

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, September 2, 1964.

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

QUESTIONS.**CONCESSION FARES.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Can the Premier say whether the Government could extend tram and rail concession fares to widows of totally and permanently incapacitated pensioners who have no income other than the pension?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The whole subject of concession fares will have to be completely examined by the Government. We have gone further than other States in granting these concessions. In New South Wales the only concessions granted are to people who have medical entitlement cards, not to pensioners generally, which greatly restricts the number that can benefit. I do not want it to be understood from what I am saying that the Government would take away a concession from a person already receiving one. Before any further concessions can be granted, however, the matter will have to be closely examined as to their future effects. The sum shown in the Budget this year for concession fares is nearly double that of last year, and last year's cost had increased steeply. I cannot give the Leader a definite answer, except that this matter is receiving attention. Every time the Commonwealth Government increases the pension rate or liberalizes the means test, the result is the extension of concessions to many more people, many of whom have an income greater than that of some persons working and supporting a family, even though such pensioners receive only a marginal sum from the Commonwealth Government. In those circumstances, every honourable member will realize that the present set-up in this State has to be examined. I will inform the Leader as soon as possible on the specific matter he has raised.

NURIOOTPA HIGH SCHOOL.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Education say what are the plans for additional accommodation at the Nuriootpa High School to allow for the increasing number of students? Wooden structures have been built over the years to meet the position and, as the Minister will recall, I led a deputation to him on this matter.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The honourable member introduced two deputations

to me and I understand he has also approached the Premier on this matter. As a result, Cabinet has authorized the preparation of sketch plans and estimates of costs for new solid construction buildings for the Nuriootpa High School in accordance with a schedule of requirements drawn up by the Education Department. When these plans and estimates have been completed the proposed work will be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee for investigation and report. The existing solid construction building is sufficient to accommodate only 100 students. Existing accommodation in wooden construction includes 18 classrooms, three laboratories, a commercial room, two art rooms, two craft rooms and a library. It is proposed that the new solid construction buildings should be of two or three storeys of compact design to accommodate about 750 students. This will enable the removal and replacement of the wooden buildings and thus greatly increase the recreation space and make for greater efficiency in the functioning of the school.

PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL.

Mr. RICHES: Has the Minister of Works obtained the promised report concerning the progress of work on the Port Augusta Hospital?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. Various plans for the redevelopment of the Port Augusta Hospital have been prepared by the department, some of which have had to be modified and even discarded for various reasons. Some were not acceptable to the department and others, although perhaps acceptable, involved certain difficulties. In July, 1963, the department set aside certain staff to draw up further plans for the hospital, which have not yet been completed. A decision as to the necessary laundry provision that will be required at the hospital is outstanding: the question has arisen whether a complete and separate laundry should be installed at the Port Augusta Hospital, or whether its laundry service should be co-ordinated with the larger laundry at the Port Pirie Hospital. That matter has not been resolved. However, planning is proceeding and, subject to the availability of staff and finance, this project is receiving a high priority. The Government is giving top priority to hospitals for the mentally ill this year, and that may have an impact on the progress of plans for the Port Augusta Hospital, but the honourable member can be assured that the work is in hand and will proceed as rapidly as possible.

TORRENS ISLAND POWER STATION.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier indicate the progress of work on the Torrens Island power station for the Electricity Trust of South Australia? I understand that considerable work has already been undertaken on site works, especially on bridge-building and pile-driving. Can the Premier assure the House that the pile-driving and other work, as well as the planning and ordering of plant for the power station, are proceeding without delay? This project is vital to the interests of South Australia.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have not had a recent report from the Electricity Trust concerning this matter. I flew over the area recently and I noticed great activity on the site, and I am led to believe that no problem has been encountered which would hold up the work. A fortnight ago I discussed with the Chairman of the trust the matter of fuel supplies for Torrens Island. As honourable members will recall, when I explained the Bill covering this project I said that the first unit at Torrens Island should be ready to go under steam in 1967, and the discussion I had only about 10 days ago with Sir Fred Drew was still along the lines that a fuel supply had to be arranged for the plant to be available by then. Therefore, I do not expect there will be any embarrassing delay. In fact, I understand that the project is proceeding satisfactorily.

TIMBER.

Mr. HARDING: Has the Minister of Forests a reply to my question of August 20 concerning private saw millers' licences?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Two licensees are at present obtaining log timber from Comaam forest. One (Mr. P. Joseph) has a sawmill at Naracoorte, and the other (Mr. A. W. Donnelly) has a sawmill at Penola.

MURRAY BRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. BYWATERS: About two years ago the work of levelling and paving an area for tennis courts was carried out at the Murray Bridge High School. This work was done at the direction of the Public Buildings Department. The department asked the high school council if it would be willing to pay its half share by way of subsidy for the forming and sealing of the surface, and the department estimated then that the cost would be £1,700—£850 for the school council and the same amount for the Education Department. Rather than have two people dealing with the matter, we agreed readily that the Public Buildings Department

should do all the work. On October 11 last we received an account for £409 1s. as our share, and therefore we concluded that the estimate had been rather high and that this was our share of the full cost of the job. The account merely stated "To cost of forming and paving, £409 1s." This amount was paid, but, to our dismay, on April 30 this year we received a further account for £387 6s. 9d. I talked to officers of the Education Department about this and they pointed out that the amount was still within the original estimate and that we had agreed to pay that sum. I now find that we have another account for £46 19s. 4d. We are wondering how long this will go on. We expected to pay a certain sum, but in these circumstances we do not know how many accounts we will receive, although only one contractor did the complete job. I am told that this is not an isolated case and that separate accounts are sent out even though only one contractor has done the complete job. Will the Minister of Works ask his department why this procedure is followed and whether one account could be sent out for such work in the future?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall take up the matter with my department and I should be glad if the honourable member would let me have the invoices to which he referred. I point out (and I offer this only as an opinion) that this could concern the keeping up to date of departmental accounting in order to finalize the affairs of the department at the end of a certain period or, more particularly, at the end of the financial year. Also, progress payments have to be made to contractors, but I do not think that point would arise in this case because it was a short-term contract. I have not heard of similar cases, but I shall inquire and try to straighten the matter out.

ADELAIDE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL.

Mrs. STEELE: In this morning's *Advertiser* appears a letter to the Editor headed "Waiting Time at Hospital", which states:

My son's appointment at the Adelaide Children's Hospital was for 9.30 a.m. After we had waited until 11.30 there were still quite a few people to be seen before him. I asked a nurse if I could make an appointment for another day at a later time so I would not have to wait so long, only to be told, "There were 60 people to see the specialist today and they all have appointments for 9 or 9.30. You must wait." I was also told it was impossible to stagger appointments in case people failed to turn up. My experience of the outpatient department is that it is always crowded with people waiting.

I have had a similar experience once or twice when I have taken children to the hospital. For any sick person such a long wait is undesirable, but for the mother of a sick child, who probably has left other children at home (either on their own or in the care of somebody else), it is worse than undesirable. I am not sure whether the same procedure applies in other public hospitals. Has the Premier any knowledge of this state of affairs at the Adelaide Children's Hospital, and will he ask his colleague, the Minister of Health, for a report on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know that the honourable member is aware that the Adelaide Children's Hospital is not a Government institution: it is run by a board and receives Government assistance to enable it to give service. Therefore, the control of the hospital does not come directly under the Minister of Health. However, I shall see that the honourable member's question is referred to my colleague so that he can discuss it with the board of the Children's Hospital to see whether better arrangements can be made to meet the circumstances mentioned by the honourable member.

GEORGES CORNER.

Mr. LOVEDAY: During the last two or three years representations have been made about the condition of Georges Corner, near Port Pirie. Many accidents have occurred at this corner over the years. The trouble is that fast traffic approaches from both directions and nothing indicates that it is a very sharp corner and different from other corners on that road. Last weekend two further accidents occurred, one car rolling completely over, and a semi-trailer turning on its side. I do not know the condition of the drivers. Will the Minister of Works draw the attention of his colleague to this corner to see whether it can be posted so that motorists know that it is a specially sharp corner and that vehicles have to reduce to a low speed, not exceeding 25 miles an hour, to negotiate it safely?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This matter has been raised several times in the House by the honourable member, by the member for Stuart, and by others. The most recent effort made to improve safety at this corner was to put rumble strips in position, and a week or so ago I noticed them. I do not know how long they have been there, but they should warn motorists approaching the corner that their speed should be reduced. However, I agree with the

honourable member that this corner is subject to accidents and, indeed, members of my family have reported to me that it is a difficult corner to negotiate with a heavy vehicle. I do not know the answer; perhaps it should be re-engineered and reconstructed, but that would be an extremely expensive project.

Mr. Riches: There should be warnings that it is different from other corners.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: They are in Rundle Street, but some do not have the desired effect. This difficult problem is accentuated by the acute angle at which the by-pass road joins the main road into the town of Port Pirie. Perhaps the contour of the road predisposes vehicles to leave the road or to roll over. I shall bring the honourable member's comments to my colleague's attention.

ELECTRICAL TRADE SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently, the Electrical Trade Apprentices School at Challa Gardens was remodelled, which is most gratifying, and during the remodelling gas heating was installed. As this does not seem to be in accordance with the apprentices' learning about the use of electricity, can the Minister of Education say whether it is the policy of the department to install this type of heating (as the Electricity Trust is a semi-government department), and whether gas is more economical?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I would be the last to give a Solomon-like decision as to the relative merits of gas and electricity. I use both myself and favour them equally. I am sure that is the policy of the Education Department, but I shall refer the specific question to the Superintendent of Technical Schools, who is in charge of that trade school, and let the honourable member have his reply soon.

THEBARTON TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question yesterday about the radio trade school at Thebarton Boys Technical High School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As I stated yesterday, the availability of the former Commonwealth building depends on the completion of the contract for the Electrical and Radio Trade School (Stage II), which is a large stage. I have ascertained that tenders for the work closed yesterday and, subject to a satisfactory tender being received, a contract should be let shortly, probably by the end of this month. The building will probably take

from 15 to 18 months to complete, depending on the type of building contractor, and this would mean that the Commonwealth building in the grounds of the Thebarton Boys Technical High School should be available for school use some time in 1966, possibly in the first half of that year. I am hoping that it should be made available by the beginning of that year because I know the congested state of that school, and I am anxious to relieve the over-crowding apparent there. I will do everything I can to speed up the project.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY YARD.

Mr. LAWN: Yesterday an article in the *News*, headed "Rubble weeds and frogs", stated:

Eyesore in Rail Yard.—A ready-made jungle exists in the Adelaide railway station yards. Naturalists can even study bullfrogs there. The frogs thrive in stagnant pools beside the tracks—in spite of the oil scum washed from the lines. An inspection followed complaints from train travellers that the western end of the yards was an eyesore.

The article had more comments on this matter, but as you, Mr. Speaker, and honourable members are aware, Standing Orders prohibit my expressing an opinion or discussing the matter. Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Railways a report about the condition of the Adelaide railway yard?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

ELIZABETH WEST SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK: On June 18 I wrote to the Minister about the unsatisfactory state of the toilets in the infants and primary school at Elizabeth West. On June 30 I received a reply from the Attorney-General, acting for the Minister of Education, stating that the matter had been investigated by officers of the department who considered that a permanent toilet block should be erected to serve the infants and primary schools. The letter further stated that the department was arranging for the erection of this block, and hoped that it would be satisfactory. That information was satisfactory to me, but nothing further has been done. Will the Minister of Education further investigate to see when that work is likely to be started?

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

PARKING.

Mr. CASEY: Unfortunately, over the past few years I have received parking stickers in the city of Adelaide. Will the Premier ask

the Adelaide City Council whether a sticker or emblem could be available to members of Parliament for use on their cars when the cars are being used in Adelaide? I do not often travel by car in the city but when I do I find that when visiting various Government departments I am sometimes delayed, so that, even though I have placed a coin in the parking meter, my car has overstayed the time limit. Naturally, I receive a parking ticket for which I usually pay, although lately the Town Clerk has been kind enough to exempt me from such fines. Will the Premier take this matter up with the Adelaide City Council to see whether a special certificate might be supplied for members' cars?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not quite sure where the honourable member's question takes us. I point out that many people find themselves in a similar situation to that outlined by the member for Frome. They may be people with urgent business to attend to and they may be subject to delay. I have always been rather inclined not to ask for special privileges for members, because that often leads to certain public reaction. I shall look at the matter but I will not give a definite answer to the honourable member at present. I know that he will be consoled when he remembers that any fine that he pays for a parking offence goes not into the Treasury of this State but to the Adelaide City Council.

FORBES SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In view of the Minister of Education's reply yesterday concerning the Forbes school, can he say when plans are likely to be ready for the consideration by the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Deputy Director of Education (Mr. Walker) with whom I have conferred on this matter from time to time, has completed his schedule of requirements for this proposed school on much the same lines as those discussed by the Leader and me some time ago. These plans have been forwarded to the Deputy Director of Public Buildings. If Mr. Walker has not asked already, he intends to ask that the drawing up of the plans be expedited. I cannot take the matter any further at present. The ideas that we both submitted when we inspected the school a long time ago are being carried into effect. The only difference is that the department received advice that it was not structurally possible to construct an

additional storey on the existing building and, even apart from that, I think it would raise many difficulties, for the whole school would be disrupted for a time. We shall have either a two or three-storey building constructed at about the position suggested by the Leader, and there is no reason why plans for that work cannot be expedited. As soon as I can obtain information as to when this work will be completed I shall let the Leader know.

FREELING HOUSING.

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the possibility of the Housing Trust's providing rental houses at Freeling?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Ramsay, General Manager of the trust, has reported to me as follows:

A housing survey has now been made in Freeling and this establishes that there is a demand at Freeling for both rental and sale houses. The trust will commence a programme in the immediate future for houses, some of which will be available for rental.

MURRAY PLAINS WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Minister of Works had an opportunity to speak to the Engineer for Water Supply, Mr. Campbell, as to the feasibility of a scheme to provide a water supply between Palmer and Sedan?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It would not be correct to say that I had not discussed this matter with Mr. Campbell, because I briefly discussed it with him on his return from his visit to the area concerned. He is preparing a report for me, but I have not yet received it. When I receive it, however, I shall let the honourable member know.

BEEF ROADS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: From time to time this session I have raised the matter of beef roads in this House and, of course, other members, notably the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), have done the same. The Premier has replied to questions on this subject, and his last reply was that he had written to the Prime Minister again about the matter. Has he received a reply recently?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I received a reply from the Prime Minister yesterday concerning this matter, and I hope it will be available for release soon.

Mr. CASEY: Will the Premier announce the contents of the reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have been faced with a problem recently in releasing letters from the Prime Minister. The

letter in this matter was not marked "Confidential", but that applied also to other such communications that apparently were not to be released. Therefore, when the member for Mitcham asked whether I had a letter I did not release its contents because I was not sure of the new rule on this matter. However, if the honourable member looks at today's *Advertiser* he will see a reply given yesterday to a question by a Labor member in the Commonwealth Parliament. The answer quoted in the second paragraph of that report is not dissimilar to the contents of the letter I have received.

POINT LOWLY.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question concerning the allocation of shack areas near Point Lowly lighthouse?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: The department certainly has received requests from a number of people for licences for shack sites in the general vicinity of Point Lowly. The whole of the land in this locality, excluding the coast reserve (where it exists) and the lighthouse property, has been acquired by the Department of the Army. The City of Whyalla Commission has for some time been desirous of arranging for the release of an area near Point Lowly on which could be built permanent holiday houses of a better class, and the Lands Department has deferred dealing with the applications which it has received, pending finality being reached in negotiations between the commission and the Department of the Army. So far as is known, these two parties have not yet reached agreement, but negotiations are continuing.

RADIATA PINE.

Mr. HARDING: In view of the ever-increasing demand for radiata pine in this State can the Minister of Forests say what practical assistance and advice can be given by officers of his department to landholders who desire to plant radiata pine in suitable areas on their properties?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Every advice is given to anybody inquiring as to the suitability of soil and the methods of planting and looking after trees. I think I mentioned earlier that it is hoped a Bill now being prepared will encourage the private planting of trees even further than simply by extension advice.

UMEEWARRA MISSION BUILDING.

Mr. RICHES: Mr. McWilliams of the Umcewarra Mission has applied for a licence over a beach frontage for the purpose of erecting a holiday shack for the children of the mission. I know that the Minister of Lands has been interested in this matter and that he has inquired with a view to helping reach an early decision so that, if possible, a start can be made on the erection of the building during the school holidays. Has the Minister reached a decision on this matter?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I am happy to tell the honourable member that no obstacle exists in my department: the whole thing has been approved and the land made available. At present the local officer of the department has been instructed to peg out the area on which the building is to be erected. Regarding the latter part of the honourable member's question, I do not know just when the inspector will be at the site, but I will make immediate and urgent inquiries and, if the co-operation of the mission authorities can be secured, and if work can be carried out in the holiday period, I will do everything possible to help.

GOODWOOD ROAD INTERSECTION.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently a realignment of traffic lanes has been made at the intersection of the Goodwood and Greenhill Roads, and since then a most noticeable traffic hazard has existed at peak periods, with vehicles in long queues. Several constituents of mine who travel over this section daily have asked me to see that the danger of accidents is minimized. In fact, several accidents have occurred at this intersection. Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague, the Minister of Local Government, to seriously consider installing traffic lights to ease the present congestion?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I regret that I could not hear the honourable member very well, but I appreciate that he desires me to refer this matter to my colleague, the Minister of Local Government. I shall do that.

The SPEAKER: The comment of the Minister of Works that he was unable to hear the question has been noted. Frequently there is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber when questions are being asked. I ask members for their co-operation in this respect by not carrying on audible conversations when questions are being asked or when a debate is in progress.

TEENAGE DRINKING.

Mr. BYWATERS: A report in today's *News*, headed "Teenage Drinkers Anger Promoter—Arriving at Balls Drunk", states:

A leading Adelaide dance promoter claims today's teenagers are drinking too much at pre-ball parties, arriving drunk at balls and sneaking drinks at balls from bottles concealed in their clothes. The promoter is Mr. Bob Christie, who bans alcohol from balls at his Wonderland Ballroom, Hawthorn. Mr. Christie says he has the support of the Superintendent of Licensed Premises, Mr. V. J. Pope, in his proposal to make it illegal for people under 21 to get alcohol.

The article goes on to say:

Mr. Christie says he had approached Mr. Robin Millhouse, M.P., to ask for legislation to make it unlawful for liquor to be available at functions where people under 21 were present. Mr. Millhouse had approached the Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, with the request and he had asked for a report from Mr. Pope. Mr. Pope had suggested, "It would be beneficial to legislate to make it unlawful for persons under 21 to procure or attempt to procure liquor."

In view of this rather alarming statement, will the Premier introduce legislation to comply with the requests of these responsible people?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As far as I know, there has been no control in any State over the taking of alcoholic liquors at a private function or in a private house, and that problem is involved in this matter. This State has always had legislation (I think it is the only State to have it) that prohibits drinking in public dance halls. That legislation was introduced by the Government during the war period, and it was so beneficial that it has been maintained. Members will recall that when that legislation was introduced there was considerable criticism. Those who were here at the time will recall that the legislation prohibited drinking in motor cars or in places adjacent to dance halls. I will inspect the docket for the honourable member to see what the problem is, and I will inform him.

WARREN RESERVOIR.

Mr. LAUCKE: I ask the Minister of Works to further consider raising the wall of the Warren reservoir to increase its holding capacity. I understand that the areas served by the Warren now require 500,000,000 gallons more a year than the reservoir's present capacity of 1,400,000,000 gallons, and the extra requirement must be pumped from the River Murray. Although the overflow of the Warren runs into the South Para reservoir

and therefore is not wasted, the height of the Warren above sea level gives it a unique position amongst State reservoirs in the ability of low-cost gravity reticulation from it over vast areas of the Warren and Northern water districts. I understand that the raising of the Warren wall by 10ft. would treble the capacity of the reservoir and render costly pumping from the Murray River unnecessary.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think I am correct in saying that this matter has been examined, but I am unable to say from memory whether there are any insuperable technical difficulties in regard to it. So far, I have not had any recommendation from the Engineer-in-Chief that this should be done. The honourable member correctly states that the area served by the reservoir has grown greatly since the reservoir was constructed. Indeed, it now extends to the lower end of Yorke Peninsula and the Yorke Peninsula scheme largely depends on it, although it could be somewhat augmented from the Bundaleer scheme. Since the reservoir was constructed, the whole Yorke Peninsula scheme has been undertaken and extensions made to the Barossa Valley scheme. In order to cope with this, the reservoir was linked to the Mannum-Adelaide main when it was laid and, as the honourable member said, it was augmented from that source. I am not sure whether it would be a simple matter of raising the wall or whether other difficulties are associated with it. This year the Warren reservoir has filled only recently although, in the main, it is a reliable reservoir in that it has generally filled each season. I shall raise this important matter with the Engineer-in-Chief and bring down a report for the honourable member. More water is obviously needed in the Warren reservoir and the Warren supply must be further augmented if a link-up from the South Para reservoir to pump to the Warren high level system is to be avoided.

MANNUM TECHNICAL COURSES.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of August 4 regarding educational facilities for skilled workmen at Mannum?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I discussed this matter with the Superintendent of Technical Schools and also with the Director of the Institute of Technology, but neither could provide any solution to the problem under existing legislation or regulations and I do not think anything can be done this year. I am not satisfied with the position and I think something could and should be done. I hope

to take up the matter again later in the year, but nothing can be done this year. I believe that this is a real problem, but that it can be solved.

LITTLE PARA RESERVOIR.

Mr. LAUCKE: From time to time references have been made to the possibility of constructing a reservoir on the Little Para River at Golden Grove. Can the Minister of Works say whether further planning has been done in respect of a reservoir at this site?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If the honourable member desires a concise answer, it would be no. However, that is not the whole story. The Engineer-in-Chief is constantly examining all possible sources in the high rainfall areas for the establishment of reservoirs, even though they may have to be comparatively small, because the demand for water is growing so rapidly in the metropolitan area and along the Adelaide Plains. I know that the department's investigation officer, Mr. Beaney, and other officers have been examining the possibilities of the South Para and other locations in a general way, but I think that specific detailed planning has not yet commenced. That does not mean, however, that the sources of supply will not be used in due course.

STURT HIGHWAY CROSSING.

Mr. CURREN: Recently, when the Berri council applied to the Railways Commissioner to have the level crossing on the Sturt Highway near Glossop widened it was informed that the highway could be widened but that the council would have to bear the total cost. As the crossing is on a highway controlled by the Highways Department, will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Roads to ascertain the Government's policy and whether the council must bear the total cost?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: FRUIT FLY.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. CURREN: My personal explanation relates to further misreporting in the daily press. Yesterday, as you know, Sir, I asked the Premier a question relating to fruit fly and particularly about the New South Wales ban

on South Australian oranges. The report in the *News* of yesterday stated:

Replying to Mr. Cohen (A.L.P.) who represents the Upper Murray citrus growers—

Following the protests by the honourable member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) on three recent occasions, I add my protest about this misreporting. For the benefit of the press, my name is not Cohen but Curren.

The SPEAKER: Now that the honourable member has raised this matter, following the remarks yesterday by the honourable member for Adelaide, I think I should make a statement. I hope to be able to arrange a conference with press reporters this afternoon, when I will make every endeavour to see that the honourable member's name is spelt correctly in future, because I can see the implication of the report.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FRANCHISE).

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1963, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

UNLEY BY-LAW: TRAFFIC.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That by-law No. 28 of the Corporation of the City of Unley, in respect of traffic, made on May 18, 1964, and laid on the table of this House on July 28, 1964, be disallowed.

This by-law, an amendment to the Corporation of the City of Unley traffic by-law, deals with two matters, the first of which is the prohibition on the parking of vehicles and trailers, either separately or together, measuring more than 18ft., for more than one hour in a street in the city of Unley. The precise terms of clause 5 (1) are as follows:

Any person who, without the consent of the council, allows—

- (a) any motor vehicle or
- (b) any trailer or
- (c) any motor vehicle or trailer whether connected together or not

which is or are (measured together) longer than 18ft. to remain stationary for more than one hour in any street or road shall be guilty of an offence.

The second matter is a prohibition on repairing or washing vehicles in a street. Clause 6 (1) states:

No person shall upon any street or road or in any public place within the municipality of the said corporation affect repairs (except of a temporary nature or rendered necessary by a sudden emergency), paint, wash, panelbeat or other work of any nature whatsoever on or to any motor or other vehicle.

In explanation, the council said that difficulty had been experienced both with the parking, and with the repairing and washing of large vehicles in the streets of the city. The first paragraph of the explanation states:

The reason for this amendment is on account of the influx of large vehicles into the district over the past four to five years. These vehicles are being parked, washed and repaired in the street.

That difficulty was amplified in evidence given before the Subordinate Legislation Committee by Mr. Leighton Perry, Town Clerk, and Mr. George Payne, Deputy Town Clerk. Although members of the committee have every sympathy with the object of the by-law, they consider that it has been phrased much too widely, so widely in fact, as to prohibit a big American-type car, or a smaller one with a trailer attached, from being parked for more than one hour in a street where, apart from the provision of the by-law, there could be no objection to such parking.

The witnesses, Messrs. Perry and Payne, said that this was certainly not the intention of the council in making this by-law, but is, unfortunately, the undoubted result of the by-law. We discussed with the witnesses an example of this. A well-known undertaker, who conducts his business on Unley Road and who is a member of the council, is, with his hearses and funeral cars, undoubtedly transgressing the provisions of the by-law as drawn. He does not do any harm, and the council did not intend that he should be caught under its provisions. The committee does not feel that a by-law, to overcome an undoubted specific nuisance ascribed to it, should be couched in such wide terms as to catch many other cases to which there could be no objection. That deals with the first matter contained in paragraph 5. The second one regarding repairs and washing of vehicles is separate.

On this matter members of the committee did not feel so strongly that it was objectionable, but felt that a blanket prohibition against the washing of a vehicle in a street goes too far. We were told that some big semi-trailers are hosed out, and that is a real nuisance. We accept that and we have every sympathy with the council in prohibiting it, but we considered that it was going too far to say that no-one could wash an ordinary motor vehicle in the street. The witnesses agreed that it was not the intention of the council to go as far as that, nor to prevent the washing of such cars. I remind the House that in 1960 it disallowed two similar by-laws, one from the City of Adelaide and one from the City of Prospect,

which contained such a prohibition as this. I do not think it is necessary to explain the motion further. We have every sympathy with the council in these matters, but unfortunately the by-law has been couched in too wide terms.

Motion carried.

DRAINAGE.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Dunstan:

(For wording of motion, see page 595.)

(Continued from August 26. Page 596.)

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): May I briefly recapitulate what I said when I moved this motion. In my district, the First and Second Creeks flow through the local government area of the Kensington and Norwood City Council. Second Creek passes from the Kensington and Norwood council area into the area of the town of St. Peters, and then into the Torrens River. First Creek passes from the area of the Kensington and Norwood council into the area of the Adelaide City Council in the park lands and then flows into the Torrens River. The creeks, where they flow through private property in Norwood (as they mainly do), are the responsibility, under the Local Government Act, of the persons through whose properties they flow. These creeks over a long period have become, in fact, stormwater drains. Originally, in their catchment areas there was a good deal of absorption, and the creeks, as naturally formed, were formed by nature to take far less water than comes down now. There has been considerable building in the Burnside area where the creeks rise, and in that area because of the paving of streets, the building of houses, and the concreting of suburban blocks, large quantities of water originally absorbed are being poured down the creeks. The people who suffer most damage from the flooding of the creeks—and the flooding has become a fairly regular occurrence—are the people in the areas of Kensington and Norwood, for the most part, and in St. Peters.

Before 1947, the most serious flooding occurred at Second Creek in the St. Peters area, and an agreement was reached between councils which contributed water to the out-flowing through the drain in St. Peters Street, and an estimate of cost was arrived at. The work was not proceeded with and the situation has steadily worsened. No agreement has been made in relation to First Creek, and serious flooding is now taking place on that creek. Many citizens within the area have approached the Kensington and Norwood council and the

St. Peters council over a period of years, and I have approached the council several times. As a result of floods, two years ago I wrote to all councils in the area seeking their assistance in this matter. Burnside council was prepared to come along provided other councils were willing to do so; St. Peters council was anxious for something to be done urgently; the Kensington and Norwood council took the attitude that the creeks within the area were the responsibility of the citizens through whose properties they passed, and did not intend to alter that attitude. When the member for Unley and I saw the Commissioner of Highways to see whether something could be done, he told us that the Highways Department was willing to take action provided the councils could agree to a concerted scheme, but it depended on the councils' reaching agreement. I personally approached the Minister who put a similar view to me, namely, that, if the councils were to approach him with a concerted scheme, then the Government would be prepared to look at it and treat it as it had treated other schemes where it had given assistance. However, no agreement was reached between the councils, and I received from the St. Peters Council a letter written in November, 1963, in the following terms:

As you are aware, flooding has occurred in Magill and Payneham Roads and several other streets in this council area on several occasions this year, and of course on each occasion many private properties are affected and considerable inconvenience is occasioned, not only to St. Peters ratepayers but also to the general public. This flooding is caused by increasing development in adjoining council areas of Burnside, Payneham and Norwood, resulting in the over-loading of Second Creek. Not only does this creek then flood its banks in several places (and considerable damage has been caused by this) but many subsidiary drains (in this council area) which feed into the creek cannot empty until the flood level drops.

Water drains right back through Evandale and Maylands, causing flooding because drains cannot be emptied into the creek. The letter continues:

On Saturday, October 26, although moderately steady rain was received in St. Peters, the flood level of Second Creek was the highest experienced for approximately 25 years and this council is becoming increasingly concerned regarding the problem. In 1947 an agreement was drawn up and agreed to, whereby the estimated costs totalling £51,500 would be apportioned as follows: Commissioner of Highways, 50 per cent; Burnside council, 24 per cent; St. Peters, 15½ per cent; Kensington and Norwood, 8½ per cent; and Payneham, 2½ per cent. However, this agreement was not put into effect and a further meeting was held

last December, when the Commissioner of Highways agreed to draw up new plans and estimates for the whole project for submission to the councils concerned. This council has made inquiries on at least two occasions (by letters to the Commissioner dated May 24 and August 15, 1963), copies of which are enclosed for your information, but no reply has been received. It would be much appreciated if you could make inquiries on this council's behalf to obtain the desired information.

I did make such inquiries: the estimate was far in excess of the original cost estimated in 1947. Following further complaints I wrote to all councils in the area asking for them to co-operate with me in action, and particularly did I address a request to the Kensington and Norwood council. I wrote to the Town Clerk in these terms:

Further to my previous letters to the council I have received from a number of residents on First Creek (and at that stage no scheme existed as to this) complaints concerning flooding and the difficulties of maintenance of the creek which has now become so much a public draining system. I have also received from the St. Peters council a request to endeavour to expedite action on Second Creek under the terms of the existing plan for straightening Second Creek and providing a wider outlet in view of the large-scale flooding of Stepney, which occurred at the end of last year. In my discussions with you and members of the council it is apparent that the Kensington and Norwood City Council is dissatisfied with the present agreement, since its contribution seems disproportionate to the amount of carry-off of water from the Norwood district, the main volume of water coming from the new areas of Burnside. In all the circumstances I should be very glad if your council would consider firstly inspecting with me a number of areas on First Creek and discussing with residents the possibility of action in relation to First Creek to obviate flooding and to relieve the residents of maintenance, and secondly in having a further meeting of the councils concerned together with the Commissioner and myself to see if some new agreement can be arrived at in relation to Second Creek, and seeking Government assistance in relation to any proposed scheme for First Creek.

I thought in my naivete that that was a courteous and helpful approach to the Kensington and Norwood council, and previously I had always found that the council was prepared to co-operate with me (as I have always sought to do with it) whenever I have had a request from it to consult and discuss with it a problem of mutual concern. I have always made it my business to attend the council at the first opportunity and to make myself available to its members. In reply to that letter I received the following letter from the council:

I have been directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 10th inst., which has been considered by the council. In reply I have to advise that the council does not consider any

good purpose would be served by inspecting First Creek as it is not prepared to contribute towards the cost of maintenance of the creek where it flows through private property.

That was that! The letter continues:

With regard to Second Creek and the construction of drains along Magill Road, the council does not consider that it should be asked to contribute towards the cost of larger drains, which are required to carry off additional water discharged onto Magill Road from development in other council areas. This council is not prepared to enter into a new agreement in connection with this work.

So the Kensington and Norwood council was not going to have anything to do with discussions about any scheme. I was abruptly told that that was the case, so I wrote to the council again, because it was quite evident at that stage of the proceedings that no sooner did we get any sort of flash rains in the area than many residents were seriously affected by flooding. In my further letter I said:

I very much regret that the council is unable to meet me and discuss the schemes for First and Second Creeks. I had hoped that an amicable arrangement could be arrived at. It is quite plain that it is my duty to my constituents to see to it that I do whatever I can firstly to avoid flooding and secondly to see that private citizens who may have bought property through which creeks run are not now charged with maintaining a public draining system, for that is what the creeks have become. The water running through the creeks is not now the natural run-off from the catchment areas of the creek, but water is artificially poured into the creeks from the drains constructed by councils through whose areas those creeks run. I emphasize that I am very keen to negotiate some amicable arrangement with all interested parties in this matter.

I made it clear that I was anxious to have talks and to negotiate with the council to see whether we could arrive at something that we could mutually put forward to the Government. The letter continues:

If, however, that cannot be reached, I shall deem it my duty to introduce an amendment to the Local Government Act which will fix public responsibility for First and Second Creeks in the absence of agreement.

To that letter (which, again, was asking for negotiations with the council) I received this courteous message:

Dear Sir,

I have been directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 2nd inst., which was placed before the meeting of the council held on the 16th inst. In reply I have to advise that after considering the letter, the council has decided to adhere to its previous decision in this matter, but I am to inform you that any effort by you to obtain an amendment to the Local Government Act to fix responsibility for these creeks on the public, will be strenuously opposed by the council.

Then the council thought to add a little homily, for the letter continues:

I have further been directed to point out that you have a responsibility to all of your constituents in this area, and not only to those few who own property with a creek flowing through it.

Apparently I am not allowed to come forward to speak for a minority of citizens in my district who are adversely affected. Naturally, I was not particularly pleased to receive that letter, for it is not the kind of letter that I should have expected from the council on a matter of this kind, especially in view of the attitude that I have taken to the council's requests to me on other occasions. The effect of it was that I was being told by the council to go and jump in the creeks. As was to be expected, flash rains occurred, and in my area, both on First and Second Creeks, thousands of pounds' worth of damage was done. Many residents on First Creek had their homes badly flooded. The newly built house of an architect only 50 yards from my own had water right through it. The garage crash repair premises of Mr. Usher at the end of Birrell Street were flooded right through, and cellars of his house were filled with water. The house of Mr. McEwin in Osmond Terrace had thousands of pounds damage done to it. Mr. Sierp's house nearby was also badly affected. The water was right through Mr. McEwin's house, and there was silt a foot deep in the house. Valuable furniture and pianos were ruined, and it was a shocking state.

A little farther down the creek the local shop on William Street was flooded right through and severely damaged, and numbers of other properties had land torn away and garden installations and sheds severely wrecked. The premises close to Sydenham Road had land torn away by the amount of water coming down the creeks, and properties were endangered. That was on First Creek. On Second Creek there was severe flooding once more right through the Stepney area. The basement of the Oriental Hotel on Osmond Terrace was flooded to a considerable depth, and numbers of other properties had land torn away and buildings undermined. I had a bit to say publicly about the lack of co-operation I have had in trying to get something done to prevent just that situation, and I then received this letter from the Kensington and Norwood City Council:

The council desires me to point out that any work required in First or Second Creek where it passes through this council's area

is not included in the eastern suburbs drainage scheme, which is the reason why the council has expressed opposition to the proposal.

I imagine it refers there to the proposal for the eastern suburbs drainage scheme. I am unable to follow that remark of the council's. It was just because there had been no scheme in Norwood that I had been trying to get them to discuss the thing with me and come and examine the creeks so that we could put forward a scheme. The council adamantly refused to do anything about it. The letter continued:

It is understood that the Highways Department is having a survey and report made of First and Second Creeks in addition to the Stonyfell Creek, which causes the flooding of Magill Road and other places in the St. Peters council area. In the meantime it is considered desirable to await the outcome of this report before taking any further action. The council has commenced the inspection of both creeks in its area with a view to having obstructions removed.

I believe that the council did conduct an inspection of First and Second Creeks in the area. What happened then was that numbers of residents in the area got notices to clean out the creeks. They were told that a contractor would be sent around to make quotes for work which the council specified. The council asked the residents to agree to pay the money which the contractor quoted for doing the work that the council specified. In many of these cases these people were poor (numbers of pensioners are involved in this) and they were being required to pay money for bulldozing the creeks and for clearing out considerable amounts of debris for which they could be in no way personally responsible. This sort of thing is putting an impost on some of these people which is quite unjust in the circumstances. So far I have not been able to get any agreement with the council. As I say, I am most regretful about this, because this is the first occasion in nearly 12 years (since I have been in this House) that I have not had the utmost co-operation from the Kensington and Norwood council. I have had it previously, and I expected I would get it in this matter, and I am most distressed to find that I have not got it.

I certainly have had plenty of co-operation from the St. Peters council, which is more than anxious to get something done at the first possible opportunity and to do something for its citizens. That council clearly agrees that this sort of damage to residents is not the responsibility of the local resident at all, that this is a public drainage scheme, and that

something should be done about it from the public's point of view immediately. I know that the Government has proposed that a metropolitan drainage authority be set up. At this stage of proceedings I understand that there has been no final agreement by the Kensington and Norwood council upon that proposal. I have been unable to obtain any clear undertaking that the works needed to be done on First and Second Creeks in the local government area of Kensington and Norwood will in fact be undertaken by the metropolitan drainage authority, nor am I aware who is going to be responsible for the maintenance of the creeks, once works have been carried out.

At the earliest possible opportunity I want to establish that these people in my area are not going to have this unfair impost placed upon them for ever and a day. It is with that in view that I have moved the motion and have continued with it. I hope the House will agree with me that this is something on which the House should take action to alleviate the unfortunate and unpleasant conditions which now exist for many people in my area. It is not only my area, of course, which is affected by the flooding of the creeks: there has been flooding at those creeks also in the area of the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele). Some of the Kensington and Norwood council area is also in the honourable member's district. I know that problems of this kind are not exclusive to my area, as some of the honourable member's constituents have been adversely affected as well, and I know that she has been very sympathetic with the situation that has faced them. I hope the House will accept this motion and set up a committee of inquiry to see what work needs to be done, how the work is to be paid for, how it can be fairly borne, and who is to maintain this system in the future.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): It is with pleasure that I second the motion moved so ably by the member for Norwood. We both have similar trouble with drainage, and this trouble has been multiplied in recent years. No doubt other honourable members are concerned about this matter. The North Unley Creek has a long list of convictions for damage over many years. Back as far as 1938 there were many trouble spots, and concreting was started by the Unley City Council in several sections of the creek. Unfortunately, that concreting was not done over the whole course of the creek.

At that time 5in. to 6in. of rain was required for the creek to overflow, but quite recently

it has taken only one and a half inches of rain for the same thing to happen. Most of this creek flows through private property, and it causes grave concern to residents of Young, Robert, and Trevelyan Streets, North Unley, I wish to quote from a report, headed "Flood Fear from Creek", in the *Sunday Mail* of December 10, 1960:

Residents in Trevelyan Street, Goodwood, fear flood damage from a creek which runs along the back of their properties. Some have not yet finished repairing damage done by a flood last winter. Now Unley Council has dumped a large quantity of filling on a vacant block adjoining the creek. Some residents believe the filling has narrowed the creek, causing a bottleneck for floodwaters. They want the creek cleaned of debris and concreted over or replaced with concrete pipes.

Mr. E. J. Sandery, who owns a guest house in Trevelyan Street, said: "An inch of rain in the foothills makes the creek overflow its banks. Debris in the last flood included empty oil drums, kerosene tins, timber, dead chickens, and tree branches. It cost me £75 last year to clean out the section which runs through my property."

Mrs. F. P. Richards said: "The creek has many stagnant pools in summer and children play in them. It is unhealthy."

The Rev. R. D. Harris said: "Undergrowth along the banks is a fire hazard. There was silt 18in. deep in our back yard after the last flood."

The principal of Wesley College, the Rev. A. H. Blacket, said: "In the 14 years I have been here, I have never known the floodwaters come up so high. They rose more than 3ft. over our fruit and vegetable garden and drowned more than 200 fowls and chickens. The water was inches deep over the floors of one of the main buildings of the college 50yds. from the creek. Carpets and flooring were ruined."

Since I was elected to this House, much more frequent flooding has occurred and there was a near disaster when a child was saved from drowning. Many reasons can be advanced for the flooding in this area. Most councils now have good roads without a mile of unmade road. Much money has been spent on footpaths and in many of these creeks easements have been provided which have helped considerably with the flooding. Naturally, everybody in the area to which I refer is pleased with these added amenities, but something will have to be done to get rid of the water that has been put into this small creek. I was interested to hear that the Adelaide City Council was not interested in any schemes of drainage because one of the main problems of this creek at North Unley is that much water comes through the park lands and from the streets of the Adelaide City Council area. The water is often brackish. In the park lands

of the Adelaide City Council horses are often in action and during one flooding many parts of hurdles were noticed in the creek. This shows that the water comes from the Adelaide City Council area. The people of Unley who have to put up with this sort of thing are not happy about it. One resident, Mr. Williams, of Young Street, required a new bridge in his property. He used steel girders and hoped that the resulting bridge would be used by young people. However, during the flood he found that overnight the materials he had bought were no use whatever. He gave up the idea of putting up a bridge. That gives an idea of what is happening near this North Unley creek.

Mr. Ryan: In the main, is this drain open?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, and the flow has increased five or six times over a period of years and is dangerous for children in the area as they can easily get to it because it is in the open. Since 1962 there have been at least six bad floodings and between August 1, 1962, and January, 1963, it overflowed three times in six months. This is hard on the people in the area who have to provide what is necessary to keep the water from their doorsteps. With the member for Norwood, I recently visited the Commissioner of Highways and he told us that it was a council matter, but that he would be willing to co-operate. As a result of this advice, I went to see the Town Clerk of Unley and he invited me to attend a meeting with the Chief Engineer on October 19, 1962, which I attended. I received a letter from the Town Clerk as follows:

In reply to your letter, concerning matters on King William Road, and further to the conference held in my office today, I wish to point out the following relevant facts:

- (1) The drain in question between Young Street and the main Unley drain flows through private property.
- (2) As this drain is not council property, the council is not legally responsible for carrying out maintenance or construction work.
- (3) The drain between Young Street and King William Road is cleaned frequently and this has been done several times during the last three years.
- (4) Recently, the council has completed the reconstruction of the bridge over the main Unley drain at LeHunte Street. Previously, an obstruction existed in this drain by the poor alignment and the small flow section of the old bridge. This reconstruction will generally improve the flow in both the Unley drain and the drain in question.
- (5) The levels of the drain between Young Street and the Unley drain are fixed, due to the levels of the existing drains.

If any construction work were carried out, it would be necessary to increase the flow level of the existing creek by building levee banks or filling in adjoining properties.

- (6) The architects designing the new flat development have advised that they intend to build levee banks adjacent to the creek on the property owned by the National Mutual Life Association. This will prevent flooding of the property by stormwaters flowing in the creek during high intensity storms. They have also indicated that the company intends to clean the creek and make arrangements for its Maintenance Supervisor to keep the section of the creek flowing through its property in a clean condition.

I further advise that the council, at present, has no plans for carrying out any work on creeks within the Unley area. Several large creeks, which pass through the Unley area, are unlined and many approaches have been made by owners of the properties through which they flow for the council to carry out certain works. In all cases, the council has advised that, at the time, no moneys are available for this type of work.

Mr. Ryan: Can you insure against flooding?

Mr. LANGLEY: I have been told by my constituents that it is impossible to insure against flooding, especially over a period, as it is too costly. Many Unley people have spent much money out of their own pockets to try to stop the water from coming in and to make sure that it will not cause any real damage to their homes. I am sure the member for Norwood finds that people in his area lose much money because of flooding. I think it is up to the Government or some other body to alleviate the position. Flats were built alongside the creek recently and, as mentioned in the letter, banks are to be built to stop the water flooding several houses and also the flats. Recently, there was a flood as a result of a flash rain, and the water came to within half an inch of going into these flats. This shows that if the banks had been built some of the things I have mentioned might not have happened. Since that flooding, which was one of the worst, people have had to pay about £200 or £300 to get the water out of their cellars. One man recently opened a restaurant on King William Road and the cellars were full of water. He has now built a concrete bank which has stopped the water from coming in. With the end of the winter near, people who are affected are anxious that something be done in the immediate future. These people have paid out many hundreds of pounds over a period of years in building walls and so on and surely their plea will not fall on deaf ears.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I oppose the motion. The two creeks to which the honourable member for Norwood referred flow, in the higher levels, through my electoral district, but creeks that flow into the Burnside electorate do not have any bearing on the points raised by the member for Unley. I have, quite naturally, been in touch with the Burnside council to find out how it regards this motion. The council considers that it has sufficient power under the Local Government Act to deal with any situation that arises from this spasmodic flooding. I say "spasmodic", because it happens only in times of flash floods or with abnormal weather conditions when, literally, a cloudburst occurs over certain areas. In 1959 a cloudburst occurred over the area we now know as Skye, and precipitated much water into the creek, which led to flooding north of Magill Road. That was similar to the recent occasion when a flash flood affected both First and Second Creeks.

Many people buy properties because they are adjacent to creeks and they consider this an added attraction to their property, and because they feel they can develop it in some way by landscaping it and making it an attractive part of the property. Apparently, these people do not realize, until they have bought properties through which creeks run, that it is their responsibility to keep creeks free, and they are surprised when prosecuted or when the council takes action against them to keep the creeks free. I know that people err by casting debris into creeks, because I live practically on the banks of First Creek where it passes through Tusmore Park. Recently, that park was flooded on its lower levels to a depth of inches when the flash flood occurred, and much debris was brought down and deposited on the lower levels. I have seen, and wish that council officers could see, people actually tipping debris (cuttings from lawns and branches from prunings of trees) into the creeks and expecting that the flood water will carry it away. An accumulation of debris in the higher levels adds to the situation created in areas to which the member for Norwood has referred.

The Burnside council considers that it has power under the Local Government Act to prosecute in these circumstances, and I consider that, in cases where people have deliberately put stuff into creeks, it is right that they should pay. I realize that people further down the creek are inconvenienced by debris for which they are not responsible, but, when all is said and done, these are known

watercourses, and it is written into the Act that it shall be the responsibility of people with frontages to the watercourses to keep them free. In reply to the member for Norwood, I have not had representations made to me by people who have been affected in this way, although I know that some months ago a quarry owner, who has a frontage on to, I think, First Creek, was instructed to put the watercourse back into its original position. This happened because the residue from sand-washing plants had diverted the course of the creek on to which much sand had flowed and was being deposited on the side of the creek and in the creek bed, where it went through other peoples' property. I understand that action was taken and the situation remedied. Since the motion of the member for Norwood was made public, no-one has come to me to say that they have been troubled. These floodings take place, to my knowledge, only when we have a flash flood or abnormal rain that adds to the flow of water in First and Second Creeks.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

FLUORIDATION.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That in the interests of dental health, a Select Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into and report upon the desirability of adding fluoride to the water supplies of the State.

(Continued from August 26. Page 603.)

Motion carried.

The House appointed a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Dunstan, Ferguson, Hutchens, and Millhouse, and Mrs. Steele; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on October 14.

SCHOOL CANTEENS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Frank Walsh:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should continue to provide for payment of electricity and gas used in all departmental school canteens.

(Continued from August 26. Page 619.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): In view of the Minister's statement that the department will continue to pay for the gas and the electricity used in school canteens, I move that the motion be read and discharged.

Motion read and discharged.

WEST TORRENS BY-LAW: ZONING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That by-law No. 19 of the Corporation of the City of West Torrens in respect of zoning, made on November 26, 1963, and laid on the table of this House on June 10, 1964, be disallowed.

(Continued from August 19. Page 516.)

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): I oppose the motion and, in doing so, I may be at a slight disadvantage as the Chairman of the Joint Legislation Committee has moved the motion and two members of the committee may follow me and support it. I appreciate the courtesy of the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) who forwarded me the proposed by-law. When it was first received I was asked whether I objected to it, but unfortunately it came just prior to my illness, when I was unable to give it any proper attention. In fact, I did not object to it but I should have liked time to study it, and I would undoubtedly have approached the committee and advanced my views in the hope that it would arrive at a different decision from the one that it eventually arrived at. Representatives from the West Torrens council, the Chamber of Manufactures and the Town Planner appeared before the committee. Unfortunately, the Housing Trust was not represented. I believe it could have given much valuable evidence, as it was affected by the rezoning of this area. It had purchased a considerable area opposite the area where this rezoning was to take place. No doubt that trust area will become a large residential section. The area to be rezoned is near the Glenelg golf links which are bisected by a road built by the West Torrens council from Morphett Road to Tapley Hill Road. My knowledge of the area goes back for many years and I believe that this should never have been an industrial area in the first instance because it is too far removed from any main thoroughfare, being at least a mile from both Anzac Highway and Marion Road. There is no form of public transport except for the Graymore bus that runs along Stonehouse Avenue. The factories are far removed from main highways. I should like now to read submissions I have received from the West Torrens council, which should put the matter in its proper perspective. The submissions are as follows:

The land that the council desires to rezone comprises an area in Camden Park upon which there are 59 dwellings, 18 flats built by the South Australian Housing Trust for elderly people (this is nothing to do with the trust's

building which is contemplated and to which I referred), eight allotments in respect of which we have received building applications, and three vacant allotments. There is also a vacant piece of land for which application has been received for subdivision into building allotments, and there is a strip along the backyards of a number of residential properties. We would point out that there are no factories in the area to be rezoned and the council has no other purpose in this rezoning than to protect those people who have built homes or are living in the area in rented flats. My council feels that the industrial concerns opposing the amendment to the by-law are unrealistic in their contention that the rezoning will adversely affect their business or properties.

By the comments made in the House it would appear that the Town Planning Committee's report has had an impact on the decision of the Parliamentary committee. I would point out that the development plan in dealing with the matter of planning reads as follows: "The various zones shown on the development plan are of a general nature and provide a basis for further detailed investigation. Local councils should be given the opportunity to consider the boundaries of the zones in more detail and also the type of development permitted before the zones are given statutory approval." In my report to the Hon. the Attorney-General on this part of the development plan I wrote that my council agreed to the recommendation in principle regarding zoning but suggested that the actual zoning of areas within the municipality should be determined by the council thereof. The Town Planning Committee, in response, replied as follows: "The committee considers that zoning is essentially a planning matter which cannot be divorced from other planning functions. The committee therefore feels that the Town Planning Committee is the appropriate body to prepare model zoning regulations The committee envisages the determination of local zoning boundaries as the prerogative of the council in consultation with the committee. The boundaries of the zones of metropolitan significance should be the function of the Town Planning Committee in consultation with the council." Until now we had taken that as being a proper indication of the object of the development plan, but apparently it is being taken in some quarters that the development plan as laid before Parliament, if not having the force of law, is the sole and accepted authority on zoning.

Last year the West Torrens council passed a by-law that contemplated rezoning an industrial area to a residential area. A small factory that made wire baskets would have been affected by the rezoning. After consultation with council representatives (and I think the committee) it was agreed that the council would redraft the by-law. I believe that was ultimately done and it was agreed that that area would be excluded from the rezoning of the proposed residential area. Everything was satisfactory from that point.

Last Tuesday week I received a petition from residents within the area to be rezoned as a residential area. That petition is signed by 78 people, although two of those people do not live within the area. The petition, addressed to me, states:

We, the undersigned, being resident in the township of Camden within the area which the West Torrens council desire to change from an industrial zone into a residential zone by amendment to by-law No. 19 in respect of zoning, respectfully request that you support the move of the West Torrens council. Our reasons are as follows:

(1) At present we have no protection against backyard industries or the establishment of a large factory right in our midst by the purchase of several homes for demolition or for modification to become part of a factory.

(2) No-one is likely to be adversely affected by the amendment to zoning, as there is no factory in the area under consideration.

(3) We realize that factories are in close proximity to us at present, and these factories will continue to operate, and to this we have no objection.

(4) We who are not renting our homes have invested a large amount of money in them.

(5) To many of us it is our sole investment.

(6) Those who own their own homes purchased them from the South Australian Housing Trust, and without implying directly or indirectly anything against the trust in any way in its dealings with us, we feel sure that a semi-government instrumentality would not have sold us residences in an industrial area had they believed that Parliament would not allow a rezoning of this area.

This petition was forwarded to me after I had sought the adjournment of the debate and indicated that I intended to oppose the motion.

Mr. Colin Branson, on behalf of the Chamber of Manufactures, commenced his evidence by apologizing for the case he made out last year in connection with the rezoning of an area at Underdale, and this showed clearly that he had not given the matter any thought at all. I think he might well have followed this up and apologized for his case in this instance. The Chairman of the committee more or less had to bring Mr. Branson back onto the rails, because apparently he wanted to continue discussing Underdale. I point out that Mr. Branson was concerned with one factory only, and actually that factory is not involved, if we analyse the position properly. There are only about seven or eight factories in the whole area, and they are only small when all is said and done. Camelec is the biggest and probably the most important of all. That factory is the only one Mr. Branson was interested in, and

it is not affected by the rezoning, nor will any of the other small factories be involved at all.

That is the point I want to make regarding this by-law. The council has made it clear and definite that it does not intend to affect any of these people. In fact, some industrial sites will still be available for those who want to erect factories in the area. Two that come to my mind are each 2½ acres in size. One site is on the corner of Mooringe Avenue and Morphett Road, and the other is about 300 yards or so further along; and there are other sites of a smaller size. It would not be possible to have any very large factories built there, for the whole area is only small. I am not a very good judge of acreage, but I estimate that the whole area, including the part that has been rezoned and the part that is proposed to be left as industrial, would not be more than 40 to 50 acres. Perhaps you, Mr. Speaker, know the area and would probably say that that estimate was somewhere near correct. I may be a little liberal in my estimate of the area.

Mr. Millhouse: If you were Liberal that would be a good thing.

Mr. Jennings: He doesn't mean it that way.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I do not know whether the member for Mitcham had that figure in evidence. I do not think much notice could be taken of Mr. Branson's evidence, because he was concerned only about Camelec: he was not concerned about the other smaller places. To be truthful, I do not think the committee took much notice of his evidence, either.

Mr. Jennings: None at all, as far as I was concerned.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I come now to the meat of the subject, if I may put it that way. I believe (and everybody else who opposes the committee's recommendation believes) that the committee was influenced by the Town Planner's evidence. I do not wish to discredit the Town Planner, for I respect that gentleman and the office he holds; I know that he has applied himself to his job. However, I think this particular instance is too small and too petty for a man in that capacity to be very much concerned about. From my knowledge of the area, I do not think it can hold too long, and I do not think it should ever have been brought into any development plan at all. I believe that, if any planning is to be done, these little tinpot things should not come into it: we should look for bigger things.

I have been most critical of the West Torrens council at various times, but I give credit

where credit is due. I believe that in recent years the council has done a good job with the resources at its disposal in developing reserves. It is not an easy matter now to obtain space for reserves in closely settled areas and develop them. The Minister of Education will appreciate that the council is to be commended for its work in schools in conjunction with the Education Department. The council's library would be a credit to any suburban council, not only in South Australia but anywhere in Australia. I put that forward to show what the council is trying to do for the people.

I believe that many areas that are at present zoned residential will have to be rezoned industrial. This may apply soon to the area in which I live, because it is near the railway yards in Hilton. People in this area will soon be compelled to move out. My block is 212ft. deep and there is an interstate transport depot at the back of it. While I was ill, about three weeks ago, I was disturbed by a noise from this depot and it was a giant refrigerator plant's batteries being recharged at night. I informed the council of this, but the plant was shifted to another part of the premises the next day. That is an instance of what is happening in the area and it will not be long before it may be rezoned industrial.

The problem will then be where to put the people who have lived there. It may be necessary to zone residential areas to take them. No place would be more suitable for this than the area we are discussing, as it is more suitable for residences than the area where I am living. In the evidence before the committee Mr. Jennings referred to accepting and channelling development and said, "But we cannot go back 10 years." Mr. Hart said:

No, I must admit that in this case my sympathies lie with the industrialist who, according to previous evidence given before the committee, which I have had the opportunity to read, was in the area before the houses were built, and obviously this can give rise to pressures that will eventually cause him to move on. I believe that the industrialist is entitled to the same benefits as the resident in the area. The industrialist's area should be protected in the same way as the residential area.

My point is that the Town Planner was prejudiced and could not give an unbiased opinion. He said that he was influenced by the Chamber of Manufactures' representatives and the committee has already said that their evidence was of no value and was discarded. The Chairman of the committee indicated by nodding his head that that is so and Mr.

Jennings has done so by interjection. Mr. Hart said he was influenced by that evidence.

Mr. Millhouse: I think that you are putting it far too strongly now.

Mr. FRED WALSH: The honourable member nodded approval when I said that he had discarded this evidence. Mr. Branson apologized for the type of evidence he gave concerning Underdale and he gave similar evidence in this case and was concerned only with Camelec. Mr. Jennings would admit that he discarded the evidence.

Mr. Jennings: You are quite right.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Mr. Hart said he was influenced by that evidence and therefore he was prejudiced in favour of the industrialist. I ask members to assess the value of what I have said, as it shows that the Town Planner was prejudiced. This plan was in the best interests of the metropolitan area irrespective of whom it affects. It is said that it is a small area and would not hold a recreation ground, yet the Education Department contemplates building a primary school there. Land has been purchased for a primary school in the area that it is contemplated to rezone. Factories should not be built around that and the council is doing the right thing in rezoning the area. It is all summed up in a question put to Mr. Hart at the committee hearing. The Hon. F. J. Potter asked him, "How flexible is the Town Planner's plan regarding zoning?" and Mr. Hart replied,

It was given as an indication of broad zones, looking at them from a metropolitan point of view, and as a basis of the preparation of more detailed zones. We anticipated that these detailed zones could be arrived at after detailed consultation with each appropriate council and by public inspection that would enable the public to have the right to inspect them and object to them if they wished to; and in that way arrive at a solution that would be generally acceptable.

I do not think anybody would object to that and that is how I believe things should be done. However, matters are unfortunately not carried out that way and the Town Planner believes in that. I believe that is the main point at issue. It has been said that pressures are likely to be introduced later to force these people out, but I do not think that is the case. If it were, that method could be used in my area where many complaints were made about nuisances of an objectionable nature that affected the quiet of the evening and the living conditions of residents. The council has not seen fit, unless strong complaints have been received (I have made one or two and conditions have been remedied),

to take action, but one has to make allowances, and I am sure that the people who sent the petition will make those allowances in the future.

I assure members that good standard houses are being built in these areas. I am sure the members of the committee who inspected the area will agree with that, and that houses built in the future will be of this same high standard. The Housing Trust can be relied upon to build a good standard house in the areas it has purchased. No factory will be affected by this rezoning. Sites are still available and persons purchasing land on which to build houses will know that it is an industrial area because the council has erected sign boards stating that fact. I ask the House not to support the motion, for it does an injustice to the West Torrens council.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the motion. I hope the House does not think that I, for example, would consider that because I was a member of a committee I should regard the decision of that committee as paramount to this House. I do not regard any committee that is subordinate to Parliament as a committee to which I owe my principal allegiance. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) put forward an excellent case. I appreciate him more today because I am opposing him. Usually I support him 100 per cent, and in the 20 years we have known each other I have had good reason to support him—and sometimes he has deigned to support me. We have also agreed at times to disagree. I want to make abundantly clear to the House that the committee is not acting capriciously in this or any other matter. It has had 216 papers before it since this session started; two motions for disallowance have been unanimously agreed to by the House; one, at the request of the member for Port Adelaide, is down for disallowance; and four others have been set down for Wednesday, September 16, in the name of the Chairman, only because time is running out. These papers have to lie on the table for 14 days to keep them alive, but the committee has not yet considered them.

I agree with the member for West Torrens when he says that when one drives around a strange area one does not know much about what is going on there. I wonder why the Public Works Committee spends so much time inspecting places which they cannot hope to understand merely by making an inspection. We should keep in mind that certain things heard before a committee can certainly never be shown in the evidence. The member for West

Torrens has demonstrated that he studied the evidence; he very ably demonstrated, too, that he was capable of understanding it. All members at some time or other have either had to give or listen to evidence, and it is obvious that many things can never be put on the printed document. We did not have a *Hansard* reporter with us when we made this inspection. The Town Clerk of West Torrens said then that if we passed this rezoning by-law there would have to be another one fairly soon. That will not be found in any evidence, but the Town Clerk, being an honourable man, would not deny that he said it. The member for West Torrens is correct when he points out that the Housing Trust did not give evidence. Perhaps it should have. I do not know. The trust is largely the villain in these rezoning matters because it, as an authority, is not answerable to local government and, as a consequence, it can build houses or pensioners' flats, as it did in this case, in an industrial area, and afterwards the council feels obliged to rezone. That cannot affect the Housing Trust but, unfortunately, it does affect its tenants. I believe the West Torrens council received a rough deal from this Parliament. I was absolutely prepared to agree to this rezoning. I acknowledge that zoning is always a controversial matter. The member for West Torrens quoted something that I was trying to draw out in the evidence, namely, that the only way that rezoning could be effectively carried out was to have commenced 10 years earlier. I still have not found anyone who knows how to turn the clock back! This will always be a vexed question.

Until the Town Planner spoke to the committee about this matter I was prepared to see the zoning proceed, considering that no blatant injustice would be inflicted on anybody. Let me say here that I know we shall be accused of being unduly influenced by the Town Planner. Indeed, I acknowledge that I was influenced by the Town Planner, but not by his personality or the fact that he is a "nice bloke". It was the cogeny of his case that impressed me. The member for West Torrens said that only a small area was involved, but to have that small area referred to the overall report, and to know that every council in the metropolitan area will say, "We shall do a bit of a jigsaw puzzle and shift a certain area to some other section", will mean that it will not be long before the Town Planner's recommendations will have no effect at all. The Town Planner pointed out another example of where this is likely to happen soon.

I deeply regret that this action is making a guinea pig out of the West Torrens council, but we have to start somewhere. I think it was the week before the West Torrens by-law was considered that the Mitcham council had a similar matter before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. It was certainly before we heard the Town Planner's evidence and I thought at the time, "Let the councils run their own affairs." However, we realized that, seeing that Mitcham was in the district of the honourable member who is the Chairman of the committee, perhaps we should have that matter restored to our files, which was done for the sake of consistency. Several rezoning matters are before the committee in which councils have stated that they have drafted proposals after consultation with the Town Planner. If some councils can do that why should others not? We want to create this precedent, because the real fact of the matter is that, whatever Party is in power, not only do we have to face up to the fact that the house-building programme in South Australia is badly lagging behind its needs: we also have to face up to our responsibilities on such matters as slum clearances, redevelopment projects, and so on. This can be achieved only if the report of the Town Planning Committee (on which local government was fairly well represented and whose report has been accepted by this Parliament) is endorsed and given a few teeth by this Parliament.

Mr. BOCKELBERG secured the adjournment of the debate.

HONEY MARKETING ACT REVIVAL AND AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 1. Page 714.)

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I support the Bill which, sets up the machinery for the continuation of the Honey Marketing Board's activities, that is, if the beekeepers themselves desire the board to continue. Last evening when I moved the adjournment of this debate I was in the process of preparing an amendment but I had had no time to distribute copies. So that all members would have time to consider the amendment, I secured the adjournment of the debate. I did this in courtesy to other members, and it is a courtesy I expect other members to extend to me.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I rise on the second reading to refer to only one point. As the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters)

said last evening in his second reading speech, some time ago the old Honey Board got into difficulties, and much money was lost as a result. I do not intend to say more than that but I do refer, as the member for Murray referred last night, to one result that flowed from that unfortunate happening: namely, that the Auditor-General, Mr. Jeffery, made a report to the Minister concerning what had happened. I do not intend to go into the whys and wherefores as to the contents of that report. It has not been made generally public and the only part to which I refer is the paragraph at the end of the report, where Mr. Jeffery, having investigated the matter obviously with great care, recommended that the board be reconstituted to provide for three producer representatives, three packer representatives and an independent chairman with no direct interest in the honey industry. Mr. Jeffery, an officer of this Parliament is a man upon whom we, as members of this House, rely to a great extent. After what has happened there should obviously be a tightening up of financial procedures and, to carry out the recommendations made by the Auditor-General, there should at least be an independent chairman of the Honey Board.

I very much regret that the Government has not gone further than clause 6 regarding financial tightening up, and I regret even more deeply that it has apparently ignored altogether the recommendation made by the Auditor-General, in his report to the Minister, that there should be an independent chairman of the Honey Board. The House should consider these important matters before the Bill passes. I have had discussions with members on this side of the House concerning the reconstitution of the board, and I am willing to believe that it is desirable, despite Mr. Jeffery's recommendation, that there should be a predominance of producer members on the board. I believe very strongly indeed that there should also be an independent chairman, and I intend at the appropriate time when (if I may say so with the utmost respect) you, Mr. Speaker, are out of the way, to develop that point. It would not be relevant to do so now, nor would you allow me to do so. I simply at this stage point to the defect in the Bill which I hope can be remedied later.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the Bill. In company with the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) I have in the past few months had discussions with producers of honey who were gravely concerned about the operations of the old Honey Board. As the member for

Murray has pointed out, we had such discussions as late as last week, when we discussed with those people some provisions of this Bill. What exercises my mind is the provision on voting for the producer members. The roll to be prepared by the Minister for the four districts will include the names of the producers, but I point out that producers are not prevented from registering hives in the names of their children and thus obtaining more votes. It has been pointed out that in some instances a babe in arms has, by this method, been registered as a producer.

Mr. Freebairn: It is very difficult to stamp it out.

Mr. CURREN: The only way it could be stamped out would be for the producer to have his name on the House of Assembly roll as a prerequisite to having his name included on the producers' roll.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: A person 19 years of age, even though he had a thousand hives, could still not be on the roll.

Mr. CURREN: Perhaps it could be provided that anybody over the school-leaving age who had the required number of hives could be registered. In previous legislation concerning boards (notably the Acts passed last year in respect of oriental fruit moth and red scale) the provisions for the abolition of a board required that a certain number of registered growers had to vote before the poll was valid. I cannot see any such provision in this Bill, which provides simply that a majority of those who vote are required to be either for or against the proposal.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Constitution of Board."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

In new subsection (3) after "section" to insert "one member, who shall be the chairman of the board, shall be appointed by the Governor."

The effect of this and the other amendments in my name is that the number of members of the board shall remain at seven, the number of members elected by the producers will remain at four, and the number to be selected by the Minister from nominees of the South Australian Honey Packers' Association shall be reduced from three to two. I understand that, although the old Act provided for three packer representatives, only two were nominated, so I do not think this amendment will upset anybody. It will allow for a producer majority, and it will also allow for what I

think is of extreme importance, in view of the Auditor-General's recommendation, namely, an independent chairman. The chairman would be appointed by the Governor, on the recommendation of the Government, and although I have not provided for it in so many words in the amendment I assume that he would be neither packer nor producer; that discretion would be left to the Minister in making the recommendation to His Excellency. My amendment gives effect to the recommendation of the Auditor-General, while not upsetting the preponderance of producer representatives on the board.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I cannot accept the amendment, which is entirely out of line with the policy Parliament has adopted in the matter of stabilized marketing procedures. It is not correct to say that an independent chairman has been recommended by the Auditor-General, for it is only partly the recommendation. The Auditor-General's report was made at the request of the board. The board experienced great difficulty and asked that the Auditor-General report on its affairs. I have always looked on that report as the property of the board. In the course of his report, the main purpose of which was to investigate the problems the board had experienced, the Auditor-General recommended that the board should consist of equal members of packers and producers with a chairman to be appointed by the Governor.

I have the greatest confidence in the Auditor-General, who is an outstanding auditor with wide experience in marketing problems, but that does not mean that his recommendations for the framing of stabilized marketing schemes have to be accepted. This is the Honey Marketing Bill and the whole problem is the marketing of honey; it is the producers' honey and their problem is to market it. If there are equal numbers of packers and producers this would not leave the control of the industry in the producers' hands. The member for Mitcham recognizes that. He has taken away one representative of the packers and replaced him with a member to be appointed by the Governor who shall have no interest in the industry in any way. This disqualifies each of the four elected producers from becoming chairman and, if anything, is designed to weaken the producers' confidence in a marketing scheme. Therefore, the four best men the industry can produce will be out of the running for the job of chairman of their own board.

The industry has had considerable marketing trouble. The board has had difficulties not only within its own administration but also with competition from other States. I have much sympathy for the board and the industry. As a result of problems, the honey producers took a long time to decide what they wanted. Finally they brought forward this proposal which, in general, is included in the Bill as it now stands and should satisfy everybody in the industry. Some producers clearly oppose the existence of a board, and the petition asking for a vote on the establishment of a board included the names of people both for and against the future of the board.

If there is an unfavourable vote on the poll the Bill provides for winding up arrangements and if the vote is favourable it provides for producer control of the industry. It would be a serious blow to producer control of the industry if the right were taken away to have a chairman appointed from elected members. Further, it would greatly influence votes in the future. Even those opposed to the existence of the board who will, perhaps, vote against it would support the Bill because of the poll provided in it. Those in favour of the board would also support the Bill because they would want to vote to confirm their confidence in the system. If the system were changed and the right of chairmanship of the board taken away from elected producers, the attitude of producers throughout the industry would be greatly altered.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you distinguishing between this board and the Potato Marketing Board?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am talking about honey, not potatoes. If one makes comparisons with other boards, one can find something to suit any case if one seeks far enough. Parliament has generally considered that producers should control their own marketing schemes and that such schemes should be designed to meet their wishes. I strongly urge that we do not tamper with these arrangements, which were arrived at after long deliberations within the industry by the producers concerned and have been generally agreed upon. By passing the Bill in its present form we will meet the requests of producers whether they are for or against the future of the board.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I know all members appreciate the interest shown by the member for Mitcham in this legislation and, at first sight, I thought that his amendment was desirable. However, on reflection I realize

that representations I have received from beekeepers in the Watervale-Auburn district indicated that they had no real concern with the set-up of the board provided in the Bill. As their spokesman and in their interests I oppose the amendment.

Mr. BYWATERS: I have complete sympathy for the amendment of the member for Mitcham. I favour an independent chairman. The reason for the past discontent was the feeling that there was insufficient know-how for the board to have the confidence of the growers. I pay due respect to the former Honey Board. This feeling has been spoken of often and I believe that the Auditor-General had that in mind when he made his recommendation. The member for Mitcham has bent over backwards trying to bring this board into line with other boards. Last night I said that I was not in favour of having the same number of growers and packers on the board. I consider that, if anything, membership should be weighted in favour of the growers. This applies not only to this board but to others.

Mr. Laucke: It is fundamental.

Mr. BYWATERS: It is. I cannot understand the Minister's objection. It seems that he suggests that a member of the elected representatives should be the chairman. Does that apply to the Potato and Egg Boards?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Eggs are a much more staple diet for the community.

Mr. BYWATERS: That has not been evident of late. The industry has been suffering from instability. I support the amendment, unless the Minister can convince me otherwise.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You are against producer control?

Mr. BYWATERS: No.

Mr. Shannon: You need a lawyer as chairman!

Mr. BYWATERS: That is an unfair comment. No suggestion has been made that the chairman should be any class of person.

Mr. Clark: There is no reason why he should not be a lawyer if he is the right type.

Mr. BYWATERS: That is so, especially if he is capable.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Give me one reason, apart from the Auditor-General's report, why there should be an independent chairman.

Mr. Millhouse: That is a cogent enough reason in itself.

Mr. BYWATERS: Considerable discontent has existed in the industry, and because of this many people were not satisfied with the former set-up. It is necessary to appoint someone capable of giving the best to the industry.

Mr. HARDING: I support the clause in its present form. The retiring members of the board had experience and a knowledge of the industry. They were outstanding men, and the only way to prove whether a person has knowledge is to see whether he is successful in his own field. This amendment will not be acceptable to producers. The Australian Honey Board was appointed after years of consideration and years of failures of various types of organization. A producer member is chairman of that board because he knows the industry. This is not an industry like the wheat or wool industry. It has all the problems in the world and only a successful honey producer knows them. The Auditor-General did not reflect on the chairman of the board, nor did he believe that the board made mistakes. The mistakes were made because the board's authority was not observed. I will read this extract from the minutes of the 21st annual general meeting of members held at 62 Gawler Place, Adelaide, on Tuesday, January 17, 1961, at 2.30 p.m. Under the heading "Directors" it states:

Mr. Harding announced to the meeting that he did not seek re-election as a Director, and explained that ever since his election to Parliament he had known that there must come a time when he would with reluctance have to relinquish his office as a director of the society. He had felt that he should continue until the society had overcome its major difficulties and now felt that he could retire with confidence. He spoke of the early days of the honey industry, how he had gone from beekeeper to beekeeper canvassing the establishment of an association which subsequently, with the S.A.F.U., conducted a voluntary pool to enable honey to be exported. The pool failed because the beekeepers failed to support it. In 1939 came the establishment of the Australian Honey Producers. While he had kissed his first £1 goodbye, the society had surprised him. It had grown in membership and in strength, the loyalty of members had been considerable, especially in the moving to the present premises. Notwithstanding the failure of the Walworth Group and its consequent loss, the society was still functioning. He commented on the establishment of the S.A. Honey Board and the men who had given their best to set it going.

Under the heading "Presentation" it states:

The directors and members expressed their sorrow that Mr. Harding was retiring after 21 years of very valuable service, not only to the society, but the industry in general. Mr. Weidenhofer described Mr. Harding as a very successful chairman. One who always conducted the meetings so that there was in the main a unanimous vote, and never had to use his casting vote. His wise counsel would be missed. As a token of appreciation and respect Mr. Harding was presented with a business

satchel suitably inscribed. Mr. A. A. Weir (who was the first secretary of the association and whose occupation was consulting engineering chemist) in supporting the motion commented on the activities of Mr. Harding at interstate conferences and his battles for the rights of South Australians.

Resolved that this society record its humble appreciation of the great contribution to the affairs of the society and the industry that Mr. Harding had made over some 40 years.

Mr. Reeher (who at that time was president of the S.A.A.A. and at present is occupying his second term as president of the S.A. Apiarists Association) expressed the opinion that all Mr. Harding's work had been for the beekeeper first and last.

The chairman must be a producer, and, if this Bill is to be thrown overboard, then we should accept the present amendment.

Mr. HALL: I oppose the amendment. It seems that the main reason for it is that the Auditor-General has recommended it, but we cannot believe that in policy matters his is always the last word. If it were, our presence here would be unnecessary because we could delegate policy-making matters to public servants. Last year the Auditor-General criticized the South Australian Egg Board, and poultry producers were greatly perplexed by his criticism of the board's quitting stocks of eggs at low prices. At that time there was no place to sell the eggs other than the market on which they were sold. Eggs are perishable and cannot be kept indefinitely. A practical man's experience would automatically negate that criticism by the Auditor-General. The board was applying one of the best-known methods of quitting stocks of perishable eggs on the market, at a time when no other course was available. The Auditor-General's recommendations are not necessarily correct. This board has not a monopoly of the industry, such as the Wheat or Barley Board has. Trading in other States does not greatly influence the board's activities. In this instance we have a valuable product, particularly in regard to weight. Eggs can be transported easily but the board has had great difficulty in marketing the producer's goods properly. Therefore, every attempt should be made to weight the grower representation on the board. The best way to do this is to give producers a majority and to give them the chairmanship.

Mr. SHANNON: The mover of the amendment is not game to leave the representation on the board at 50/50, as the Auditor-General recommended. I think that he does not like marketing legislation and that this is an adroit method of defeating a measure he does not like.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense!

Mr. SHANNON: The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) indulged in a little nonsense, too. He opposed a producer as chairman of the board. This is an obvious attempt to defeat what producers have requested. Some people have been taken for a ride; they are not as adroit at seeing the way the wind blows as they should be. If this amendment were carried, the Bill would be virtually defeated, as it would be akin to saying that a producer was not fit to run his own business. If this is the approach of some members, they should vote against the measure, as the amendment would really achieve that purpose. The member for Murray will go around his district and say he approved of four producer members on the board, but he will not say he did not want one as chairman. This amendment is an attempt to get through the back door quietly.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE (Minister of Lands): Although Parliament has many rights and powers, I do not think it should impose on producers something they do not want. This Bill is a product of many consultations with leaders in the honey industry, and they have asked for this. If we give producers an opportunity to vote and they do not favour what is being done, they will vote against it. I know that they will oppose having the chairmanship of the board taken out of their hands. If we carry this amendment, it will do more than anything to prevent the establishment of the board that I think most producers want.

Mr. HEASLIP: The Minister has conferred with the honey producers and has gone to much trouble to get a satisfactory arrangement, and I am certain that if those producers were dissatisfied with the Bill they would have approached me and expressed their dissatisfaction. The whole question is whether the producers can run their own affairs, and I have confidence in them to do just that; therefore I oppose the amendment.

Mr. RICHES: The producers are capable of running their own affairs, and I do not think they would favour a board unless they were running it. I would go along with that part of the member for Mitcham's amendment which suggests reducing the number of packer representatives to two, and I would be happy to increase the number of grower representatives to five, with one of the growers to be appointed chairman. I have always held that the people who handle production should not have as much say in an industry as those whose sole livelihood depends on it and who are the real producers and the backbone of the industry.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: The packers are important people.

Mr. RICHES: Yes, and I am not saying they should not be represented. However, I think that if the board is going to operate at all it should be a growers' board. I shall support the member for Mitcham if he persists in that part of his amendment to reduce the number of packers' representatives to two.

Mr. LAUCKE: I strongly oppose the amendment. The Honey Board has had great difficulties in the past and the Bill is designed to provide a more satisfactory industry for growers. I believe the interests of beekeepers will best be served by retaining the clause as it now stands, because it provides a grower predominance on the board and enables a grower to be chairman. The clause is fundamental to the success of any future operations of the Honey Board.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I, too, oppose the amendment. Growers should control their own affairs as they will be happier doing that than they otherwise would be. Both the members for Mitcham and Murray had in mind the best interests of the producer, but it is a question of how those interests are to be served.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I regret that the amendment has not received the general support it deserves. However, while it will obviously not find favour with the Committee my aim has been partly achieved because the recommendation of the Auditor-General has now been aired and tested in Parliament, as it should have been.

Mr. BYWATERS: Earlier, when I spoke to the amendment, I was inclined to support it. I believed the purpose behind it was good and that the member for Mitcham had achieved something in drawing the attention of members to the Auditor-General's report. I do not intend to wreck the board or this Bill. If beekeepers wish to have this board, I shall give it my blessing and be 100 per cent behind it. I do not want it thought that I am against the continuance of the board. I am not worrying about the comments of the member for Onkaparinga, but having heard other speakers and paying due respect to what they have said, if there is any possibility of upsetting the board by the passing of this amendment I shall not support it. What the member for Mitcham said has much merit, and I commend him for drawing member's attention to these facts.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 4—“Election of producer members.”

Mr. CURREN: I move:

In new subsection (5) after “in that district” to insert “and who are fifteen years of age or over”.

This is to overcome fears of plural voting by producers who register their hives in the names of their children.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This is a sensible and democratic amendment, and I support it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—“Audit.”

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I move:

After new subsection (3) to insert the following new subsection:

(4) The Board shall as soon as possible after the close of each financial year prepare a report of its proceedings during that financial year, including a statement showing its receipts and expenditure during that year, and shall present the report and statement to the Minister.

The Minister shall as early as practicable lay the report before Parliament.

The object of this amendment is to allow Parliament access to the affairs of the Honey Board, which for too long have been shrouded in secrecy. If this amendment is carried, the board's activities will at least have some ventilation in Parliament. Nearly all the complaints I have received from bee farmers in my district have concerned this secrecy.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 13) and title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EXCHANGE OF LAND: PARNDANA.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

ROAD AND RAILWAY TRANSPORT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road and Railway Transport Act, 1930-1963, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 15, at 2 p.m.