken because the speedboats did not carry markings.

This is one of the problems associated with it. It is true that councils can make by-laws. They can have a model by-law, which is not in evidence at the moment, but it can be done. Unless we can police this matter, however, it is all of no avail.

I remember that the Minister of Marine (Hon. G. G. Pearson) on one occasion, in reply to an interjection from me that was not recorded in *Hansard*, said that they could be caught when they came into shore. I point out that some speedboats do not come into shore for some time. They can travel at 40 miles

per hour and it is difficult for a policeman, who from the shore sees them offending, to try to catch them when they are soon 40 miles up river at, say Walker Flat. This happens commonly because speedboats travel long distances. The boats to which I am referring bear no identification marks or names. The people using them are allowed to carry on as they wish. The South Australian Skiers Association has markings on its boats and does the right thing. Its members are disciplined by the fact that they belong to this club, but this does not apply to the people I have in mind who are making things bad for the whole sport.

This matter was first brought to my notice by the Murray Bridge corporation, which was concerned about accidents that were happening in small boats through the boats not being properly equipped, the people in them not being able to swim and the boats being overloaded. There were and still are tragedies along the river almost every summer, and nearly always it transpires that no protection was available for the people involved in such tragedies. Mr. Holloway suggests that life jackets be worn, and I agree. They would keep people afloat until a rescue could be effected. If a boat sinks in deep water and the occupants cannot swim, they have no chance at all. Even some good swimmers have been affected in deep water, particularly if attacked by cold and cramp, and that renders them helpless if they have no life jackets to assist them to keep afloat.

When the Murray Bridge corporation brought this to my notice in 1958 I told Parliament what the corporation had in mind: a recommendation that a committee be formed to investigate the whole matter. Knowing that I was no authority on it, I believed that people who should be interested ought to be the ones to investigate it to see whether something could be done. That was in 1958. Again, in 1959 on three occasions I drew the Government's attention to this matter by way of questions to the Treasurer. Eventually a committee was formed by the Municipal Association of South Australia. It comprised members of the Local Government Association, the South Australian Harbors Board, the police, the National Safety Council, boat builders, boat users, the Royal South Australian Yacht Squadron, and I see that the word "etc." was used, so other interested people could be involved. It is interesting to recall some of the questions and answers in this place, because I raised this matter on a

number of occasions. On November 1, 1961, I asked the Treasurer:

Over the last few years I have asked the Premier more than once about the regulations for boat safety, particularly regarding small boats on the River Murray. Earlier, in answer to a question from me, the Premier said:

The Government has considered the matter and would be prepared to alter the Local Government Act to enable a council to pass a by-law to operate in its area if such a request came from an authoritative local government source.

I understand that a committee was set up by the Municipal Association to examine the control of small boats, that it has met and formulated certain recommendations that have gone back to the Municipal Association, and that a report has been forwarded to the Premier. Can the Premier say whether this is so and whether any action has been taken to introduce regulations to control small boats?

The Treasurer answered:

I think the honourable member's information is correct. Some work has been done upon a regulation, but the last I heard of it was that certain minor difficulties had arisen in its framing. I will check to see what has happened.

The very next day I asked the Treasurer another question:

Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked yesterday about the control of small boats?

He replied:

The Minister of Local Government reports that the Municipal Association desires an amendment to the Local Government Act to give councils power to make by-laws to register and control boats 18ft. and under. The matter is at present with the Director of Local Government but it has not yet been referred to the Local Government Advisory Committee. The intention of the association is to ask for a "once and for all" fee instead of an annual fee, except where ownership changes. Other problems have arisen: first, the problem of registration in a district when a non-resident takes his boat there; secondly, all councils may not require registration; and thirdly, licensing would imply the need for some sort of inspection as to seaworthiness, gear, and safety, which on a perpetual licence would be impracticable.

The suggestion by the Municipal Association is, apparently, that a licence or a registration be effected only in the initial stages and that it be not a continuing thing; that once a registration was effected, that would be it. I know the purpose is that in policing a situation like this if there is a registration it can be cancelled. Even if it were possible to catch the offending person and a fine were imposed and paid, that would not be enough. Most of these people would not worry much

about a fine and they would be back on the job again the following weekend; but, if their registration was cancelled, that would be a different matter. On the roads, if a person repeatedly commits offences, his licence is automatically suspended, and that is more of a deterrent than all the fines that could be imposed. This is what I have recommended and suggested, but again we find that it is not to be. At page 2003 of the 1963-4 *Hansard* the following question by me is recorded:

Considerable concern has been expressed in my electorate and in other districts on the River Murray about the irresponsible actions of some owners of small boats towing water skiers. The trouble seems to concern people who are not associated with clubs and who often perform to the annoyance of other river users. The Premier will recall that I previously requested that some action be taken to control small boats. I understood that a committee was formed at that time to consider the matter and to suggest to the Government legislation to control small boats. Has the Premier had a report from this committee and, if he has, what action is to be taken by the Government to control small boats, particularly those used on the River Murray?

The Treasurer rather rocked me when he answered:

I must confess that the honourable member's statement that the Government had set up a committee surprises me.

I did not suggest that the Government had set up a committee; I said that a committee had been set up, which the Treasurer recognized in another answer, when he said:

As I have no knowledge of that committee, I will inquire whether one has been established. Cabinet has frequently considered whether it would be desirable to have State-wide registration of small boats, but its opinion is that it would be a cumbersome and ineffective control. Honourable members know that local government authorities have certain regulation-making powers should they wish to control annoyances in their area. Cabinet has taken the view that rather than subject everyone to an overall control because of some foolish by-play by irresponsible persons in one area, it would be advisable for a local regulation to be made to control undesirable actions. However, in view of the honourable member's definite statement about a committee, I shall inquire and inform him of the results when he asks another question, perhaps next week.

Mr. Lawn: He had evidently forgotten what he told you on a previous occasion.

Mr. BYWATERS: That is quite evident.

Mr. Lawn: He forgets a lot of what he promises in his ADS7 talks, too.

Mr. BYWATERS: On February 25 (page 2071 of *Hansard*) I asked the following further question:

Last week, in asking the Premier a question about the control of small boats, I referred, among other things, to water ski-ing. I said that I was under the impression that a committee had been established to consider the position. The Premier apparently took it that I meant a Government committee, but I did not. I understand that the committee was set up by the Municipal Association and included representatives of the Harbors Board, Police Force, National Safety Council and possibly other organizations. Has the Premier had a report from this committee, and is any action contemplated by the Government?

The Minister of Marine answered, and said:

The Premier has asked me to deal with this question because this morning I sent a report to him which is still in the course of transit and which contains a summary of the position by the General Manager of the Harbors Board. This report set out the requests and proposals which had been made on behalf of the river councils and under which they had suggested that the board assist them or provide information that would enable them to draft a model by-law for the purpose of controlling small boats on the river. The proposals which the Upper Murray councils advanced were that they should provide for control of the behaviour of boats and also that it should be compulsory for the driver to be licensed and the boat registered. Those two latter matters are contrary to the Government's policy in this matter, for the Government believes that they are unnecessary and would be a nuisance and an annoyance to people who use small boats. However, we believe that it is advantageous to have regulations to control the behaviour of boats. Several municipal councils have already availed themselves of the legislation enabling them to draft such by-laws, and from all appearances the by-laws they have drafted are working very well. The text of the report I saw this morning pointed out those matters and suggested that councils be invited to re-submit their proposed by-laws with the provisions for registration and licensing omitted. Registration and licensing are the very things councils are seeking. On February 26 I asked the following further question of the Treasurer who had informed me that he had received a report on the subject:

Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked last week concerning the control of small boats?

The Treasurer replied:

Mr. Sainsbury, the General Manager of the Harbors Board, reports: "The matter of a committee to consider measures for the control of small boats was referred to previously in the House on August 4, 1959, by Mr. Bywaters. However, he was informed by the honourable the Premier of the reasons for the Government's decision not to take any action. Subsequently, the Municipal Association of South Australia formed a committee to consider the matter and invited the board to be represented. Cabinet decided against representatives from Government departments attending the meeting

but, after further representations from the association, the Minister agreed to a representative of the board attending meetings of the committee in an advisory capacity. As the Minister is aware, section 667 of the Local Government Act was amended in 1959 to permit councils to make by-laws (subject to the approval of the board) to control small boats within areas adjacent to council boundaries, and the committee formed by the Municipal Association is endeavouring to prepare model by-laws for its members. The board has consented to a number of by-laws made under this section and submitted by certain councils. The Murray Lands District Councils Association (through its Adelaide solicitors) recently submitted for the board's comment a draft of a model by-law to regulate the use of motor and speed boats on the River Murray. Following discussions with the honourable the Minister, the association has been informed that the board is not prepared to approve the proposed by-law as drafted, as it includes the registration or licensing of small boats which is opposed to Government policy. It has been suggested that the by-law be reframed to provide only for the control of the behaviour of persons in charge of small craft."

It is evident that the Government definitely opposes registration, mainly because it claims that it would be cumbersome and not in the best interests of people using small boats on waterways. However, it is still the view of the responsible people that there is a need for some control by way of registration and for the boats to be identifiable by a system of numbering, so that people may be prosecuted if their misbehaviour persists. On June 29 of this year I received a copy of a letter sent by the Municipal Association of South Australia to the corporations of Murray Bridge and Henley and Grange, which councils in the early stages were instrumental in this matter being brought to the notice of Parliament. That letter stated:

You will recall that a few years ago the above two councils referred to this association the question of the control of boats both as to the design, buoyancy, equipment and control. At that time the Premier stated in the House that if a request was made by a recognized local government authority he would introduce legislation along these lines. The association set up a committee comprising representatives of local government, South Australian Harbors Board, Police, National Safety Council, boat builders, boat users, Royal S.A. Yacht Squadron, etc. A considerable amount of work was put into this research and extensive regulations were compiled which would enable councils which desired to handle this matter to register boats and to provide for their numbering and branding with the number of persons they were designed to carry. It was intended that a registration fee of £1 should be charged for this service, but that no annual fee would

be levied and the only charge made would be in cases of change of ownership. For the last two or three years this association has been following up with the Government this matter and it was with some surprise that we received the following letter from the Minister of Local Government dated June 10, 1964:

"In further reply to your specific request regarding the Government's views on this matter, they may be stated briefly as follows:

1. The Government is not in favour of the controlling of small boats by any system of registration, etc.
2. The Government is agreeable, however, and the power already exists in the Local Government Act, that councils should control the behaviour of boat users in their respective areas."

As your councils were those who originally sponsored this move, we are formally reporting back to you this disappointing and rather unexpected result in view of previous assurances.

The attitude of these people today is that the only way to get effective control is by some form of registration. The imposition would not be great: it is suggested that £1 should be paid in the initial stages, and people who can afford a £3,000 high-powered boat can afford to pay this small amount for registration. This system of registration would be a means of detecting offenders, for a policeman or any responsible person could report the owner of a boat who was misbehaving on the river. Those people could then be reported, in the same way that a motorist can be reported when the registration number of his vehicle has been noted. That is all that is being sought, and surely it is not too much. I fully agree with what the Minister of Lands said a few moments ago: this money could assist in the provision of extra water police to control these boats, particularly on public holidays and at weekends. It would not be necessary to have frequent patrols: it is a matter of people knowing that apprehension is always possible, in the same way that people can be apprehended by road patrols when they least expect it. This in itself would be a deterrent to people trying to abuse privileges.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: What about the man with the automatic rifle who sits in the bow of a speed boat and chases ducks on the river, shooting every bird in sight?

Mr. BYWATERS: I know that that goes on, and I would see that he was prosecuted with the utmost rigour of the law. Such people are mutilators of bird life and not sportsmen.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: It would be necessary for the police to be in a boat.

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes, and a high-powered speed boat at that, for the people who offend use such boats and the police would need them, too.

Mr. Lawn: You would not need a high-powered speed boat to keep up with this Government.

Mr. BYWATERS: I have mentioned earlier the interest that the South Australian Boat Owners Association has in this matter. That active body has now drafted a letter to send to members and intending members, stating what it has in mind to provide for greater safety. Many people who buy and use high-powered speed boats have no idea of the rules, and would not know on which side of the river they should travel. Only last week, a Harbors Board officer reported a man on the Murray River for having his navigation lights in the wrong places. These are matters that people do not know about and it is the aim of the South Australian Boat Owners Association to educate them. The association is now preparing a book entitled *Rules of the Road at Sea*. Of course, it will apply to all waterways. The association has said (I do not know whether this is practical but it is worthy of Government consideration) that it is prepared to accept the responsibility of registration. It will ensure that registration numbers are issued and that all that is necessary in this regard is complied with. It has suggested a questionnaire containing particulars of registration, be filled in by people wishing to register a boat. An applicant will be asked whether he is a member of the South Australian Boat Owners Association, and if he is, he will be asked to give his registration number; if he is not, he will be asked for the number of any other club or association with which he is registered. If he is registered by the Brighton council, which is the only council that has its own registration number, he will be asked to give the name of the boat (if any); the makers or manufacturers (if known); the name of the owner or owners and their addresses; the type of boat; its make of motor—whether inboard, outboard, inboard/outboard, or boat impeller, the number of cylinders, the horsepower and engine number (if known). This information is customary in any other form of registration. The association proposes this scheme as it is similar to others. I believe it is within the realms of possibility and should be considered by the Government. I repeat that I am concerned, as are others, that, if some action is not taken, within a short time there may be a worse

tragedy on the river or along our coastline than any accident that has already occurred. This is because of the increasing number of people using boats and because there are irresponsible people on the waterways as well as on the roads. It is therefore necessary to have some form of control.

These difficulties are recognized in dealing with road transport and they must be recognized in dealing with waterways. I realize that a need exists for education on these matters and I have no quarrel with that at all. I know that it is possible to have by-laws drafted so that prosecutions can be laid, but I say emphatically that unless there is some form of policing, all the other provisions are of no avail. Two things are needed—registration and police control on the river. The Minister referred to police control and I thank him for his interjections as they have been most helpful. This report is becoming more and more popular; there is room for it and I applaud it. There is great activity among those who participate in the sport. I wish I could take a part in it, but it is a bit costly for me and my bones are a little old for water ski-ing. However, I enjoy watching water sports and the use of our waterways for them will grow. We must not allow irresponsible people to carry on as they have been carrying on. I support the first line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I do not expect to be long. I see the looks of anticipation from members opposite when I say that; that is a good thing, I suppose. I do not intend to talk about the grand financial affairs of the State as far as Loan works are concerned. The sad truth is that the money we have available to spend on Loan works in this State is circumscribed. It is decided by the Loan Council, and behind the Loan Council (and a major participant in the Loan Council, of course) is the Commonwealth Government, which undoubtedly decides what we spend. Therefore, it is not really much use dwelling for long on that. Members just have to accept what is given in this matter. While I have said that, I must add that I listened with much interest to the remarks of the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) and, by and large, I agree with what he said.

I wish to get a couple of matters off my chest, and I think I can do this better during the debate on the first line than in the debate on the lines that will follow, although there are a few things there that I should like to

talk about. However, as these two matters concern omissions from the Loan Estimates, it is probably more appropriate that I deal with them now. The first concerns the place in my district that is of interest to the whole State—Windy Point. I have often been rubbished by members for pushing the claims of Windy Point as a tourist resort.

Mr. Dunstan: Lots of people do resort there.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They do, as the member for Norwood says. No doubt the honourable member has had more experience in this than I have.

Mr. Dunstan: In my younger days.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No doubt. The honourable member is now getting sere and yellow, as we can see by looking at him, but he is still very distinguished. Be that as it may, I make no apology for claiming that Windy Point is one of the best tourist attractions in South Australia. Of course, one of its great values is that it is so close to the city and, therefore, to the main centre of tourist trade in the State. I do not want to go into the economics of the tourist trade—they speak for themselves. Tourism is big business and can mean a lot to South Australia. Here at Windy Point we have something that can be developed into a great tourist attraction. Many people go there now because it gives an unrivalled view of the lights of the city spread out on the Adelaide Plains. That is a lovely sight, but we are not making enough of it. What is the history of it? This area, until about 1960, was under the control of the Mitcham council. The council called it Mitcham Heights, which I think was not an attractive or fortunate name; but I am glad the old name of Windy Point was restored by the Tourist Bureau when it first took over in about 1960.

Since then we have heard of plans to develop this area. The suggestion made by Mr. Pollnitz, Director of the Tourist Bureau, was that it should be developed as a first-class restaurant. Members will recall that the idea was that plans should be prepared (and they have been) for a building housing two restaurants—a first-class one, and one that might be called a buffet for lighter meals. The estimated cost was about £60,000. The Government then decided, and quite wisely, of course, that it would be better to make sure there would be someone to run the restaurant, as it did not propose to do so itself, before the building was actually built.

Mr. Harding: Have you seen the revolving restaurant at Katoomba? You should have a look at it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe that is a suggestion for Windy Point. What happened when tenders were called to run it? The response was, I believe, not encouraging: it was disappointing, and now we find, as the Treasurer said to me in this place, that the plans for any expansion at Windy Point have been shelved. I say without hesitation that that is a great pity. There are two alternatives open to us now if we are to make some good use of Windy Point. The first one, and this is what I suggest strongly should be tried, is to allow or to offer the area for private development, perhaps on a long lease of 99 years or 50 years or something like that. In other words, not only allow private enterprise to run a restaurant built by the Government, but to give a private developer the opportunity to develop the site himself on a long lease. I do not know whether it would work or not. I do not know whether there would be any takers or not. However, I strongly urge, with my usual deference, that the Government should consider that course of action. The other alternative, which is the less satisfactory one but the one to which we may be forced, is to consider development of a rather different nature from that of a first-class restaurant, and on a less ambitious scale.

I do not know what that would be. While a restaurant seems to be a good idea there (the site lends itself to one), I have heard it suggested that a restaurant would not be successful and perhaps that is the reason why the tenders were not encouraging. The first-class restaurant business is pretty competitive in Adelaide at present and there may not be room there or anywhere else for another one to operate successfully. All I say is that at present the Windy Point area is shabby. It is not being used to the best advantage. The State took it over from the Mitcham council with the idea of developing it, and that was four or five years ago, and now I believe something should be done. In the meantime, until a decision can be made, and I trust indeed it won't be too long before something is done along the lines I have suggested, some money should be spent on running repairs, as I called them the other day, that is, some interim maintenance measure to make the area a little less shabby and more attractive than it is now. I hope that, with a pretty full front bench, something will come of the comments I have made.

The other matter is also of State-wide importance and does not directly concern my district more than any other district of this State. It concerns the arrangements for the expenditure of money on roads and highways. The views I am going to express have been expressed before in this place, notably by the member for Torrens and by other members as well. What is the position with regard to roads? The expenditure by the Highways Department on roads in this State—and I am talking only of main roads and roads with which the department assists—comes from the Highways Fund. If we look at the last report of the Highways and Local Government Department we find that the amount available in 1962-63, because they are the last figures we have, was over £11,500,000. Yet what do we find in the Loan Estimates? The only mention of roads or bridges is a paltry sum of £200,000 set out as a payment to the Loan Fund. No details are given, of course, but that is not the point. The fact is that only £200,000 of something over £11,500,000 ever comes formally before Parliament for discussion or scrutiny as to the way this money is to be spent. That is not a good thing. In these Loan Estimates we are considering a programme of some £36,500,000. In addition to that, almost exactly one-third of that sum, is the expenditure on roads. Surely that too is a capital investment in the State. Yet, we do not, as a Parliament, get an opportunity to consider how that money is going to be spent. I suppose you could say that we have an opportunity to debate the report of the Highways Commissioner when it is laid on the table, but let me point out—

Mr. Coumbe: Has that ever been done?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I do not think it has been done, for this reason, a practical one, that under the Highways Act the report has to be presented to the Minister of Roads not later than September 30 in every year, and if members look at the report for last year, they will find it is dated September 26—within time, and I have no complaint at all so far as the Commissioner is concerned. It was ordered by Parliament to be printed on October 17, and that was within a fortnight or so of the long break we had in the session; it was right towards the end of the session when we were busy as we could be and when there was little time for members to read and consider the reports laid on the table. But more important, the jolly thing was not printed until after we had got up for the adjournment. Those reports that are not actually printed

before we get up never do find their way into members' files. One has to ask for them before one gets a copy. That means, I guess, that very few members do look at the reports (and I plead guilty myself: I am not blaming other members and holding myself up as an example) and I believe that the report of the Highways Commissioner is one of the most important of the lot. It is a well-produced document running into 104 pages.

Mr. Coumbe: What do you suggest?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the member for Torrens bears with me I shall tell him what I suggest. I shall quote two short paragraphs from the introduction to the report to show how important a document it is and why I believe this Parliament should have the opportunity to consider the matters set forth in it. The report states:

During this year the department prepared a Road Needs Survey for South Australia to cover the 10 year period from 1964 to 1974. This survey involved making an inventory of the present road system, estimating from present traffic the 1974 traffic, and designing a road system which would provide reasonably for the 1974 traffic. These results form a basis for construction and maintenance programmes for the next 10 years and for estimating the finance required. The finance required comprised all expenditure on roads by local authorities and the department (and this is the important part to which I think honourable members should be lending their attention) and indicated that an expenditure approximately 50 per cent greater than funds estimated to be available would be required to provide a reasonable standard for 1974 traffic. As the traffic will double in the next 10 years, a large part of this additional expenditure will be required to prevent congestion and reduce accidents in and near the metropolitan area where roadworks are more complicated, difficult to design, and require more supervision than those in the country. At present urgent and difficult works in the metropolitan area are being placed far below their true priority because qualified experienced staff is not available for planning, design, and supervision.

Those are matters of great importance for South Australia. I do not, and could not, make any estimate of how much our economy depends upon roads and their state of fitness but it would certainly depend upon them to a great extent; yet members have no formal opportunity to debate how that £11,000,000 is to be spent.

Mr. Loveday: Do you think it would make any difference if we did?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know. That is a rather cynical question to ask, although I must admit that it is quite a fair one. What difference does it make if this Parliament

debates any expenditure of that Government—whatever the political complexion of the Government? If we say that it does not make any difference, we are all wasting our time, but if we believe that we have any function left at all as members of Parliament, we hope that it makes some difference, and that at least the publicity we are able to give the matter and the views that we express do have some influence on public opinion in South Australia and on the Government itself. While I could not give to the member for Whyalla a 100 per cent certain reply, I hope that debating the Loan Estimates and the Budget does make some difference. I believe, anyway, that we should take the matter as seriously as we can. Why should not Parliament have the same control over the spending of moneys from the Highways Fund as it has over the spending of Loan moneys in this State? That is the crux of the matter. There may be an answer to it but I do not know what it is, because I have never heard it.

Mr. Hutchens: There are a few other allocations in that category.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be so. I am referring to this one because I think it is one of the most important.

Mr. Coumbe: The Public Works Committee does not inquire into roadworks.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, that is so. There is no Parliamentary control. However, there is Ministerial control; I will grant that.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Where?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Leader looks at Part 3 of the Highways Act he will find this heading, "Financial Provisions Relating to the Construction and Maintenance of Main Roads". Section 31 sets out the Highways Fund and section 32 states:

The moneys standing to the credit of the Highways Fund shall be used by the Commissioner.

Section 34 states:

Subject to the provisions of this Act (not Parliamentary control) the Highways Fund shall be under the control of the Commissioner. The only other relevant provision is contained in section 36 (b)—

Mr. Lawn: The member for Ridley is considering whether he is going to join the member for Mitcham's Party.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He may be doing so but he would do better if he listened to me on this occasion. Anyway, section 36b. (1) states:

Before the commencement of every financial year the Commissioner shall prepare and submit to the Minister a schedule setting out—
(a) the programme for that financial year . . .

Of course that never reaches us and, as far as I know, it is never published. What do we find if we look at the Commissioner's report? We find in considerable detail what has been done in the preceding year but we do not find any proposals set out for what should be done in the future. That, of course, is far more relevant than what has already been achieved by the department. I believe that, if Parliament has any duty at all to control Government expenditure, it has a duty to control the expenditure from the Highways Fund. The member for Torrens asked me some time ago what I thought should be done. The answer is quite simple, and I should think quite obvious: this matter should be brought under Parliamentary control. The programme of roadworks of the Highways Department should be subject to the same scrutiny that other works of a capital nature receive in this place. This is an imperfect remedy; let us face that, but at least it would mean that some exercise of Parliamentary control existed over the spending of what is about one-quarter of the capital investment by the Government in this State annually.

Mr. Riches: Would that not lead to the parish pump?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why should it lead to the parish pump any more than any other activity of government does, such as schools and water supply? What if it does! Is that not part of our job? Why should it do so any more than anything else? I cannot see why it should. In any case, I cannot see why it should be more harmful if it did. I do not think, with respect to the member for Stuart, that that is a very good reason for not bringing this matter under Parliamentary control. There is no doubt that the influence and prestige of State Parliaments, not only this one but all State Parliaments, is declining in the eyes of the people of Australia, and this sort of anomaly—because that is what it is—speeds up that process. I hope that something can be done, or at least that members can consider doing something, to put it right. I shall have an opportunity during the lines, no doubt, to raise other matters, but I support the adoption of the first line.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I rise with a feeling of sympathy for the plea that the member for Mitcham has just made. I entirely

agree with him that this place should be in a position to control the expenditures of the Government in this State and that large sums of money should not be spent without the scrutiny of the elected representatives of the State.

Mr. Clark: Possibly a public accounts committee might be of some use.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I hope that the Government, at some time, will take notice of the submissions that were made to it last year on that particular score. We on this side of the Chamber have for years raised our voices in apparently futile protest at the lack of a proper Parliamentary accounting system as known in other Parliaments.

Mr. Lawn: We should be able to introduce it next year when we are in government.

Mr. DUNSTAN: We shall then see that the accounts of this State are properly placed before the representatives of the people. It is on behalf of the representatives of the people that I want to have a word or two to say now. In looking at the lines, I find that there is a singular lesson to be learned by the people of this State, and particularly the people of the crowded areas of this State, for, like the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), I lament the fact that on these Loan Estimates many of the things that need to be done most urgently for the people in the crowded areas are missing. If we look at the line relating to hospital buildings, we find that the Government is making no adequate provision for general hospital accommodation—none at all. I well remember the Minister of Education (Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson), when a private member, raising on many occasions the need for a general public hospital in his district at Oaklands, and pointing to the fact that the Government had land for such a hospital.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: Oaklands adjoins my district.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am sorry; it adjoins the Minister's district. I can remember the protests he made as far back as 1953, but we see no sign of that hospital. We see no sign in that area of a teaching hospital, which is absolutely vital to the people of this State. What is the position now with our medical school? We have insufficient trained medical staff to cope with the needs of the populace. In many areas we simply cannot get doctors. We find that in many cases our hospitals are inadequately staffed. There is a restriction on entry into the medical school because there is no adequate clinical teaching accommodation for people who might be

absorbed into the medical profession. In order to expand this provision we must have a teaching hospital, but is one even on the drawing boards? It is not.

Looking at the way in which this Government takes its time about hospital accommodation, it will be more than a decade before we even see the first sod turned. Look at the time it took to build the Queen Elizabeth Hospital! There is no provision, in accordance with the recommendations of the Town Planning Committee on the expansion of population, for a general public hospital in the developing northern areas. Where is the public hospital at Tea Tree Gully to be provided? It is an obvious necessity, but all the Government is doing at the moment is dickering about giving a subsidy to the District Council of Tea Tree Gully for a subsidized hospital; it is not doing anything about a general hospital to cope with the vastly expanding population that the Town Planner forecasts will take place there. There is no adequate provision at all.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: What is the backlog of patients in hospital?

Mr. DUNSTAN: It is very considerable. The pressure on the Royal Adelaide Hospital at this moment is grave indeed.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: That is in the process of being rebuilt.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It is in the process of being rebuilt, but it will not cope with the needs of the populace in this State—not those people who need public hospital accommodation. We have by far the worst hospital bed provision in proportion to population of any State in Australia. That will not be better by the time the Royal Adelaide Hospital is rebuilt. What is happening at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is not that a vast number of extra beds will be provided but that at least we shall be able to have wards in which people will be able to go without having to climb over existing beds to get into a bed!

Mr. Lawn: And each building will have to be demolished.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly. If the honourable member went to the hospital in recent years and saw the utterly antediluvian conditions there he would realize why the honorary medical staff made public protests after their private protests had been ignored by the Government. The Royal Adelaide Hospital building is years behind its time; but it will not cope with the future, and we are not having prepared an adequate plan for hospital provision or for the training of proper medical staff.

Let us have another look at the Public Buildings Department line, in relation to the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department. True; there has been a considerable expansion in spending, but it is also true that it is long overdue. But what is the programme for that department? It is for the provision of a somewhat inadequately conceived programme for delinquents. But where is the adequate programme—the kind known to comparable countries—of preventive treatment in relation to young people in this community? There is none. These things in South Australia are left to private organizations and occasional charities. No overall provision is being made by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department to cope with social disease, for that is what happens with young people who are developing in an affluent society and who have not got the kind of associations provided by the community that they should have. They now reach maturity far earlier than they did in the days when it was enough to provide a church youth club. The kind of mass entertainments they now seek—in days when they are able to obtain a fair wage in the kind of affluent society we are developing—demand some kind of a community provision. Older people can find clubs and associations; there are adequate clubs for them, but where do people under 21 go?

Mr. Lawn: I know a good club, but you have to be 30 to get there!

Mr. DUNSTAN: Unfortunately, juveniles cannot enter there, however juvenile may be the comments made in that august place from time to time. Why is it that on this score, and on many others that I shall mention when we come to the individual lines, the Government is not providing what is needed by the people of this State? It is because it is not representative. It does not represent the people of the crowded areas of this State and is therefore not interested in what is needed for them. For the main part, it does not know. Of the Cabinet, only one member comes from the part of the State that contains 67 per cent of the population. This Government is completely and hopelessly unrepresentative of the people of this State, and it maintains that position in complete subversion—I use that word advisedly—of the Constitution originally laid down for this State. It has fraudulently denied the provisions of the original Legislative Council when providing a Constitution. We can see this kind of process going on continually all over Australia from the Party that is represented on the Government benches here. It is

carefully putting the clock back wherever it can do so in complete contrast to what is being done in other countries on this score. At the time when we were discussing the foundation of representative institutions in this State, it was completely accepted as unarguable that the institutions of this State should be democratic and that every person within the State should have an equal voice in his own future governments—equal with every other citizen, that is. This was not something new back in 1855: it had already been accepted long before that time.

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

Mr. DUNSTAN: Before the adjournment I was pointing out that in 1855 it was already accepted that people, in electing their representatives, should have an equal say with all other citizens in that election; and, indeed, in the United States of America, over 60 years before, this principle had been quite clearly stated. In some recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court, the basis upon which the United States Constitution (which, of course, was in many ways the basis of our own Commonwealth Constitution) was drawn was clearly cited. The deliberations of the representatives of the people, as set forth in the papers of *The Federalist*, were cited with approval by the United States Supreme Court. Indeed, James Wilson, who was one of the members of the Constitutional Convention, said:

All elections ought to be equal. Elections are equal, when a given number of citizens, in one part of the state, choose as many representatives, as are chosen by the same number of citizens, in any other part of the state. In this manner, the proportion of the representatives and of the constituents will remain invariably the same.

Madison, who was one of the leading members of the Constitutional Convention of the United States of America, in *The Federalist* described the system of the division of States into Congressional districts, the method that he and others assumed the States would adopt. He said:

Numbers are not only a suitable way to represent wealth but in any event are the only proper scale of representation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will understand that this is a debate on the Loan Estimates, and that he must link his remarks with them.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am linking my remarks with the fact that from the Loan Estimates a number of things are missing which would occur in the State of South Australia were the

principle originally contained in our Constitution still to be maintained in South Australia—that, in fact, all citizens should be represented equally here—because then their needs would be met. As I pointed out at the opening of my speech on the first line of the Estimates, their needs are not being met, and they can be met only by alteration of our present Constitution, to conform to the principles originally laid down. I am pointing to the basis on which the members of the original Legislative Council in South Australia formed our Constitution—the things from which they drew their principles, one of which was the debates contained in *The Federalist* papers cited recently with approval by the Supreme Court in the United States. As the majority judgment in the case of *Wesberry v. Sanders* in the Supreme Court of the United States in the October term of last year, reported in No. 57 of *The Federalist*, said:

Who are to be the electors of the Federal Representatives? Not the rich more than the poor; not the learned more than the ignorant; not the haughty heirs of distinguished names more than the humble sons of obscure and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States.

The members of the United States Supreme Court Bench went on to say that readers surely could have fairly taken this to mean “one person, one vote”, a principle that the Treasurer maintains exists nowhere in electoral matters in the world. They continued:

While it may not be possible to draw Congressional districts with mathematical precision, that is no excuse for ignoring our Constitution's plain objective of making equal representation for equal numbers of people the fundamental goal for the House of Representatives—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not allow a debate on electoral reform. The honourable member must confine his remarks to the Loan Estimates.

Mr. DUNSTAN: May I at least refer to the foundation of the Constitution in this State that is being set aside?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has referred to it and, as I have said, I have allowed passing reference to it, but there has been more than passing reference. If the Chair allows a speaker to digress as the honourable member has digressed, we will get nowhere at all.

Mr. Lawn: I think we might get further.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Do I understand that I may not now refer to the basis on which our Constitution in South Australia was founded

and point out that, since this has been subverted in South Australia, we are not having the sort of Loan Estimates that we should have?

The CHAIRMAN: I merely ask that the honourable member get on with the Loan Estimates, and if he is on the rails I shall not object.

Mr. Shannon: Perhaps he knows nothing about them.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I have no doubt that honourable members opposite are not very happy with what I have to say on this subject.

Mr. Shannon: You will get an opportunity later.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I have no doubt about that, but I intend to say something on this at the moment because the people in my district have not sufficient voice in this Parliament, although I try to make my voice as loud as possible. At the same time they are denied their rightful representation in this place.

Mr. Jennings: Your voice is all right, but you have only one vote.

Mr. DUNSTAN: That is so. Unfortunately we do not have a card vote system here! I have heard the Treasurer say that before. He said it in my district, and the result was a resounding vote in my favour at the next election. I trust that the honourable the Speaker, who is elsewhere at the moment, will not be foolish enough to fall for various overtures that are publicly reported at the moment.

Mr. Shannon: What has that got to do with the Loan Estimates?

Mr. DUNSTAN: If I may turn to the basis of that—

Mr. Lawn: If the honourable member for Onkaparinga is seeking information there is no member of this place who needs it more.

Mr. DUNSTAN: How right you are!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the Loan Estimates.

Mr. DUNSTAN: If I may turn to the basis on which this Parliament was originally to be elected according to the—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair has been very lenient with the honourable member. I think the honourable member should realize that there is an opportunity to expound that subject in the Address in Reply debate.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, but I understand that on the first line of these Estimates one may raise matters of grievance, and I have pointed out that the nature of these Loan Estimates affects the representation and arises from the

representation in this Parliament. This has often, in fact, been ruled upon by the Chair as being a proper matter for debate in these circumstances on the first line. I have pointed already to the lines in these Estimates that show rather clearly that we are affected by the fact that in South Australia at the moment we do not have the basis on which our Constitution was originally founded.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is returning to the matter on which I ruled a moment ago that he was out of order, and I ask him to refer to the Loan Estimates.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Do I understand from your ruling that I am not to refer any further to the basis of representation in this place.

The CHAIRMAN: I gave the honourable member to understand that he could make passing reference to the matter, but not to debate or expound the subject at large.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am sorry. I do not understand that ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: I will understand the honourable member if he speaks to the Loan Estimates, and I ask him to proceed.

Mr. DUNSTAN: What may I say?

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has ruled that the honourable member is out of order.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am asking what I may talk about.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Loan Estimates which have been placed before honourable members. If he confines his remarks to those Estimates he will be in order. I have ruled that the honourable member was out of order in dealing with the matter that he was dealing with.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Mr. Chairman, if you are ruling that I am out of order in dealing with the matter to which I was referring, then I must move disagreement with your ruling. I move:

That the Chairman's ruling be disagreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to Standing Orders, the honourable member must state his objection in writing.

The Chairman left the chair and the Speaker was called.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that during the debate on the Loan Estimates, while the honourable member for Norwood was speaking, I ruled that he was out of order in referring to certain matters in a debate on the Loan Estimates. I ruled that his remarks relating to the principle of representation of members in this place were

out of order in the Loan Estimates, and that any remarks addressed to the Committee must be relevant to the Loan Estimates before the Committee. The honourable member disagreed with my ruling and has stated, pursuant to Standing Order No. 161, in writing:

I object to the ruling of the Chairman of Committees that I may not refer at length to the basis of representation in this House when I have pointed to a number of omissions and inadequacies in the Loan Estimates, which I say arise from the lack of proper representation in the House of the crowded areas of the State. I have sought to show that the original basis of representation would have produced different Estimates and I am denied the right to explain this to this House.

The SPEAKER: I am asked to give a ruling on this question which has been referred to me by the Chairman of Committees, who ruled the member for Norwood out of order for bringing up the question of the basis of representation in this Chamber in the debate on the first line of the Estimates. The honourable member has referred to the Standing Orders. I take it that the Chairman of Committees drew his attention to this question and I understand that he persisted in referring to it when it was ruled out of order. The honourable member would know that, under the Standing Orders, the Chairman of Committees is right in his ruling in that, on the first line of the Estimates, the honourable member must not pursue this question. I therefore rule that the ruling of the Chairman of Committees was correct and I uphold his decision.

Mr. DUNSTAN moved:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) in writing has objected to the Speaker's ruling and states:

I object to the ruling that I may not, in debating the first line of the Loan Estimates in Committee, refer to a matter of grievance at length when the matter of grievance relates to deficiencies in the Loan Estimates. The Chairman has allowed on this occasion, as on others, wide debate on matters not contained in the Loan Estimates on the ground that failure to provide for them was a proper matter for comment on the first line. I contend that it is proper that the same latitude be given to the member for Norwood as to Government members.

With great respect to the member for Norwood, I contend that what he has written relates to what the Chairman of Committees has done. His objection to the Speaker's ruling does not seem to have referred to the ruling at all.

Mr. Shannon: Out of order!

The SPEAKER: Therefore, I take it that in this disagreement to the ruling the Chairman of Committees is referred to as the Speaker. I point out to the honourable member that a precedent has been established in this matter of dealing with the first line of the Loan Estimates. On the first line a wide scope exists for discussion of every item in the Estimates, but it is not nearly so wide in scope as the Address in Reply debate. As I understand it, the Chairman of Committees did give some latitude before calling the honourable member to order, but the honourable member persisted in disagreeing to the Chairman's ruling. I upheld the Chairman's ruling on that point. The honourable member has now moved that the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The House divided on Mr. Dunstan's motion that the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Frank Walsh.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Tapping and Fred Walsh. Noes—Messrs. Nankivell and Freebairn.

The SPEAKER: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes. Motion thus negatived.

In Committee.

Mr. DUNSTAN: In view of what has just transpired, I will reserve my remarks on the subject that is interesting to members on this side of the Chamber, to people elsewhere and, unfortunately, perhaps to members opposite, until another time. However, I should like to say one or two things generally on the Loan Estimates, carefully confining myself to matters contained in the Loan Estimates, and not dealing with any that are not contained in them. A matter contained in the Loan Estimates about which I have something to say relates to the Public Buildings Department line and concerns the Sheriff's and Gaols and Prisons Department. While it is true that several wise and reasonable reforms have been made in the treatment of imprisoned persons in South Australia, there is still much to be desired in the treatment of those who are subject to gaol sentences. While the Sheriff's

office has made adequate provision for commencing an education programme for prisoners, at the moment there is insufficient staff, and insufficient work is being done in this direction. The officer who has been seconded to this duty is doing extremely valuable work, but it is only a small beginning.

Many of our gaols and prisons are ancient institutions originally built in a manner completely out of accord with modern prison treatment. Nowhere is this more the case than at the Adelaide Gaol, which is a place from which we should quickly remove prisoners and under which we should put a bomb. In the Loan Estimates there is a proposal to spend £14,000 on alterations to the Adelaide Gaol to provide dormitory accommodation in the central block. At the moment it is a hazardous fire trap, a place of small cells bounded by corrugated iron. It is a hopelessly ancient and inadequate structure and to spend £14,000 upon it at any time would be a great waste of public money. In fact, we should get rid of the institution altogether.

Three classes of person are catered for at the Adelaide Gaol—short-term prisoners, women prisoners (and that is the only women's gaol in South Australia) and prisoners on remand. The prisoners there on short-term are given some assistance in training by the staff, as far as the facilities in the gaol will permit, but the facilities for keeping them adequately healthy, with properly balanced exercises, are inadequate. The gaol itself is so ancient that it is not possible to keep the people in any reasonable minimal comfort. After all, a gaol is not supposed to be a place of torture.

As far as women prisoners are concerned, to go down there and see the rooms in which they have to be concentrated can only show that we are making no adequate provision for looking after them. The place is something that often the staff, I believe, despairs of because of the nature of the building, but we are not providing adequate treatment for women prisoners in this institution.

As far as remand prisoners are concerned, the place is a crying disgrace to this State. For the most part they are not convicted persons, yet they are put, while on trial, into a primitive yard with primitive accommodation. There is no recreation facility for them. They live in enforced idleness, discomfort and degradation during the period of their trial or while they are awaiting further remand. It is improper to treat in this way

people who, in some instances, are later found to be not guilty by the courts; but they are still subjected to treatment that we should not mete out to any convicted criminal.

Mr. Jennings: I know someone who is now a judge of the Supreme Court who once complained about this.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Quite so. When Mr. Justice Travers was a member here he complained bitterly about the treatment given to remand prisoners; yet there continues this extraordinary system by which we require people coming before the Supreme Court for trial in the criminal jurisdiction to spend a period of their trial at the Adelaide Gaol. There are very few exceptions to this. I can remember only two or three. Bail has been granted to only two or three people in the last decade; it would not be many more than that. I remember that bail was granted to Mr. Rohan Rivett when he was being prosecuted, and in the case of one other prisoner it was granted, but for the most part people, many of whom are subsequently found not guilty, are subjected to this kind of treatment. Even those found guilty should not be subjected to such remand conditions while undergoing trial, should not be suffering conditions like those obtaining at the Adelaide Gaol, in respect of which these Estimates make no provision, because the £14,000 is not in relation to the remand section of the gaol. I do not believe the Sheriff's and Gaols and Prisons Department could possibly regard the Adelaide Gaol as a satisfactory institution.

I think it would be quite the contrary. I believe that the staff there must be extraordinarily hampered in their attempts to deal adequately with prisoners and to provide for their rehabilitation and reformation. We are maintaining an institution here about which the Howard Penal Reform League in England in the last century would have said some pretty stringent things. We in this Parliament should not be prepared to maintain an institution of this kind: we should get rid of it, and we should have a new short-term prison, a new women's prison, and a separate remand institution, and each one of them, Sir, adequate to the job for which it would be provided. At the moment, no section of Adelaide Gaol is adequate to that job, and the sooner we get rid of that institution the better.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) suggested a good place to put a bomb; I could suggest a better place, and that is under this Government. **My**

remarks this evening, unless I am stopped from speaking, will be on behalf of a section of our community which I consider to be the lost legion in South Australia. This matter is referred to in a small way on page 8 of the printed Loan Estimates on the lines concerning Parkside Mental Hospital, alterations and additions, £87,000; Hillcrest Hospital, alterations and additions, £50,000; Child Guidance Clinic, alterations and additions, £20,000; and St. Corantyn Psychiatric Day Hospital, alterations and additions, £26,000.

When the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) spoke he quoted an example of the Treasurer's reply to a question in 1963 to the effect that he did not know anything about a certain committee which in 1962 he said he knew about. I wish to refresh the Treasurer's memory of something he said in 1962 on the television channel which he uses to issue information and propaganda to the people of this State. The Treasurer forgets a lot of things he says over ADS7. The *Advertiser* on June 1, 1962, referring to something the Treasurer said in his television appearance on the previous evening, reported that the Treasurer had referred to Dr. Cramond's having gone to New Zealand with a senior Government architect to study mental hospital developments in connection with the building on a new Parkside Mental Hospital and the proposed Northfield centre for the treatment of alcoholics. The way I read that statement was that he meant a new hospital at Parkside: I thought it was clear. The Treasurer has either forgotten the statement he made or he has some other interpretation on the subject. The *Advertiser* report went on to say:

This was announced by the Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) last night in his weekly ADS7 telecast and 5AD broadcast. Dr. Cramond will also visit the Eastern States. "In the coming financial year's Loan allocation (that is for 1962-63) to South Australia, we have given a new mental hospital the highest possible priority and we have also given an extremely high priority to the new institution to deal with the problem of alcoholism", the Premier said.

Mr. Jennings: It is just as well they weren't low on the list!

Mr. LAWN: Yes, I am coming to that later on. We will just see how high they are. The *Advertiser* report continued:

The Premier said after the broadcast that the proposed new mental hospital would be in addition to the existing Parkside Mental Hospital and would be built on the "considerable amount of land" owned by the Government at Parkside.

That is a definite statement of the Government's intentions. We must realize that it was put over ADS7, which we know is the Government's propaganda mouthpiece.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Do you know that they back-peddled in 1962 over that?

Mr. LAWN: Yes, but that was after the election, not prior to it, so there was no need to have said it, except that the Treasurer is bound to speak at 6.55 p.m. every Wednesday, and apparently he was short of propaganda or anything definite to speak of and he had to fall back on that suggestion. After what the Treasurer said about the coming Loan works programme for 1962, that this project was to be given a high allocation, the 1962-63 Loan Estimates provided a line for the Parkside Mental Hospital as follows: "Heating, drainage, roads, etc., £49,000." For the Northfield Mental Hospital, £49,000 was provided for training centre, roads and drains. According to the Treasurer's statement, the building of a new Parkside Mental Hospital would be given a high priority on the 1962 Loan Estimates, but they got only £49,000 for each of Parkside and Northfield! Also in 1962, on July 24, I referred to the appalling conditions at Parkside. With other members I paid two visits to the institution and went through it. That was when Dr. Birch was Superintendent, and I know his opinion of that place, and I know to some extent, but not fully, the representations that he made to the Government.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Do you remember Dr. Shea out there?

Mr. LAWN: The Government lost Dr. Shea. He did not have the scope to do the work he wanted.

Mr. Frank Walsh: He could do it over there, though.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, he could do it in New South Wales. In 1962 in this place I referred to a statement by Mrs. Ruby Hutchison, a member of the Legislative Council in Western Australia. I met her in this building after she had toured all States and visited their mental institutions, and she told me that the worst of the institutions she had seen was at Parkside. I drew the attention of the Treasurer to this by way of a question recorded on page 212 of the 1962 *Hansard*, and I said that Mrs. Hutchison had made a press statement in South Australia and I asked the Treasurer whether he had seen it. I asked him whether he agreed with Mrs. Hutchison's statement and, if he did, what plans he had to bring Parkside up to the standard of the best of these

institutions in Australia. He had already promised to do something to improve the standard. He denied the statement made by Mrs. Hutchison, and he went on to say:

In fact, some time ago a proper survey was made of mental institutions throughout Australia by a competent body appointed by the Commonwealth, and it was shown conclusively that the South Australian institutions at that time were the best in Australia.

Hansard records that the honourable member for Adelaide said, "How long ago?" The Treasurer, however, declined to answer that. The Stoller report, the last report prior to the occasion I have referred to, condemned our mental institutions. Following that, Mr. Speaker—I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. . . .

Mr. Jennings: Be careful. He has had one of his rulings questioned tonight. He is not too happy.

Mr. LAWN: He should be happy to be called Mr. Speaker. Anyway, you never can tell what will happen next year.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Adelaide will please proceed.

Mr. LAWN: The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan), in company with other members, went to the Parkside Mental Hospital and saw the conditions there.

Mr. Ryan: They were shocking.

Mr. LAWN: And they were filthy, too. An article appeared in the *Advertiser* of August 2, 1962, which stated:

"Filth" at Parkside. Conditions seen recently by members of Parliament at the Parkside Mental Hospital were the worst he had ever seen, Mr. Ryan (Australian Labor Party) said in the Assembly yesterday. It was almost impossible for patients ever to become well in the filthy conditions in which they were treated, Mr. Ryan said.

Mr. Ryan: There is no doubt that statement is true.

Mr. LAWN: That statement is true. The article continues:

Yet a report given by the Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) claimed that the hospital was one of the best in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Ryan: Apparently the Treasurer had never seen it.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, and I think that applies to the Minister of Health, too. The article continues:

"If Parkside is one of the best, then I never want to see the worst," Mr. Ryan said. "I don't know how the Premier can say it is one of the best, because I have been told that neither he nor the Chief Secretary has ever visited the institution in their 23 years of office."

The Minister of Health replied to that later and, in fact, he supported the member for Port Adelaide. The article continues:

Mr. Ryan said that the group of members of Parliament who visited the Institution were shown all of it. "I saw filthy conditions," he said. "We were told not to think of the home as a mental asylum but as an institution to treat people who are sick."

The doctors told him that. There is no doubt of their sympathy for the unfortunate people they look after. The article continues:

"But it is practically impossible for people housed and treated under these conditions ever to become well. We saw a toilet system that would have been considered outmoded 50 years ago."

That is correct; I can visualize that from memory. The article continues:

Mr. Ryan said that if the staff ever went on strike in support of better conditions, he knew of no case where it would be better warranted. "These people should receive medals for sticking to the job they do on behalf of the patients," Mr. Ryan said. Mr. Ryan was speaking in the Address in Reply debate.

Then there is reference to what I quoted from *Hansard* with regard to Mrs. Hutchison.

Mr. Frank Walsh: I have the Stoller report, if you want it.

Mr. LAWN: In his speech on the Address in Reply, the Leader said:

A comprehensive report was compiled by Messrs. Stoller and Arscott for the Commonwealth Government in 1955, dealing with the mental health facilities and needs of Australia. Probably that is the report the Treasurer just referred to. The Leader continued:

It was a complete condemnation of mental health treatment throughout Australia, and South Australia fared no better than the other States.

That is the report which the Treasurer claimed stated that South Australia fared as well as any State in the Commonwealth in this field. This matter was again referred to in the *Advertiser* of August 3, 1962. In this article the Minister of Health made a statement. It reads:

"Unjust" Attack Over Parkside—Minister. Many statements made in Parliament and elsewhere about the Parkside mental institution reflected unjustly on the Government, the Minister of Health (Sir Lyell McEwin) said yesterday when closing the Address in Reply debate in the Legislative Council.

How could we reflect unjustly on the Government?

Mr. Ryan: It is impossible.

Mr. LAWN: Of course it is. It is doing a good job of that itself. The report continues:

He said the Government did not suggest that everything there was perfect. However, independent observers—"who had no wish to make political footballs out of mentally afflicted people"—had found much that was excellent and things which could be improved. The Government was happy to accept the challenge of anyone who would attempt to show it how the available money could have been better spent in a more effective order of priority. Water conservation, roads, other hospitals, public buildings and sewerage were among the many other expensive and vital demands on the Government's revenue.

The Minister was saying that the Government was getting demands from members of Parliament, from councils and other people wanting roads and other amenities, but that no-one was presenting a case for the foreign legion at Parkside. Tonight I am raising my voice on behalf of these people. The Minister of Health seemed to be saying that other facilities were being demanded. The Minister continued:

In hand were plans for an institution for subnormal patients, two institutions for mentally retarded children and a security institution. When the new buildings were in use it was proposed to demolish certain outdated buildings at Parkside, including the original main building.

Mr. Ryan: He admitted they were outmoded.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. I shall repeat what he said:

When the new buildings were in use it was proposed to demolish certain outdated buildings at Parkside, including the original main building.

These new buildings are not completed yet. I remind members of what I said at the outset, and what the Treasurer said over ADS7:

The Director of Mental Health (Dr. W. A. Cramond) will visit New Zealand with a senior Government architect to study mental hospital developments in connection with the building of a new Parkside mental hospital and the proposed Northfield centre for treatment of alcoholism. Dr. Cramond would also visit the Eastern States. In the coming financial year's Loan allocation to South Australia we have given a new mental hospital the highest possible priority . . .

That was said on May 31, and yet, on August 3, the Minister of Health stated:

In hand were plans for an institution for subnormal patients, two institutions for mentally retarded children and a security institution. When the new buildings were in use it was proposed to demolish certain outdated buildings at Parkside, including the original main building.

A couple of months earlier the Treasurer said that the demolition and rebuilding work on the new hospital were to be given a high priority. Later, the Minister of Health had said that certain other buildings were to be built and when they were finished the buildings at Parkside with high priorities would be commenced. On July 16, 1964, the other buildings mentioned by the Minister of Health were referred to the Public Works Committee.

Mr. Ryan: Two years after!

Mr. LAWN: Yes. After the Minister made his statement the Treasurer said the matter would be given high priority. Two years later the smaller jobs are referred to the Public Works Committee and that committee will bring in its report in another two or three years. I may or may not be here to see them. The other projects, as reported upon by the Public Works Committee, will be commenced by the Government some time in the future. The Treasurer will not be Treasurer then. In 1962 he was going to place this hospital high on the priority list. The member for Port Adelaide claimed that the Minister of Health had not visited Parkside during his term of office but, in denying this, the Minister said that he had visited Parkside usually once a year and in recent years had been to Parkside to open new ward buildings. I was there on that occasion. We were all there! The Minister of Health opened the new nurses' quarters. In other words, he admitted that what the member for Port Adelaide had claimed was correct. On August 7, 1962, another statement was issued by the Minister of Health in the *Advertiser* under the heading, "Plans for Hospital", which states:

Improvements to Parkside Mental Hospital were announced by the Minister of Health (Sir Lyell McEwin) yesterday. Tenders will be called soon for new consulting rooms and extra offices, a women's hairdressing salon, and conversion of part of the nurses' home to an outpatients department. Contracts will be let soon for a new sitting room for women's E ward and for alterations and additions to the medical officer's house. Tenders are being called for alterations to the occupational therapy building No. 1 and architects are drawing up plans for a new workshop and garage and four new houses for medical officers. Lighting, toilets and heating facilities will be improved in the next few weeks. Experts are studying a proposal to lower the height of the front boundary wall.

The only improvement that I can see from a casual observation—and I am not going to say that there has been no improvement effected inside the hospital—is the knocking down of the boundary wall. I should at least give the

Government (or whoever was responsible) credit for that. The article continues:

At the Northfield Mental Hospital, roadways and stormwater drains will be laid and additional lighting, power points and fans fitted. Tenders will be called soon for the conversion of an old kitchen and installation of hot water heating in the industrial therapy wing of Ward One. Estimates are being worked out for a nurses' training centre and a women's hair-dressing salon. At the Enfield Receiving House, private architects are planning flats in the administration block.

Many people have complained to me since they have heard the Commonwealth Budget that they would have to pay £8 for a licence to hear what comes over ADS 7 every Wednesday at 6.55 p.m.

Mr. Jennings: They should be paid to listen.

Mr. LAWN: I do not think I have ever heard one of the Treasurer's talks because I believe a person would need to paid for listening to it. In 1962 high priority was given for building a new hospital—even reconstructing the main building. I have indicated what the Minister of Health claims has been taking place since the Loan expenditure that I instanced in 1962-63. At Parkside in 1963-64 out of the Loan expenditure, £127,000 was provided for Parkside Mental Hospital, alterations and additions; Northfield Mental Hospital, alterations and additions, £100,000; Enfield Receiving House, laundry, £10,000. So we see that despite the fact that the Government provided only £49,000 for each hospital following the ADS 7 talk on May 31, 1962, it increased the sum to £127,000 for Parkside Mental Hospital and £100,000 for Northfield Mental Hospital, in 1963-64. This year we are going back to £87,000 for Parkside; £50,000 for Hillcrest; £55,000 for Enfield; £20,000 for the Child Guidance Clinic; and £26,000 for St. Corantyn Psychiatric Day Hospital, for alterations and additions. That, of course, is for a new hospital and the building probably has to be altered accordingly. I say in no uncertain terms that no work I know of is more urgently needed than the rebuilding of the Parkside Mental Hospital. Members who have been there and seen the shocking conditions under which patients live will agree that the whole place should be knocked down and rebuilt.

The patients are also shockingly treated by the Commonwealth Government, and I hope I shall be allowed to finish my remarks on this, for the State Government comes into it. My comments will relate first to the way in which the Commonwealth Government treats the patients—I do not know whether the way they

are treated is due to their not having a vote (which many do have)—and secondly to the treatment it gives the State Government. I will deal with the second point first. The Commonwealth Government makes an allowance to all patients who enter hospitals; even if they are not in a medical fund I think the payment is 6s. a day. If persons are in an approved society, the Commonwealth Government makes up to £1 a day available. This is made available for patients in Government institutions, except people in the Parkside and Northfield hospitals. To be quite fair, the Chifley Government gave only 10d. a day, but at least it gave something, but that was taken away by the Menzies Government. The Commonwealth Government takes away from these patients their sickness payments if they are sick, or their pension payments if they are pensioners. Some of these people go into hospital voluntarily seeking treatment, yet the Commonwealth Government stops sickness or social service benefits of £3 15s. a week.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Does that apply to receiving houses?

Mr. LAWN: The Leader is referring to Paterson House and Cleland House, which are both receiving houses. The east wing at the Enfield hospital is a receiving house and the west wing is a convalescent house. Cleland House is a receiving house and Paterson House is a convalescent house, but I am not speaking of those places; I am speaking about the main building. Once patients go into the main building at Parkside, the Commonwealth Government takes away the £3 15s. a week sickness benefit, or if they have been receiving a pension it takes away the pension. This is done despite the fact that some of these people leave the hospital from Friday night until Monday morning and some go out through the week to the pictures. Any Government that does this should be condemned by the people of this Commonwealth. Relatives have complained to me and to Senator Cavanagh about having to support patients because the pension or sickness benefit has been stopped. If they have nobody to look after them they must go without things. There is nobody to buy them cigarettes, a chocolate, or take them to the pictures. They just live a life of despair. The doctors at Parkside say they do not want the patients to stay there if they can go out because they become accustomed to being there and will never want to leave.

On one occasion a patient was there in a voluntary capacity, going home every Friday and returning on the Sunday night. The pension was stopped. A few weeks after the patient had gone home, discharged for good, I was handed a letter from the Department of Social Services cancelling the pension altogether. Apparently, the pensions are suspended once the patients enter Parkside hospital. When I tried to communicate with the Director of Social Services I was asked whether it was a personal matter or otherwise. When I said it was not a personal matter I was told that he would not discuss it with me. Someone else offered to help and put the facts to the Director. I said that that was all right, and that I would remain here till 11 o'clock. I asked the person to ring me back. At 11 o'clock I got a telephone message to confirm the facts. I said that I wanted to speak to the Director but was told that I could not. I said, "If he does not want to speak to me I can make a statement elsewhere." Then a lady, whom I took to be the Director's secretary, came in. The same thing happened: I was told that the Director would not speak to me. He must have been on the other end of the telephone because I said, "If he does not speak to me I shall make a statement to Parliament or to the press," and he came in immediately. I said, "All I want to do is to tell you that your department has fallen down on its job. After the patient had left hospital for four or five weeks, instead of receiving two fortnightly cheques he got a letter cancelling the pension." I told him I wanted to let him know that that was what this department was doing. There must have been hundreds of similar cases.

There was a breakdown in the institution at Parkside and when I rang them about it they nearly fell over backwards, not only apologizing but stating that they would make a complete check of their records to see whether any late information had been sent to the Department of Social Services and whether any other patients had been discharged and deprived of their pensions. They said that, if it had happened, they would see that it was rectified. I had a different reception altogether!

Senator Cavanagh told me that similar cases had been referred to him. There was the case of a patient who had gone home for the weekend. The Senator had approached the Commonwealth Minister, but received no redress. On behalf of these unfortunate people in our community I have drawn attention to the way in which they are treated by the

Commonwealth Government. I have reminded this Committee, without giving full details of how these people live, of statements and promises made previously by this Government about the rebuilding of the new mental hospital at Parkside. The matter has not yet been referred to the Public Works Committee. All that happened on July 16 was that it referred a job at Hillcrest to cost £3,000,000. How long it will take the Government to build that God only knows—we don't! Not one member of this Committee can say when these plans will be finalized and when the job itself will be started. If the Government goes on with the project at Bedford Park before it commences the work at Parkside, it will not be completed while I am alive. I shall be dead and buried before the Treasurer's promise, made to the people on May 31, 1962, are implemented.

Mr. Harding: You might be going out there yourself.

Mr. LAWN: I hope I do not go out there either as a voluntary patient or a compulsory one. I am sorry if I misheard the member for Victoria, but my understanding now is that he meant that I might be going out there as the next Minister of Health. I assure honourable members I shall not be a candidate for the Ministry in our Government next year. I hope my remarks will be heeded not only by this Government but by the Commonwealth Government, and that this deficiency will be rectified. I see no reason why the State Government should not be paid the hospital benefit on behalf of the patients, or why the patients should not receive their £3 15s. a week sickness benefit. Also, if these people have been declared invalids and receive pensions, I see no reason why the Commonwealth Government should take or suspend the pensions while the patients are receiving medical treatment at Parkside. After all, mental health is only another form of sickness. I see no reason why these poor unfortunate people should be treated as they are.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: If they were well they would be getting it, and they want more when they are sick.

Mr. LAWN: Yes; when they are well enough to leave the hospital but still unable to work the Government pays them £3 15s. a week benefit or the £5 15s. a week pension, but when they go to Parkside (voluntarily or otherwise) to receive medical treatment the Commonwealth Government says they do not need any payment.

Mr. Ryan: Their expenses don't cease when they are out there.

Mr. LAWN: No; their relatives or friends or other people in the community have to give them money to spend, or they have to go without.

Mr. Ryan: Their home expenses are still continuing.

Mr. LAWN: If some of these patients had been living with people other than their relatives they probably would still have to pay to keep a room available, and I do not know how they would manage that. Even patients who have been living with parents who allowed them to keep all the pension would be affected. Those parents would still have to give the patients money to allow them to pay out-of-pocket expenses, and they might even have to buy clothes for them.

Mr. Frank Walsh: And the patients have nowhere to put their clothes.

Mr. LAWN: It is a few years since I was at the institution, but I cannot recall seeing any wardrobes.

Mr. Ryan: There aren't any; the patients put their clothes on the floor.

Mr. LAWN: I believe there has been some slight improvement in recent years. I understand that about 12 months ago Dr. Cramond was having some of the patients measured with the object of providing them with a sort of made-to-measure uniform. That would certainly be an improvement, but again I expect that these uniforms would be something they could wear only while in hospital and would not be able to be worn by the patients after they left Parkside. I hope that as a result of what I have said tonight the Government will do something about the Treasurer's promise of May 31, 1962, and that the Commonwealth Government will change its attitude. I should say that I understand from the Treasurer and the Minister of Health that they have made the representations to the Commonwealth Government that I have made tonight. I am not condemning the State Government on that score, only on the other matters I have mentioned. Also, I condemn the Commonwealth Government for the part it did not play in this matter.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I am concerned with the sum provided for loans for new homes and additions to existing homes pursuant to the Advances for Homes Act. Can the Treasurer say how many applications are likely to be received by the State Bank for additions to existing homes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): The procedure usually is that people apply for an exemption. They usually want a larger house, so they sell the house they have, apply for an exemption, and buy another house. I will obtain for the honourable member figures of the numbers of exemptions.

Mr. COUMBE: Regarding students' hostels, can the Treasurer assure members that the original legislation is working effectively and doing the job it was designed to do? Is it providing effective hostel accommodation for students living away from home?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The reports that I have on this matter show that the legislation is operating satisfactorily. This year £200,000 is to be made available. That figure is based on known applications. This provision is much appreciated.

Mr. RICHES: Does the Treasurer consider that the sum made available through the various instrumentalities for housing in South Australia is sufficient to meet the State's needs? It seems that this year the Treasurer is budgeting for an increase of only 216 houses throughout the State. In view of the natural increase in population, immigration, and number of marriages in the State each year, is this provision adequate? Are we making any headway on the housing problem? I believe the backlog is as great as it has ever been. Does the Treasurer consider that the amount provided this year for this purpose is adequate?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The problem today is not so much providing money as in building the houses. Several Housing Trust contractors are asking the State for assistance in securing labour to enable them to continue. However, this question will be covered more adequately when we are discussing the Housing Trust lines.

First line—State Bank, £1,250,000—passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PULP AND PAPER MILL (HUNDREDS OF MAYURRA AND HINDMARSH) BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to approve and ratify an indenture made between the State of South Australia and Apeel Limited relating to the operation and extension of a pulp and paper mill in the State of South Australia and to provide for carrying that indenture into effect and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to ratify an indenture that has been entered into by the Government and Apcel Limited, a company at present engaged in the manufacture of pulp and paper at Millicent, for the development and expansion of the company's activities and production at Millicent. The execution of the indenture was completed on July 7, 1964. The Bill consists of eight clauses and a schedule that contains the text of the indenture.

Clause 3 ratifies the indenture and gives it statutory force. Clause 4 deals with rates that the Millicent council may fix as follows: (a) while one paper machine is operating commercially at the mill—a sum not exceeding £750; (b) while two paper machines are so operating—a sum not exceeding £2,000; and (c) while three paper machines are so operating—a sum not exceeding £3,000. Provision is also made that in any year after three paper machines have been operating commercially at the mill for not less than five years the council may fix the rates for that year at a sum not exceeding £4,000. These provisions were agreed to by the District Council of Millicent before being incorporated in the arrangements with the company.

Clause 5 provides that the company's rights to maintain, repair, remove and replace pipelines and electric transmission lines and any such pipelines and transmission lines or other structures erected or laid down in exercise of those rights shall not be ratable property for the purposes of the Local Government Act. Clause 6 absolves the company from liability for the discharge of effluent, smoke, dust, gas, noise or odours if such discharge is reasonably necessary for the efficient operation of the company's works and not due to negligence on the part of the company, its servants or agents. Clause 7 provides that if the company exercises its right to assign its rights, concessions and obligations under the indenture the assignee will be liable for failure to perform any obligation or duty undertaken by the company. Clause 8 is procedural, and enables the State to sue, arbitrate, etc., in its own name.

The indenture consists of 19 clauses. Clause 1 contains the interpretations. Clause 2 provides that the indenture does not come into operation unless and until ratified by Parliament. Under

clause 3, the company undertakes to install and operate at least one paper machine and ancillary plant on the mill site in addition to the one presently in operation and to comply with accepted modern standards in design, construction, equipment and operation. Clause 4 obliges the State to build or cause to be built at Millicent or such other agreed localities for the use of officers or employees of the company not more than 150 houses in any year as required, but not more than 450 houses in all. The houses are to be offered to the officers and employees upon reasonable terms and conditions.

Clause 5 confers on the company certain rights particularly in relation to (a) the discharge of effluent from the mill into the Snuggery drain; (b) the laying, maintaining, repairing and replacing of pipes under roads between the mill and the Snuggery drain; (c) the laying, maintaining, repairing and replacing of pipes and electric powerlines on or under any Crown land or any road or land vested in the council; (d) the taking of water from certain drains for use in the mill; (e) the sinking of bores on Crown land under proper supervision; and (f) the doing and performance on Crown land and land vested in the council of any incidental works and operations. However, before exercising any such rights, the company undertakes to give reasonable notice of the nature and place of the work proposed to be done (a) to the council, if the work is to be done on or under a road or land vested in the council; or (b) to the Minister of Works, if the work is to be done on or under Crown lands other than a road; and the company will comply with the reasonable directions of the council or the Minister in that behalf.

Clause 6 provides that the State will, at the company's expense, assist the company to obtain an adequate supply of water for the mill. Under clause 7 the company undertakes to pay to the council within 30 days after the Bill becomes law a sum of £500 and at the end of each period of 12 months thereafter a sum of £250, in consideration of which the company will be absolved from any responsibility for the maintenance and upkeep of drains, and the council will assume the responsibility for such maintenance and upkeep. This provision was agreed to by the District Council of Millicent before being incorporated in the indenture.

Under clause 8 the company undertakes to use reasonable care and skill in exercising its rights and powers and in discharging its obligations and to make good any damage to

property. Clause 9 reaffirms the responsibility of the State for the maintenance of works necessary to ensure proper disposal of the effluent from the mill and the company's responsibility to make certain annual payments to the State under the Pulp and Paper Mills Agreement Act, 1958.

Clause 10 gives the company the right to sink bores or wells and to draw off underground water on its land. Clause 11 provides that the State will arrange for the company to be supplied with its increased requirements of electricity. The company undertakes to obtain approvals from the Electricity Trust of South Australia before it installs its own power plant with a view to operating it in parallel with the trust's grid and, subject to such approvals, the company may operate its own plant in parallel with the trust's grid, feed back power thereto and supply power generated by such plant to any wholly owned subsidiary of the company operating on the mill site.

Under clause 12 the Railways Commissioner is to construct the extension of the railway sidings required for the mill's expansion, and the cost of the extension is to be recouped by a surcharge of £1 a ton on freight rates to be charged on all raw materials carried by rail into the mill site until an amount has been recovered equal to the actual cost of the extension, together with interest at the rate of 5½ per cent per annum on the balance amount of such actual cost as is outstanding at the end of each month. Clause 13 contains a guarantee by the State against discrimination against the company in relation to the imposition of taxes, charges or levies on the cartage of goods by road and in relation to the control, co-ordination or rationalization of transport.

Clause 14 contains a guarantee that the mill site will be zoned or otherwise protected during the period of the indenture against interference by public authorities or private persons. Clause 15 contains a guarantee against compulsory acquisition of any part of the mill site during the currency of the indenture. Clause 16 contains an undertaking by the State to assist the company to acquire land or rights over land where the Treasurer is satisfied that such land or rights would be necessary or desirable for the operation or expansion of the mill and the company is unable to obtain them on fair terms by private treaty.

Clause 17 gives the company the right to assign its rights, concessions and obligations under the indenture to certain associated corporations or, with the prior consent in writing

of the Treasurer, to any other person approved by the Treasurer. Clause 18 contains power to vary the indenture by agreement between the Treasurer and the company, and clause 19 limits the duration of the indenture to 50 years.

Apeel Limited, the company with which the Government has entered into these arrangements, is wholly owned, in equal shares, by Australian Paper Manufacturers Limited and Kimberly-Clark Corporation of the United States of America. Australian Paper Manufacturers Limited is a well-known and leading manufacturer of pulp and paper in Australia while Kimberly-Clark Corporation, whose main offices are in the U.S.A., is a leading producer of pulp and paper in America, and of household tissue products in most of the major countries in the world. It also produces printing and writing papers for use in home and industry.

At present Apeel Limited produces the tissue that is converted into "Dawn" products on a 120-inch Walmsley paper machine, which is capable of producing approximately 11,000 long tons of various grades of tissue a year. With the successful negotiation of a new pulpwood agreement with the Government, which assures Apeel Limited the necessary timber to increase its pulping facilities, the company has decided to expand its operations in this State with a £6,000,000 project which will result in the extension of its pulping activities, the installation of a second high-speed paper machine and the installation of a converting department for the production in South Australia (for distribution throughout Australia) of a full range of branded products now being manufactured in New South Wales. It is expected that the project will be completed in approximately three years.

The company will produce pulp from *pinus radiata* timber grown in South Australia and use the pulp in making 11,000 long tons a year of various tissue grades on its present paper machine, and an additional 16,000 tons of tissue grades on the new high-speed machine to be installed, and which is planned to come into production by June, 1966. The company's converting department, which has already begun producing "Dawn" toilet tissue in the State, will be further expanded in 1965 and will reach full capacity by the latter part of 1966. The company presently employs about 150 persons, but by 1966, when the second paper machine comes into operation, it plans to employ about 350 persons.

The company is already making plans to increase the capacity of its mill by the addition of a third paper machine to be brought

into production in the early 1970's. The capital expenditure for this further expansion will approximate an additional £5,000,000 for equipment and working capital, and the number of employees will then be increased to about 525. It must be remembered that the employment figures I have mentioned represent only the direct employment of personnel by the company and do not include or take account of the numerous other avenues of employment that will be afforded by reason of the company's programme of expansion. I refer in particular to personnel that will be engaged in the supply and production of the company's additional raw material requirements and in other subsidiary services.

Having regard to the obvious direct and indirect benefits that will accrue to the State, and to the need to continue its policy of development, the Government has decided to facilitate the company's expansion and this is the object of the Bill now before members. I commend it for serious consideration and approval. The Bill has to be considered by a Select Committee, on which I hope both sides of the House will be represented.

That is a brief summary of the Bill's provisions. If honourable members look at a Bill passed in connection with the proposal for a pulp mill at Mount Gambier they will see that many of the provisions in this Bill are almost identical with those already accepted by this House. I believe that from the State's point of view this project will turn out to be much more valuable than the one previously proposed for Mount Gambier. Whereas the Mount Gambier Bill had for its objective the making of pulp for cement bags and such things, this plant will produce a much higher quality and more valuable product, employing much more labour in its manufacture and processing. With the quantity of timber this company will receive from the private forests and the labour it will employ, this project will be a better one from the State's point of view than the one previously considered by Parliament and in respect of which negotiations ultimately broke down.

In addition to this project, the Government has now collected other agreements. I do not believe they involve ratification of indentures by Parliament, for I think they are already covered by our forestry legislation. The Government has agreed to make substantial additional amounts of timber available to Cellulose Limited, and to make more timber available to a plant in Mount Gambier. I am not sure of

the present name of this plant, but I think it formerly traded under the name of Panelboard. We have the wood available for the expansion of that industry but, what is probably of even greater benefit to the State as a whole, we have entered into agreements with the private forests to enable us to pool the pulp resources available to us, as a result of which we have been able to tell another company of the quantity of timber that is likely to be available. That company is at present considering the establishment of a pulp mill adjacent to Mount Gambier. It will take some months before the company is able to give a definite reply. It is making some investigations into the possibility of establishing a pulp mill on the site previously chosen by the Canadian firm for a similar proposition.

Mr. Frank Walsh: What can you do for the sawmill at Kalangadoo?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government is supplying it with timber from the State forests. That is a totally different proposition. We are now dealing with pulpwood rather than timber for sawing. We are supplying the Kalangadoo plant with timber and we hope to continue to supply it. As far as I know, no problem has arisen. I do not know whether we can supply as much timber as the firm would require. I believe it has had some timber diverted from another private firm. By tying up the pulpwood supplies of the Government and private forests to one department, the Government has been able to negotiate the three agreements, with the possibility of a fourth agreement that we will know about by the end of the year. That would dispose of the problem of thinning our forests because it would provide an outlet for all grades of timber produced by both State and private forests. We have at present a large surplus. By the time those with the present agreements take their supplies in full, about 1970, the large surplus will be cut down to a small surplus, but with the plantings that take place after 1970 the surplus would come again. After 1970, there will be ample timber for the pulp project I have mentioned. I do not want to canvass that much further, because it is still in the investigation stage.

I commend the Bill to the House. I have gone into it carefully and it has been the subject of difficult negotiation at certain stages, but I believe the provisions in the indenture are sound and reasonable from the State's point of view. Where they affect local government, railways, electricity and water authorities, there has been close consultation to see that

the proposals are reasonable. This matter must go to a Select Committee and I would hope that the committee might be appointed in time for it to take some evidence this month. I have told the Chairman of Directors of Kimberly-Clark, the controlling authority of this organization, that the Select Committee would consider evidence from the company towards the end of the month. I have arranged for a precis of the evidence to be submitted by the company to be available, and hope that the Chairman of Directors will give evidence before the committee on the ramifications of the industry. Incidentally, this firm is the world's leading manufacturer of the type of product it makes: it is a high-class product and the company has already secured in Australia a large percentage of the market. Honourable members have seen "Kleenex" on the market, and it is one of the products made by this company in the tissue field. I shall be happy to consult with the Leader of the Opposition upon the composition of the Select Committee when it is to be appointed.

Mr. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to provide for compensation for loss arising from measures to eradicate fruit fly.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank honourable members for permitting me to explain the Bill at this stage. The reason for wishing the Bill to be brought in as soon as possible will become clear in the second reading explanation. It is in similar form to the Acts passed in 1959 and 1963, its object being to enable the payment of compensation for losses arising from the campaign for eradication of fruit fly. A proclamation relating to the Port Augusta area was made in November of last year under the Vine, Fruit, and Vegetable Protection Act, and, as honourable members know, the practice has been for compensation to be given for losses arising by reason of any act of officers of the Agriculture Department within proclaimed areas. Clause 3 of the Bill accordingly provides for such compensation and compensation for loss arising from the prohibition of removal of fruit from land in a proclaimed area. Clause 4 fixes the time limit for lodging of claims, but this year the date is fixed at November 1, 1964, rather than February 1, 1965, having regard to the late stage of last year when the proclamation was issued. Otherwise the Bill is in the usual terms.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 19, at 2 p.m.