

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 28, 1966.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS**BANK HOLIDAY.**

Mr. HALL: I am sure the Premier remembers my recent question concerning an approach by the Bank Officials Association of South Australia for a holiday on Tuesday, December 27, and the request for that day to be declared a bank holiday; but the Premier said that, at present, Cabinet could not accede to this request. Subsequently, the association circulated a petition to its members concerning this matter and obtained 5,000 signatures to it. As officials have requested me to ask the Premier whether he will receive the bank officials (with their petition) and me as a deputation to discuss this matter further, will he do so?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If it is a question of receiving a deputation introduced by the Leader, I will receive it.

RESERVOIRS.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Works say whether the recent rains were sufficient to fill the Warren reservoir, which serves the major part of the Barossa Valley in my electoral district, and whether an appreciable gallonage of the overflow is flowing through to the South Para reservoir?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yesterday I received a brief report from the Engineering and Water Supply Department regarding the metropolitan Adelaide reservoirs and the Warren and South Para reservoirs. Recent heavy rains over the catchment areas of the metropolitan reservoirs dependent on the rivers Onkaparinga, Torrens and Myponga during the past week have resulted in large natural intakes of 3,500,000,000 gallons to these reservoirs. The present total holding is 19,660,000,000 gallons, compared with 16,470,000,000 gallons at this time last year. The Millbrook and Hope Valley reservoirs are practically full. Pumping through the Mannum-Adelaide main to all metropolitan reservoirs can be discontinued for a limited period as from 7.30 a.m. today. The recent intakes represent a saving of \$220,000 in power costs by the consequent reduction in pumping from the Murray River. During the past week, the Warren reservoir filled and is at present overflowing down the Para River to

the South Para reservoir. South Para reservoir storage in the same period increased from 4,710,000,000 to 5,590,000,000 gallons.

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, a decision on the request made by a deputation representing pensioner organizations that I introduced to the Minister of Transport recently regarding the times on week days when concession travel will be available for pensioners?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague states that he has arranged for the Municipal Tramways Trust and the South Australian Railways to alter the commencing time for concession travel for pensioners on week days from 9.30 a.m. to 9 a.m. This alteration will operate from October 1 and will also apply on private bus services licensed by the trust. The Minister also states that the present concessions provide that on week days travel cannot commence in the metropolitan area before 9.30 a.m. or after 4 p.m. Careful consideration has been given to the possibility of extending these hours of travel and, although the Government would like to assist by extending the time of commencement of travel to after 4 p.m., this is not possible, as afternoon peaks commence between 3.30 and 4 p.m., when many schoolchildren are travelling to their homes and when the employees of industrial concerns are finishing work for the day.

There is little surplus capacity on public transport operating after these times, and additional patrons would make it necessary to augment services over this period. To extend the concession beyond 4 p.m. on week days would require additional vehicles and additional staff, even though they may be required only for a limited time during the peak. For these reasons, it is not possible to extend the concessions beyond journeys commencing up to 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

EYRE PENINSULA ELECTRICITY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Can the Minister of Works say how far work has progressed on the powerline from Whyalla to Port Lincoln, when it can be expected that the work will be finished, and when it is expected that the Polda water scheme and Lock will be linked with the transformer station between Cleve and Rudall?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall try to get that information for the honourable member by tomorrow.

ECHUNGA HOUSING.

Mr. SHANNON: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked last week about the possibility of providing houses urgently needed at Echunga?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Some months ago the Housing Trust purchased an area of land at Echunga. The land could not be properly drained or subdivided until an additional piece of land was purchased. This has now been done, and a preliminary layout of the whole area has been prepared. This will be put before the council shortly and, if it be approved (the trust has every reason to believe that it will be approved), the trust will commence building four houses on part of the land immediately.

CHOWILLA DAM.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of September 21 relating to the Chowilla dam, in which I suggested that embankments be constructed to confine the waters to as small an area as possible?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports:

There are extensive areas of flat ground adjacent to Chowilla that would be inundated at full storage level, and these have been examined in detail. Designs have been prepared for embankments to limit the water spread in a number of places. Apart from preventing unnecessary flooding, the embankments will be useful in preserving several homestead and occupied areas and giving access to essential works. The details of embankments around the upper parts of the Chowilla storage that are to be incorporated in the scheme cannot yet be given with accuracy, but they may be 15 miles or more in length.

GAS.

Mr. COUMBE: Yesterday the Premier laid on the table a report of the submission he had made to the Commonwealth Treasurer on natural gas, and I thank him for doing this in response to a question on the matter. As an integral part of this report deals with the financing of the natural gas pipeline, and as I understand from press reports that the Premier was cordially received by the Prime Minister, can the Premier say, in view of the importance of this matter, whether the Prime Minister has specified any time by which the submissions made will be answered? If such a time has not been specified, can the Premier say when a reply from the Prime Minister is expected?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No definite time was stated; the reply could be forthcoming

within a few weeks, but that is as far as I am prepared to go at this stage.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In the report tabled yesterday there was much information dealing with the case prepared by Bechtel Pacific Corporation, and last week a member of the corporation's staff made public much information regarding the report it was preparing. Has the Premier considered several requests that the Bechtel report be tabled for the information of honourable members?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If the honourable member is speaking of the original report by Bechtel Pacific Corporation, I can say that it is now worthless, because it was prepared before the field was discovered at Moomba. Much of the corporation's analysis is included in the report tabled yesterday.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Will the second report be tabled?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I understand that the honourable member has a combined report.

SCHOOL WINDOWS.

Mr. McANANEY: I have received this week from the cleaner at the Strathalbyn High School a letter in which he maintains that he has already cleaned the high school windows for the three times this year, and yet his salary has been reduced as from October 1. Further, the reduction is twice as much as it should have been, in his opinion, bearing in mind the amount of work undertaken. If I supply the Minister of Education with the relevant information, will he have this case considered?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes, I should be pleased if the honourable member would do that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My question concerns the decision by the Education Department no longer to employ official school window cleaners. The Minister surely realizes that, once in a while at least, school windows will have to be cleaned or obviously they will become so dirty that they will not fulfil their function. As schools are Government property, will anyone wishing to clean these windows have to get official permission? Can any school committee without obtaining official permission clean school windows? Can a schoolteacher or schoolchildren without official permission clean school windows? Is it permissible now for school windows to be cleaned by unofficial

cleaners? In the event of an accident occurring in the cleaning of windows, will the unofficial cleaners be covered by compensation?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have already said that, if school windows are dirty to the extent that they need cleaning, they can be cleaned by being hosed down, as is the custom in many schools in New South Wales. The question whether these windows will have to be cleaned other than by that means remains to be seen. I have already pointed out that often, when bad weather follows the cleaning of school windows (which had to be cleaned three times a year) they become dirty and the effect of the cleaning largely disappears. As regards the honourable member's question about obtaining permission, matters of this sort are in the hands of the headmasters. I have the utmost faith in our headmasters' capabilities in dealing with these questions. They will decide what has to be done in this regard; they do not need authority from me to deal with all the minor matters that arise in the schools. I prefer the authority in these matters to remain with the headmasters and not to interfere with this sort of thing at the schools. I am certain that the headmasters will take all the necessary steps to see that no-one runs into danger as a consequence of any instruction a headmaster may give.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In answer to the honourable member for Gumeracha, the Minister has repeated what he has said before in this House: that if it is necessary to clean windows at all it can be done by hosing down. This may be possible, even though inconvenient and not a very thorough way of cleaning ground floor windows; but it is entirely impossible, of course, when one gets up to first floor or higher floor windows. How does the Minister see the windows above the ground floor being kept clean? Secondly, I understand that instructions have been given to headmasters to economize on the use of power and light in schools. If the windows are dirty and the lights are not to be used, the children's eyesight could suffer. Therefore, can the Minister clarify the instructions that have been given on this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member is extremely capable of drawing on his imagination in these situations, as we all know. Of course, the question of how high a window one can clean by means of hosing depends on water pressure, and I suggest that if the honourable member tries when he is home, with his finger over the end of the

hose, he will find that he can make a jet of water go a long way if he has good pressure. Regarding the question of economizing in the use of electricity, I can tell the honourable member that the electricity bill in our schools is a very considerable item indeed, and it is extremely hard to control this adequately.

However, we have asked the headmasters, in the cause of economy, to exercise as much care as they can in the schools with the use of electricity, from the point of view particularly of not leaving lights on and not using power unnecessarily. We are not restricting its use when it is required. I see no difficulty in this, and I would imagine that the honourable member would be behind the Government in its endeavours to run our schools economically.

SHEEP EXPORTS.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Agriculture further information about the question I asked last week concerning the fall in the export of fat lambs from South Australia to the United Kingdom which is concerning people engaged in the industry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The latest Smithfield price quoted for first-grade Australian lamb 29-36 lb. is 21½d.-22½d. a pound sterling. This compares with 26d.-26½d. a pound for the corresponding period in 1965, and represents a fall of about 4d. a pound sterling. Using an average Smithfield price of 22d. sterling for first-grade lamb, as above, and deducting for freight and other charges at the United Kingdom end, the value of these lambs f.o.b. at any Australian port at present would be A16.89c a pound and this makes no allowance for treatment charges, charges to f.o.b. or exporter's profit or other commissions. When the increase of 10 per cent in refrigerated freight rates comes into operation on October 1, the value of lambs will be further reduced by about A48c to A16.41c a pound f.o.b. Australian ports, less treatment charges, commissions and exporter's profit. These charges and margins could be roundly assessed at about 4c a pound, thus bringing back the value of the lamb to the producer to around 12.4c a pound dressed carcass weight, and this would be the maximum price he could expect at present. This must be considered a very low price to the producer, and is the reason why many thousands of lambs from South Australia are being sold at better prices to the Eastern States for local consumption this year. As far as this movement of lambs affects treatment works in this State,

the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs has been harder hit than has the Port Lincoln works, as the following figures will show:

Export lambs treated this season up to and including September 22, 1966, with the approximate corresponding figures for 1965.

	1965.	1966.
Gepps Cross . . .	23,000	19,199
Port Lincoln . . .	9,000	20,191

The figures clearly show that, whereas the Port Lincoln killings have doubled, Gepps Cross killings have been reduced. The increase at Port Lincoln can be attributed, in part, to its comparative isolation from the competition from the Eastern States, and also to our increased killing capacity this year. Due to the intensive effort to train new slaughtermen, we have been able to handle all lambs offering to date without any delays. We have therefore lost fewer lambs to other works than we lost last year. The fact that we have not, as yet, increased our export treatment charges at Port Lincoln this year could also be responsible to some extent.

The numbers of lambs taken away alive from the five weekly markets conducted at Port Lincoln so far are as follows:

To Victorian works . . .	2,417 (Portland)
To South Australian works	1,024 (Noarlunga)
Total ..	3,441

The Eyre Peninsula Stock Marketing Company is still finding it impossible to get sufficient lambs into its weekly markets to fill its quota and, if it were not for the numbers of lambs being purchased on the properties by exporters, the position at Port Lincoln would not be as good as it is. I still have not been able to find an explanation for this situation, because when prices are low producers usually prefer to submit their lambs for auction, where they should expect to obtain the best prices. The numbers of lambs coming into both works should show some increase when interstate competition eases off within the next week or two, but the United Kingdom price for imported lamb does not augur well for a good export lamb season.

MODBURY INFANTS SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: I understand that the Minister of Works has a reply to my question of September 21 about the details of the tender for the new Modbury Infants School.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have ascertained from the Director, Public Buildings Department, that a contract for the erection of a new infants school at Modbury was let to

Allan Tosolini Proprietary Limited on September 5, 1966. The contract documents were signed on September 21, 1966, and the completion time stated for the performance of the work in 26 weeks.

HOVERCRAFT.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: On August 25 I asked the Minister of Marine to ascertain the classification of hovercraft, in other words, whether they were to be classed as sea-going passenger craft, for in view of the proposed establishment of a hovercraft service across Spencer Gulf the matter that I raised in the question on that occasion was very important. I also understand that Miss Birdseye, of Birdseye Motor Services, is about to go to England (or has gone overseas) to investigate this matter further. Has the Minister investigated this matter and has he come to any conclusion about his ability to protect the service against competition from any similar vessel under the terms of the provisions that he administers and the powers that he possesses, or is the question still unresolved?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: A good deal of investigation has been made into this complex problem. I have received a report from the General Manager of the Harbors Board, who points out that to give a definition of what this craft may be is very difficult, although it is assumed at this stage that it will be classed as a sea-going vessel. This would give the board the right to survey the vessel and issue a survey certificate, but to give protection against any other persons who wanted to operate in competition with the proposed service we considered that the board would be hard pressed to give any reason why it should not make a survey of another vessel if requested to do so. I can assure the honourable member that the matter is still being investigated, and I am endeavouring to obtain further information from the Commonwealth authorities.

BARLEY ADVANCE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Some time ago I asked whether the Government would consider getting financial assistance through the bank in order to assist the Barley Board to make a higher first advance on barley. Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes. Cabinet has fully considered the request for the State Government to guarantee the Reserve Bank the amount to cover the freight and administration charges of the Barley Board. Having

called for reports from the Australian Barley Board, the Auditor-General and the Under Treasurer, the Government is unable to accede to the request. It would be necessary for both the Victorian and South Australian Governments to legislate for this provision and, even if this were done, there would be no guarantee that it would stop interstate trading in barley, particularly in a year of light harvest, such as last year.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT.

Mr. NANKIVELL: On September 13 the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, replied to a question I had asked regarding the break-up of the allocations to various councils in the South-Eastern and Eastern districts, but it was admitted that the reply was incomplete. Has he now the remainder of the answer?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that the allocations under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act to the two districts concerned were South-Eastern \$245,580, and Eastern, \$563,160. These figures were previously supplied in an answer to a question on August 11.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning an article in the *Advertiser* dealing with cruelty to animals?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have a lengthy report on this matter from the Commissioner of Police. I ask that it be included in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

REPORT.

Inquiries have been made regarding the article headed "Society's Fears Over Coursing" published in the *Advertiser* on September 14, 1966. It has been established that two veterinary surgeons were interviewed by the writer of the article and the latter has reported them with considerable licence.

Veterinary Surgeon "A" now states that he has treated one case of a "declawed" cat approximately 2½ years ago, and he formed the opinion that the cat had been declawed for the purpose of "bleeding" a dog. He has no evidence to substantiate this. About 15 months ago the same surgeon saw the remains of a rabbit which he believed (without evidence) had been thrown alive to greyhounds. He has only witnessed one case of deliberate "bleeding" of a dog and that was about 15 years ago in Sydney. Apart from this instance he cannot substantiate one case of "bleeding" in this State.

Veterinary Surgeon "B" has never seen a "declawed" cat but has seen a number of cats in a state of abject terror. Injuries to grey-

hounds have been treated at the surgery, particularly on Sunday afternoons when greyhound racing takes place. It was surmised from the injuries that the dogs had been fighting over a live lure. No case of "bleeding" of a greyhound can be substantiated by this veterinary surgeon.

Other veterinary surgeons were interviewed but they had no knowledge of the practice of "bleeding" of greyhounds in this State, and are of the opinion that it is a fallacy to believe that "bleeding" is essential to the good performance of a dog.

Mr. R. E. Mitchell, Chairman of the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club Inc., was interviewed. He stated that from his own experiences and from discussions with veterinary surgeons, he considers there is no substance in the article. He is an advocate of greyhound racing, as opposed to live hare coursing. He states that the greyhound racing is conducted at Thebarton on Friday nights and trials are conducted at either Waterloo Corner or Elizabeth on Sundays. The race meeting attracts an average of 700 people and the trials between 400 and 500 people.

Mr. Alsop, President of the National Coursing Association, the governing body of about forty greyhound clubs, in 40 years' experience in coursing has never seen evidence of the "bleeding" of greyhounds. Any dog owner detected engaging in any malpractices would be debarred from the Association. He believes the article has a special significance being published at this time when next week a Bill will be introduced in Parliament seeking amendments to the Coursing Restriction Act of 1927 to permit the use of mechanical lures. This Bill would be followed by another seeking amendments to the Lottery and Gaming Act to provide totalizer betting facilities at coursing meetings. Mr. Alsop favours retention of live coursing with hares, a proposal which does not meet with the approval of the R.S.P.C.A.

The attitude of the R.S.P.C.A. to coursing is expressed in the appended document which also refers to factual cases of "bleeding" of greyhounds interstate. Mr. Colley, Secretary of the R.S.P.C.A., considers that such cases give strength to his belief that "bleeding" does occur in this State, but he is unable to substantiate any instances of "bleeding". He adopts the remarks attributed to him in the article written by Mr. Cockburn.

The Secretary of the Animal Welfare League of South Australia, Mrs. Richardson, was interviewed concerning a letter written by her and published in the *Advertiser* of August 15, 1965, in which she said she had seen what had been done to a cat in preparation for "blood" training. The cat had been found in an injured state and the assistance of Mrs. Richardson had been sought. She immediately concluded that the cat had been used for "bleeding" purposes. She now concedes that her views were opinion only.

As far as can be ascertained, no person has been convicted in this State for an offence of cruelty involving the use of a live animal for the purpose of "bleeding" a greyhound. Police inquiries made reveal that there is no evidence

to substantiate that the "bleeding" of grey-hounds is practised in this State.

BARLEY MOISTURE CONTENT.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: One of the problems in handling bulk barley is to ensure that the moisture content is reduced sufficiently to make the barley acceptable for storage in silos. Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of September 20 asking him to inquire of his department whether tests were being conducted on the receipt of bulk barley with a moisture content greater than 13 per cent?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: In conjunction with the Agriculture Departments in South Australia and Victoria and the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, the Australian Barley Board has been carrying out large-scale storage trials with bulk barley received at the prescribed maximum moisture content and at significantly higher moisture contents for the past few years. The information secured from these trials has enabled the board to raise progressively the maximum permissible moisture content for bulk barley deliveries from 11.5 per cent in 1962-63 to 12 per cent in 1963-64 and 1964-65, and to 13 per cent in 1965-66.

Aeration equipment in silos constructed for the board has probably been an important factor in enabling this increase in allowable moisture. Trials will be continued both in Victoria and South Australia in 1966-67. The board appreciates the point raised by the honourable member and, in the light of the continued results from experiments, will fix as high a moisture content as is consistent with safe storage of the grain.

KALANGADOO SCHOOL.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of last week about the Kalangadoo school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states that work on the sinking of a bore and installation of pumping equipment is expected to be completed by the end of October this year, when the school will be ready for occupation. The building, which is in Samcon construction, has been built on a new site (as the honourable member knows), and arrangements will be made to occupy it as soon as it is available.

MAIN NORTH ROAD.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, replies to my recent questions concerning access to the Main North Road and the possibility of an

overpass being built at the Cavan road and rail crossing?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Regarding access to the Main North Road, my colleague reports that, as provided by the Highways Act 1929-1960, a proclamation by His Excellency the Governor declaring a section of the Main North Road a controlled access road was published in the *Government Gazette* of December 22, 1960. Mr. Dunow's property abuts this section of the road. The Commissioner of Highways has power under the Act to prevent the construction of any means of access to any property on a controlled access road. It is not necessary for notations to be made on the title of the land, but the appropriate local authorities are informed.

Regarding the Cavan crossing, my colleague reports that work on the crossing is progressing satisfactorily. An overway will be constructed in early 1968.

The SPEAKER: On this occasion I have allowed a double question to save time. However, I draw honourable members' attention to the need for one question at a time to be asked.

HOLDEN HILL SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of September 22 about the purchase of land for a primary school at Riley Street, Holden Hill?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Negotiations to complete the purchase of 9½ acres for a primary school at Riley Street, Holden Hill, are being effected by the Crown Solicitor. Because of more pressing demands for primary school accommodation in other developing areas, the Education Department has no immediate plans for the establishment of a school on this site.

SCHOOL WINDOWS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question a couple of weeks ago relating to the variation of the contract for the school window cleaner at the Nailsworth Boys Technical High School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Cleaning contracts for floors and windows are arranged as one contract and paid for on the basis of the window and floor area cleaned. The case of Mr. Thomas's contract and similar cases are being considered consequent upon the cessation of the window cleaning portion of the contract, to see whether any anomaly is brought about by the application of the formula that has been used as a basis for computing cleaners' wages for the past 20 years. The

honourable member is correct in understanding that a month's notice is needed to terminate cleaning contracts, but Mr. Thomas's contract has not been terminated. It has been varied by a reduction in the total of the floor and window area to be cleaned, and he will continue to clean the floor area at the contract rate.

FRUITGROWING.

Mr. CURREN: Recently a committee was formed in the Upper Murray area comprising representatives of fruitgrowers' organizations, the object being to investigate all means of reducing costs of production or, alternatively, increasing returns by increased production of fruit. Will the Minister of Agriculture make available to this committee the services of the agricultural economist from his department?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member was kind enough to introduce a deputation from the Upper Murray area on this subject, which asked whether I would make someone available from the department to assist it with regard to costs and other economic aspects. I was interested to hear the proposals of this committee, and I commend it for its efforts in trying to improve its knowledge of the costs of production and other aspects relating to the fruitgrowing industry. I have made available to the committee Mr. Catt, the agricultural economist from the department, and Mr. Middleton, the Secretary of the committee, has been informed and has already written to me thanking me for making Mr. Catt available. Negotiations are taking place about when and where Mr. Catt will meet the committee.

BRAEVIEW WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. SHANNON: About a week ago the Minister of Works received a deputation of my constituents from the Braeview area of O'Halloran Hill, and I have been pressed to discover what success it had in its submissions. Recently I visited the area and, although the deputation submitted that 120 houses had been completed and occupied, I saw a dozen or more in course of construction, and from inquiries I understand that more houses are to be built soon. Because of the urgency and of the difficulties in supplying household needs with one stand-pipe at Candy's, can the Minister say whether something can be done before the coming summer to provide a reticulated water supply for these people?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, the honourable member introduced a deputation and I was impressed by the way it presented its case. Its members were young men trying to do something for themselves. I referred the request to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and received a reply today from the Engineer for Water Supply (Mr. Bates) that the matter was being investigated. There were one or two complications, but he hoped to have a full report available for me next week.

TREES.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, an answer to my recent question regarding the removal of trees along Montefiore Road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, states that he has received the following information from the Town Clerk of the City of Adelaide regarding the removal of trees:

1. Eighty-two trees have been removed along Montefiore Road.

2. Twelve trees are to be removed between the Torrens Lake and War Memorial Drive to permit the construction of the wider Morphett Street and Victoria bridges.

3. The trees near the Morphett Street and Victoria bridges were not due for removal at the time that trees on Montacute Road were receiving publicity; the city council did not postpone the removal of these trees at that time.

4. Thirty trees are yet to be removed to permit the reconstruction of the wider Montefiore Road.

5. No protests have been received by either the city council or the Minister as a result of the removal of these trees.

LANGHORNE CREEK ROAD.

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that funds are available to the District Councils of Mobilong and Strathalbyn for the completion of all except two miles of the Wellington to Langhorne Creek road. Can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, say whether funds will be available to complete this road this year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to refer the question to my colleague and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

ARTERIOSCLEROSIS.

Mr. LAWN: I understand that Mr. Johnston, a Melbourne surgeon, last year commenced to investigate the oxygen therapy

method of treating arteriosclerosis. He told me that he would know within 12 months whether this method was successful. Similar investigations have been carried out at the Royal Adelaide Hospital this year by Professor Jepson. Last weekend I was told that Mr. Johnston was inquiring into the purchase of machines from Germany because investigations in Melbourne and Adelaide were being carried out by hand injection, not by machine. In view of my information that Mr. Johnston is making these inquiries, will the Attorney-General request the Minister of Health to examine this information and obtain Professor Jepson's opinion whether investigations here have reached the stage where further examination of treatment by machine instead of hand injection can be made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall take the matter up with my colleague and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

KAROONDA SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the likelihood of construction of the extensions at the Karoonda Area School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports that design work for this project is proceeding and that tender documents will be completed during the present financial year. The date of calling tenders will depend on the programme determined for new school projects to be commenced during the next financial year, 1967-68.

URANIUM.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Premier comment on recent press reports that the world demand for uranium has increased? If he cannot, will he obtain a report from the Minister of Mines on these reports and on the activities of the Mines Department in the search for uranium in South Australia?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall take up the matter with the Minister of Mines and obtain a reply.

GOODWOOD CROSSING.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, an answer to my recent question regarding an accident at the Victoria Street crossing, Goodwood?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: On Monday, August 22, 1966, at 8.10 p.m. a diesel passenger

railcar travelling from Marino to Adelaide struck a youth who was on the railway line at an unauthorized place between Clarence Park and Goodwood. The point of impact was 270 yards from the Victoria Street, Goodwood, level crossing.

MUTTON EXPORT.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that the killing works at Murray Bridge at present has a valuable contract for the supply of boneless mutton to America and that this is providing a tremendous outlet for fat wethers from the District of Albert. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the present demand is likely to continue or whether this is merely a small contract that is being satisfied immediately by present supplies?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have made frequent visits to the works of the Murray Bridge company, which is buying the sheep referred to. I shall try to ascertain the extent of the market. I know that the company works with a New South Wales company which has the export licence and which is doing the exporting for the Murray Bridge company.

MARINO QUARRY.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines, an answer to my recent question regarding dust control measures being taken at the Marino quarry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have a reply from my colleague, the Minister of Mines, to which he attaches a further report on the measures being taken by the company to abate the dust problem at Linwood quarry. The previous report was made in July last and the current submission comments only on the progress of work since that time. It is considered that satisfactory progress is being made. The officer's report to which my colleague refers is a lengthy document dealing mainly with the system adopted to overcome the dust nuisance. I ask that it be included in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

PROGRESS REPORT ON DUST ABATEMENT AT LINWOOD QUARRY.

On September 26, 1966, I visited the Linwood quarry, and in company with their Area Manager, Mr. S. Blood, I discussed and inspected progress of works in hand to deal with the problem of dust. The following summarizes the current state of affairs:

1. Old Plant (work is being performed at present).

Not completed as per report July 11, 1966.

- (a) Covering in of primary crusher house
- (b) The rolls section

Present situation.

Not yet done.

Screens and bins have been totally enclosed. The feed chute to the new gyratory crusher has also been enclosed.

Work is in progress on elevators.

On the old wooden bins, the present cyclone which is already on the site.

extractor is to be replaced by a larger unit

2. New Plant.

Not completed as per report July 11, 1966.

- (a) Covering in of the primary crusher . .

Present situation.

Not yet done. At present a water spray system has been installed in the actual feed chute. As a truck tips its load, the jaw crusher attendant actuates the sprays.

- (b) Screens and final bins

Completed.

- (c) Scalping plant

Completed.

- (d) 4in. recrushing plant

Completed, and in addition an automatic water spray system has been installed at the point where the material is dumped into the plant.

The ponding system into which the dust extraction piping discharges has been completed and is working.

3. Roads: No further new bitumen has been laid, but nearly all the old bitumen has been resealed using fined aggregate in an attempt to eliminate depressions in which dust could accumulate. On September 26, 1966, the spraying of roads in the area of the overburden dump was actually commenced, using sump oil. A watering truck for use on roadways is in the course of construction. Use has been made of a sweeper, using steel brushes, on the bituminized roadways and has been found to be quite effective. The average width of bitumen as applied to roads is about 24ft. This width should be more than sufficient to enable trucks to keep on the bituminized section. However, it is felt that even these bituminized sections may require watering along the edges when the weather becomes very dry. Owing to wet weather, no experimental work has yet been done to establish the efficacy of various oils and/or chemicals in dust allaying.

4. Dumps and Open Spaces: Generally no work has been attempted because of wet conditions. However, in the sand dumps, which can be very troublesome owing to the large percentage of very fine material, a water main has been laid to the site and the dumps will be hand sprayed as required. This "sand" material is a saleable item and the quantity of material in the dumps can vary enormously from week to week. A representative of the Shell Company is supposed to visit the quarry this week for a discussion on the usage of a material called Terolas with regard to its suitability as a spray for binding the surface of this particular dump. With regard to other dump areas, the present intention is to restrict truck travel to well-defined paths. These paths will be indicated by posts, and the roadways kept treated with oil or some other recommended material.

growing operation so he can make provision for his son's continuance in the horticultural industry. He has installed a new bore and tank and, to operate the electrical pumps and motors, requires three electricity supply poles to be installed. He has offered to pay the full cost of these poles but the Electricity Trust has refused to supply them, saying it is its policy to supply only one regardless of whether the consumer offers to meet the cost of the additional poles. I think the trust should take a more sympathetic view than this. Will the Minister of Works inquire into this matter and see whether the trust can be prevailed upon to provide the necessary poles, for which the applicant is willing to meet the expense?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am convinced that there must be a misunderstanding, but I shall be happy to take up the matter with the trust if the honourable member will supply me with the name.

HOLDEN HILL SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: In May, 1965, there was correspondence between the Engineering and Water Supply Department and residents of Kincaig Crescent and Grand Junction Road, Holden Hill, concerning the extension of sewers to serve their properties. Following the request of some residents of that area, I also wrote to the Minister on this matter, even as late as June this year. As the sewerage has not been connected to these properties, will the Minister of Works obtain a report on the matter, particularly on whether there are any engineering difficulties associated with this project?

ELECTRICITY POLES.

Mr. HALL: A constituent (Mr. C. Mecozzi, of Box 35, Virginia) has bought a property close to Angle Vale to enlarge his vegetable

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to take up the matter with the department and obtain a report for the honourable member.

FISHING.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some time ago, the Minister of Agriculture attended two conferences that dealt with the licensing of amateur fishermen, but it appears from what has been said this afternoon by another Minister that either the portfolio has been taken over by that Minister or the proposal to license amateur fishermen has been dropped. Will the Minister inform me of the correct position?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is incorrect to say that two conferences were held. A conference was to be held between members of both sides of the House but unfortunately the House sat until the early hours of that morning; I think we had breakfast and lunch here that day, so the meeting did not take place. I set another date that was agreed to, but something happened in the meantime that influenced members opposite not to attend this conference, so there was only one conference, which did not last long because the other members did not attend. It was not proposed to deal with amateur fishermen's licences at that conference; licences generally were to be dealt with, and several different types of licence were to be mentioned. A duplicated document was sent to all members interested in fishing, and to the then Leader of the Opposition, although he was not so directly interested, but nothing eventuated from this. The matter mentioned today by the Minister of Marine relates to a survey of fishing vessels, but other matters relating to fisheries will also be considered. I hope the House will agree to the Select Committee and that politics will not enter into this very important industry. It has its problems, to which I do not know all the answers. For this reason, I thought we would be able to get together and, by pooling our knowledge, arrive at some of the answers. As this did not happen, I hope that the Select Committee, which will have power to call witnesses, will be able to provide answers concerning fisheries as well as to the problems affecting the survey of fishing vessels.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY.

Mr. CURREN: On September 13 I asked the Minister of Works to investigate a report that two areas in Victoria were being considered for drainage and in each case it was

proposed to discharge the drainage water into the Murray River or a tributary. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports:

The River Murray Waters Agreement does not deal with the control of water quality except in providing for base flow in South Australia in times of restriction to keep the river fresh. The River Murray Commission is, however, alive to the interests of the several States represented and has a committee to examine and co-ordinate data collection on salinity. At a recent meeting, means of stepping up these inquiries, including the appointment of a full-time officer, were approved. These investigations will cover all parts of the River Murray system where saline waters can occur. Drainage at Shepparton and Kerang is a matter within the control of the State of Victoria, but all the States are concerned with the dangers of increased salinity and are fully co-operating in investigation of salt in the river and ensuring the future of the system.

PARILLA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question relating to the condition of the bore at Parilla?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Mines Department has completed repairs to the bore, which is now operating satisfactorily.

UNIVERSITY STANDARDS.

Mr. SHANNON: Can the Premier say whether there is any variation in the standard, based on academic qualifications, set for a student to continue studies in a faculty? Obviously, there will be some difficulty in suitably housing our increased school population for tertiary education, and obviously this aspect of university courses should be carefully looked at.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide reports that, in general, a student is allowed one opportunity to repeat a year of a course or subjects in which he has failed. A second such failure renders the student liable to preclusion from the university. However, a student who has failed particularly badly in his first attempt at any year's work in his course is also liable to be precluded from the university. Special circumstances (ill-health for example) are always taken into account before a student is precluded. The University Council has established a standing committee to investigate the recommendations of all faculties for the preclusion of students, and this results in a reasonable uniformity and consistency of policy in the preclusion of students, whatever their faculty may be.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: STATE FINANCES.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HUDSON: Yesterday, a report appeared in the *Advertiser* of a meeting of the South Australian Economics Society which I addressed on Monday night. The main theme of my remarks at that time was that the annual increase in education expenditure and in other important items could not exceed 10 per cent to 12 per cent a year without additional assistance from the Commonwealth Government. This was not reported and indeed a feature was made of certain of my remarks in answer to a question in the last five minutes of the meeting. The words quoted in the report were as follows:

Answering a question, Mr. Hudson said that there were two possibilities for the State to improve its income: by picking a fight with the B.H.P. on its royalties, as it was paying much less than it could; by picking a fight over the rent paid for perpetual leasehold land.

These words were quoted out of context and a false impression was created, which I should like to correct. I was asked at the meeting whether other sources of revenue were available to the State that would help solve revenue problems and reduce the reliance of the State on Commonwealth assistance. In answering, I pointed to the revenue measures already adopted by the Government and said that there were two sources that could provide additional revenue, namely, mining royalties and rents on perpetual leasehold land. I pointed out that there were serious political and other difficulties in obtaining additional revenue from these sources, and that any attempt to do so would involve picking fights that would be difficult to win.

I made it clear that any change in rents on perpetual leasehold land would require legislation which would almost certainly fail to pass the Liberal and Country League dominated Legislative Council and which no Government had been prepared to consider for many years. I concluded that these two sources of revenue were most unlikely to provide any solution to the Government's problems. As a consequence, the State would have to continue to work for a better deal from the Commonwealth Government by way of Loan money allocations, income tax reimbursement grants, and other grants. I made it clear that I was speaking for myself, not on behalf of the Government. I have checked with a number of my former university col-

leagues and in each case my view that the *Advertiser* report created a false impression of the meeting of the tenor of my remarks was confirmed.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should immediately negotiate with the Commonwealth Government to have provisions of the Railways Standardization Agreement implemented, to provide a standard gauge railway connecting Port Pirie to Adelaide with the object of:

- (a) obtaining the full economic advantage of additional and facilitated trade with other States, particularly Western Australia, New South Wales, and Queensland; and
- (b) providing relief from unemployment in this State.

The motion seeks to standardize 134 miles, I believe, of existing broad gauge railway line between Adelaide and Port Pirie. At the outset, I say that the motion arises not so much as a criticism of the present Government: it urges the Government immediately to implement this vital work for South Australia. There have been many reports, views expressed, and conferences held throughout the history of standardization in Australia, as well as in South Australia. We believe that the standardization of the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line should be carried out in conjunction with the standardization of the vital Adelaide to Port Pirie link. Mr. Wentworth, the member for Mackellar, said in the Commonwealth House on August 25, 1966:

By 1968, we should have a standard gauge system connecting every capital of the Australian mainland. There will be a through line from Melbourne to Sydney and Brisbane. There will be a through line also from Sydney to Broken Hill to Port Pirie to Kalgoorlie and on to Perth and Fremantle. There should be, although provision has not been made yet for it, a through line from Port Pirie down to Adelaide. This is quite a cheap thing to do. Then, on September 21 last (a week ago) the member for Mackellar, again referring to this matter in the Commonwealth House, said:

The second loose end is the standard gauge connection between Port Pirie and Adelaide. This is a matter of negotiation with the South Australian Government. Our negotiations with this Government stand on a little different footing from our negotiations with other State Governments. Honourable members will recall that the South Australian Government formally accepted the old standardization proposals and has, therefore, some claim as of right with respect to them. I would say that the foresight that Sir Thomas Playford, who even in those

days was Premier of South Australia, exercised in 1948 and thereabouts, is now paying off for the people of South Australia.

I hope that the Minister will later be able to give us the details, but I suggest to the Government that this is now the time for a plan to be announced for the extension of the standard gauge line from Port Pirie into Adelaide. The South Australian Department of Railways in the time of Sir Thomas Playford, and I think with his active advice, produced a tentative plan for this extension. It seemed to me on looking through it that the plan was a good and reasonable one. I hope again that the Minister will in his reply give us full details of the Government's proposals and I hope he will be able to say to us that the proposals will be complete and operating in 1968 to fit in with the remainder of the standardization scheme . . .

Later that same day the Minister for Shipping and Transport (Mr. Freeth), in referring to Mr. Wentworth's remarks on the standardization of this line, said:

The honourable member also mentioned the Port Pirie to Adelaide railway and suggested that this line should be standardized in time to coincide with the 1968 programme. I cannot give him an undertaking that this will be done. The former Premier of South Australia asked us some time ago to have a look at this. At that time the estimated cost was \$12,000,000. More recently, I think, it has risen to \$17,000,000. This is currently being examined because the Commonwealth undertook to examine the feasibility of fitting this work into the whole programme. As I have said, at this stage I cannot give him any assurance as to when the work will be undertaken. Of course, if and when it is undertaken, it will be part of the standardization programme which has a statutory basis with relation to the South Australian Government.

The Minister's last reference is important: the statutory basis mentioned confers on South Australia a great economic advantage concerning standardization work. We know that the Commonwealth Government provides the whole of the moneys for this work and that the States pay back 30 per cent of that money over a long period of time (I think a total of 52 years). Reference is made to the financial aspects of the work in Part III, clause 14 (1) of the Schedule of the Railways Standardization Agreement Act, 1949, as follows:

Seven-tenths of the cost of the standardization works set out in clause 5 of this agreement shall be borne by the Commonwealth and three-tenths of such cost shall be borne by the State.

Clause 16 (2) provides:

The State shall, in respect of so much of the expenditure by the Commonwealth under clause 14 of this agreement in any financial year (in this clause called the year of expenditure) as is to be borne by the State, pay to the Commonwealth from revenue during the period of

50 years after the year of expenditure, equal annual contributions of such amounts as will liquidate the expenditure so to be borne by the State together with interest on the amount of that expenditure outstanding at the end of each financial year.

The financial advantage rests wholly with the State in standardizing railways in South Australia, and particularly in standardizing the Port Pirie line, as, under the Act, it will not at this time have to furnish capital from its hard-pressed financial resources. This Government can confidently approach the Commonwealth Government in regard to this work, knowing that the approach has the statutory backing of the standardization agreement, and knowing, too, that the State Government would not be committed immediately for finance. It could make the 30 per cent repayment pursuant to the agreement over a period of 50 years. The Government cannot afford to neglect this desirable project. Indeed, I believe that, at a time when the unemployment position in this State is causing so much concern, it is up to the Government to use every endeavour to relieve the situation. Every aspect of this project is advantageous to South Australia.

The matter was brought to the notice of a number of honourable members recently when a letter was sent to members of the House by the Crystal Brook Businessmen's Association. It referred to the possible saving of length in this track by using Crystal Brook as a junction on the line from Adelaide to Port Pirie. I believe that this would mean that some of the line that would serve Port Pirie to Broken Hill would also provide the first part of the link from Port Pirie to Adelaide, which would result in a considerable saving of distance and, consequently, of expense to the State, and more particularly to the Commonwealth, in the provision of standardization funds.

The letter to which I refer here was sent to my predecessor, the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford). He then referred the letter that he received from the Crystal Brook Businessmen's Association to the Minister of Transport (Hon. A. F. Kneebone), and he received the following reply:

I understand that the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner, in the very near future, will submit a report to the Minister for Shipping and Transport on a proposed route for this project. The South Australian Railways have provided a considerable amount of information to the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner, and the merits of an alternative route *via*

Crystal Brook will receive the full consideration of the South Australian Government, and I have no doubt that the Commonwealth Government will also give similar consideration to this proposal. I regret that I cannot give you more information at the present time as the matter is dependent on future negotiations with the Commonwealth.

I emphasize the last sentence of that letter, dated August 2, 1966. Our motion is aimed at getting these future negotiations into being. We believe the Government should set about these negotiations and finalize this matter, which is receiving attention by the Minister for Shipping and Transport in the Commonwealth Parliament, as we were told by reading *Hansard* so that this work can get under way.

I refer briefly to the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner's report of 1964-65 in which, among other things, he says:

Work commenced during the year on an examination of the existing route of the broad gauge line between Port Pirie and Adelaide to assess the requirements for the possible standardization of this line.

So the actual work of this standardization has been under active consideration by the respective Railways Departments for a number of years. It is time this matter was finalized.

We could ask: why do we want this line standardized? Why is it necessary at this time? These two matters are briefly answered in the motion I am presenting to the House. However, it may be just as well to dwell briefly on the reasons. Earlier this year (or it may have been last year) the then Leader of the Opposition made the statement that South Australia could become a centre or hub of production and commerce between the Eastern States, Western Australia and the Northern Territory; that, because of the developments that were taking place in Western Australia and the Northern Territory, South Australia was assuming a far greater importance as a source of supply and research and was becoming integrated into a complex of industrial and commercial activity that was shifting, to some degree, from the Eastern States to this part of the Commonwealth.

It is noticeable that this year the Premier began to echo these sentiments. He, too, has said, I believe publicly, that South Australia could be a centre of trade in these areas. One does not become a centre of trade and commerce without efficient transport connections, and undoubtedly the standardization of the railway line from Port Pirie to Adelaide would not only play a great part in the physical matter of transportation but also engender confidence in the people who might be looking to South

Australia for future investment in industry; it would engender confidence that the South Australian Government was doing everything it could to foster easy communications with the other States of Australia. We all know, from personal observation and from reading reports of interstate trade, how important is our trade with Western Australia.

In the pastoral field, immense numbers of sheep have been shifted from this State to Western Australia in the last few years. This appears to be a continuing trade that will grow as the years go by. It would be greatly facilitated if a change of gauge was effected. We know, too, of the popularity of the East-West train trip for tourists and oversea visitors; we know that most people enjoy this trip, regardless of the efficiency offered by the airlines systems of Australia. Although this efficiency will increase, I believe the passenger trips by rail to Western Australia will never become redundant but will remain popular with a significant number of the travelling public.

Western Australia itself is becoming an industrial complex, which means that there is reciprocal trade in many matters between Western Australia, this State and the Eastern States. One has only to look at the Western Australian Chamberlain Industries to realize the number of tractors and farm implements exported from Western Australia; this makes us realize the use that this State makes of the East-West line, and how much better it would be for us if trains could come straight through to the capital city of Adelaide. In comparisons of costs, the railways are supreme in long haulage when compared with road transport. There have been a number of developments in long hauls on railway lines, and the pick-a-back system of putting semi-trailers on to railway trucks has developed and is developing. Moreover, we now have the use of containers whereby not only are change-of-gauge difficulties obviated but also pilfer-proof packaging is possible.

These matters have increased to some degree the popularity of railway trade over long distances. The experience of standardization between Albury and Melbourne has proved that, when this is accomplished, railway freight increases to a great extent. This we can expect to happen in South Australia and, above all, we can say to intending investors in our State that we mean business in providing efficient and quick communications with Western Australia and the Eastern States. I believe our thoughts have been along these

lines for long enough. When the overpass was built over the railway line at Elizabeth an additional bay was included so that a standard gauge railway line could be brought through that overpass to a terminal near the city of Adelaide. We are making slow provision for these matters from State funds. Now is the time to bring these matters to a conclusion.

Mr. Wentworth, M.H.R., has been a prolific writer and thinker on matters of standardization in Australia and has drawn attention to standardization in South Australia. He is reported in the Government Members Rail Standardization Committee in 1956 extensively on this matter. He said:

With regard to the conversion of the Port Pirie to Adelaide line (134 miles), this would appear to be a comparatively simple job, except for the terminal arrangements in the Adelaide area. Since alternative 5ft. 3in. lines (Gladstone to Hamley Bridge, Brinkworth to Moonta, and Balaklava to Kadina) exist in the district this line serves, it can be converted without prejudice to the operation of the rest of the South Australian system. Special arrangements may be necessary to maintain the salt works at Lochiel's direct access to the 5ft. 3in. gauge in addition to its access to the new 4ft. 8½in. gauge.

The important reference in this quotation is to the alternative lines that exist to serve the districts at present. Those lines can operate independently of a standardized 4ft. 8½in. line through Port Pirie and Snowtown to Adelaide, so this line can be standardized without affecting to a prohibitive degree the local service provided at present in this railway network. This is of particular importance, and in fact it places this line in a very favourable position for the immediate carrying out of this work.

Perhaps members of the Government would be further convinced of the necessity for this line to be standardized if I quoted from the *Federal Parliamentary Labor Party on Rail Standardization*. This report was also made in 1956. It deals also with standardization in general. It sets out a number of facts which we know are self-evident in standardization, including the benefit that is conferred on the community in which the standardization is carried out. An extract from that report states:

One of the stated advantages of road transport is the convenience of door-to-door delivery, and with increasing speeds and payloads, this becomes an important factor in long distance transport. The railways can meet this challenge by a co-ordinated road pick-up and delivery service at rail terminals, but the improvements striven for in each railway service by means of better locomotive power, roll-

ing stock and train control are largely vitiated by change of gauge points along the route, and the attendant immobilizing of rolling stock. . . . It is well appreciated that it would be practicable to attempt the whole of this work at once, but we should at least undertake one section at a time. This department has always held the view that the most important link is the Broken Hill to Port Pirie 3ft. 6in. section, which would give a standard gauge railway between Brisbane and Kalgoorlie. The Melbourne-Albury and Adelaide to Port Pirie Junction, as well as Kalgoorlie-Perth-Fremantle sections, are also vitally important links, and if any one of these sections were standardized it would undoubtedly prove to be of immense benefit to the nation generally.

The foregoing is an extract from the 1955-56 Commonwealth Railways operation report, and it is included in the report to which I referred. I would think that that would be sufficient to convince the Premier, because it comes from members of a Party of his own conviction that this is a very necessary work. In those circumstances, the Opposition urges him to negotiate for the completion of this work. I have already referred to the provision of funds. If this matter were successfully negotiated, the funds would be provided entirely by the Commonwealth Government. The cost, of course, is at present the subject of a controversy. In his report of 1956, Mr. Wentworth had this to say:

The conversion of the Port Pirie to Adelaide line (134 miles) would cost £400,000.

Of course, that is \$800,000. Since that time the basic wage has risen by about 50 per cent, so the cost now would be about \$1,200,000. The Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport has mentioned a cost of \$17,000,000, so obviously there is some controversy as to what the building of this standard gauge line would involve. Whatever it is, I am sure that it would be far more economical simply to shift one rail of the 5ft. 3in. line over than to build a complete 4ft. 8½in. gauge line. We know that many attendant works would be involved, such as the construction of rolling stock, the adjustment of railway stations and their facilities, and many works of a somewhat minor nature, although no doubt in the aggregate they would be expensive works. Nevertheless, this is a matter that we must face. I believe the accumulated advantages would far outweigh the disadvantage of the cost involved.

I reiterate that the State would not be expected to provide money for this work, and this should make it an attractive proposition for the present Government, which we know cannot provide the money from its own Loan

funds. As there can be no excuse that the money involved in this project would be embarrassing to us, I believe the best answer the Government can give to this motion is that it is at this moment actively negotiating for the standardization of this vital link and that it hopes it can indicate firmly to the State that this work will go ahead at the earliest possible moment. I should be very happy if the Premier could say this, and I hope he can. He will certainly have the support of the Opposition if he can do this. I know that the member for Port Pirie, who is looking his usual benign and helpful self, will support me in this matter. In fact, I should be very pleased if we could be of one thought on this question. I am sure the honourable member will support this motion, because I cannot see that there is anything involved that would prevent the Government from pressing on, with every facility at its disposal, to complete these negotiations.

Mr. McKee: I have bigger and better things in mind.

Mr. HALL: Whether or not the proposal put forward by the Crystal Brook Businessmen's Association is valid, I do not know. No doubt the Premier has knowledge of the negotiations which must be continuing concerning the final route of the standardized Broken Hill to Port Pirie line through this area, but this will not impinge on or be detrimental to any final consideration of whether this line should be built. I believe the line from Broken Hill is due to be completed in 1968. Therefore, there is still time, with the slack that exists in the building industry here and in the employment situation generally, to set this programme in motion and to complete it to coincide or almost coincide with the completion of the standardization of the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line. This would mean that, with the same rolling stock and without break of gauge, we could immediately be connected with Perth and Brisbane. This motion is intended not as a matter of criticism of the Government but as support for it. I urge the Government to negotiate immediately for the implementation of this vital work in South Australia.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I support the Leader of the Opposition in this motion. I believe that the House could carry this motion unanimously. If the matter receives the favourable consideration of the Government it will have a considerable impact on the development of the State. I will not go into the history of the

agreements made between the Commonwealth and the States regarding gauge standardization. People who have travelled in other countries and observed the advantages of gauge standardization must understand why all of the reports strongly support the standardization of our Australian railways. Only a queer turn of history prevented Australia from having a standard gauge instead of many gauges. Port Pirie Junction railway station is probably unique in that it has three separate gauges in use. The expense and dislocation caused by breaks of gauge must raise obstacles in the activities of industries that rely on rail transport.

We are not asking the Government to sponsor this matter immediately. An effective agreement, entered into by my Government with the Commonwealth Government under the Hon. J. B. Chifley in 1949, is in existence. I realize that if the Commonwealth were asked to give effect to that agreement in its entirety the work could not be undertaken immediately. It is important that the present State Government should enter into direct negotiations now rather than continue with the negotiations already started. A proposal to start new work when the present work on the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line is completed should be considered. There should not be a cessation in the work of standardization. That work has continued almost without a break since the end of the Second World War. Men and equipment are available. The unemployment position in the northern part of the State will become desperate unless the Government continues with gauge standardization.

As the Commonwealth has made funds available, the work has progressed steadily. Members are aware of the gauge standardization carried out in the South-East, and at the appropriate time there will be a switch over to standard gauge. I know the honourable member for Mount Gambier would agree on the importance of the work to the South-East. Prior to the standardization that area was almost isolated as far as effective rail transport was concerned. Today, because of the work, the South-East has a railway system that has led to tremendous development in that part of the State.

I believe that current work is being completed according to schedule, and this is consistent with the excellent record of the South Australian Railways in the dealings with the Commonwealth Government. There has been the ability to complete the work on time and,

more important, in accordance with the estimates. Some of the other States have not been able to do that and it has caused problems. As far as South Australia is concerned, the work has been well planned and well carried out. On a number of occasions Commonwealth Ministers have stated publicly how satisfactorily the work has been done in this State.

I am concerned about the Silverton Tramway Company line between the South Australian border and Broken Hill, because there appears to be a stalemate. It may well be that the line between Brisbane and Perth will be completed with the exception of this small section of about 26 miles between the border and Broken Hill. I know a number of differences have arisen between the New South Wales and the Commonwealth Governments as to the route to be followed and whether there should be a variation of the present agreement. Honourable members will remember that when the matter was negotiated with Mr. Chifley it was agreed that the Silverton tramway should be converted to standard gauge, with standard equipment, and then handed over to be operated as part of the South Australian railway system. There have been suggestions that the agreement be altered, but it does not matter much whether or not it is altered. The main concern of the Government should be to see that the present 26-mile gap in the line is completed. There seems to be a lack of interest in the fate of the Silverton Tramway Company line. A substantial amount of money is being provided by the Commonwealth to assist in bringing the Australian railway system to a high standard, and I hope that the work will not be affected because of this 26-mile gap.

The other important factor is that the economic advantage of gauge standardization falls completely to the ground unless a link is provided between the metropolitan standard gauge systems. This matter was raised with the Commonwealth Government by the previous Government, and it was a subject of much negotiation. The previous Government submitted to the Commonwealth specific and reasonable proposals that were worked out by our railway officers and did not involve the complete conversion of all the northern part of our railway system to standard gauge at this time. They provided for the conversion of the Terowie-Peterborough section to broad gauge to prevent a small gap in that portion of line. More particularly, the proposals provided for a line to connect Adelaide to the standard gauge line just south of Port Pirie.

Estimates of costs of the whole project were worked out and the Commonwealth actually allocated money.

As far as I know, the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner has made a complete study of the proposals. Therefore, I believe that if the matter were raised at this time with the Commonwealth there would be no difficulty in getting an agreement for work to be commenced, and for it to logically follow the work at present taking place, which is providing a substantial amount of employment in the north of the State. In association with this work, I believe that in due course we shall have to give the Commonwealth permission to extend the standard gauge line from Port Augusta to Whyalla. Whyalla is now becoming so important that I know the Commonwealth would be interested in establishing a line there. Whyalla is probably unique in the world because it is a steel-producing city not connected with a main line. I know that, without any solicitation by the State Government, the Commonwealth Railways Department has already conducted a survey in this area, and in due course a line there could be included in the network of lines contemplated under the agreement.

I do not think anybody would question the importance of standard gauge lines connecting South Australia with the Eastern States from the point of view of industry. From my positive knowledge, I can say that one of the first questions asked by representatives of any substantial industry contemplating establishment in South Australia is, "How long will it be before the standardization of the Port Pirie to Broken Hill railway line will be completed?" For this line there is no financial problem at all, which makes it a rather interesting proposition for the State Government at this time. Under the standardization agreement, the Commonwealth bears the whole cost of standardization; it pays the cost of expensive equipment, although it does not bear betterment charges. Even in this respect, the agreement with the Commonwealth has not been unfavourable to South Australia. It is interesting to know that when the standard gauge line from Port Pirie to Broken Hill is completed it will not only mean a new line between those two centres, but South Australia will also receive, as a consequence of the agreement, a large amount of new rolling stock. The prevailing grade from east to west (in which direction the heavy carting will take place) is about 1ft. in 200ft., so that the new equipment will

materially reduce transportation costs of heavy goods.

The conditions of the agreement are quite clear as they affect the Government of this State. They provide for the consultation between the State and Commonwealth Government on the starting time and financing of projects. It is upon the basis that the Commonwealth provides seven-tenths of the total sum involved as a gift to the State, and three-tenths of the cost is paid back by the State over a period of about 52 years. I can see no ground whatever for any delay in submitting a proposal to the Commonwealth on this matter. As Leader of the Opposition, I wrote a letter to the Commonwealth Government asking that the matter be considered, and I was rather surprised to see in the reply that the matter had been side-tracked, as I believed it might well have been considered by the Commonwealth Government. As the Orders of the Day must be dealt with by 4 p.m., I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COMPENSATION.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should, this session, introduce a Bill to provide for the payment of compensation to victims of crimes of violence.

(Continued from August 31. Page 1467.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I want to add very little to what I had to say the other day. The State is certainly not in a financial position to relieve the Commonwealth of social service obligations. Payment of money that would deprive citizens of Commonwealth social service payments under present arrangements would be robbing State revenues to relieve Commonwealth Government revenues, and until agreement was reached with the Commonwealth Government this would be inadvisable. With the present condition of the State's finances, I am surprised that the honourable member is suggesting that further considerable funds should be paid out. Within the memory of members of this House I was accused of spending money in the State like a drunken sailor. It amazes me to find so many Opposition motions urging the Government to spend thousands and thousands of dollars.

Mr. Millhouse: Before you go on with thousands and thousands of dollars, can you estimate what this will cost?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It could cost \$25,000 to \$30,000 in a year.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not much.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On an assessment of what has happened in New Zealand, it could cost \$100,000 a year; it is hard to estimate, but the way damages are assessed today the total might not be small. Whence do we get the money?

Mr. Millhouse: I could give you a few suggestions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Everything the Opposition suggested the Government should not spend money on, it now seeks to spend five times over. The Opposition said that we should not have a deficit; then it said we should raise less taxation; and then it introduced measures on which more money would be spent. Although it is trying to have the cake and eat it too, this is not possible in a financially responsible situation.

Mr. Millhouse: What are you implying by that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am suggesting that, before the honourable member seeks to spend more Government moneys, he gives more support to the Government to gain all extra necessary revenues.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This motion is important notwithstanding the financial difficulties to which the Attorney-General has drawn our attention. I am sure the member for Wallaroo will support it, as he is concerned not only for the welfare of people but because he is personally thinking about it. My learned friend, the member for Mitcham, made five points. He did not argue that the State should accept the absolute liability for the failure of the Police Force or other law enforcement organizations to prevent such injuries, but drew attention to the fact that the proper remedy for a criminal injury was recourse against the criminal. He said that we should encourage people to obtain protection from injuries where possible, and referred to the analogy of workmen's compensation. Another of his arguments that would appeal to the Treasurer emphasized that this scheme would not cost much money. The member for Mitcham pointed out that, whilst it would assist people who were victims of crimes of violence, the overall cost would not be much to the Government, as the assailant, in the main, would have to provide any compensation that was awarded. A real need exists to recognize the problems of the victim, but we often pay too much attention to those who commit crimes and not enough to the victims. As

the motion seeks to remedy this situation, and contains much merit, I hope that it will receive full and proper consideration from all members. The motion is moved in order to help people who are the victims of unfortunate happenings by laying the blame on those responsible.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

OMBUDSMAN.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the desirability of establishing in this State the office of Ombudsman.

(Continued from September 14. Page 1571.)

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): Honourable members are indebted to the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) for the way he brings to our attention matters in which the public are particularly interested. In the last Parliament, he moved a motion that resulted in the setting up of a Select Committee (of which I had the honour to be a member) to inquire into the fluoridation of water supplies. However, nothing has been done about the committee's recommendation, although fluoridation has been mentioned in this House during the course of this Parliament. The honourable member also introduced a Bill relating to the prohibition of preference and discrimination in employment. At present, he has a motion on the Notice Paper in addition to the one to which I am now speaking. He also introduced legislation providing for the installation of seat belts in motor vehicles in South Australia.

All these matters have been debated fairly fully by members on both sides and much public interest has been created in the opinions expressed by members of both Parties. Although I shall not agree with the motion regarding the appointment of an ombudsman in South Australia, I know that the honourable member will respect the opinion I express in refuting his arguments. We are also indebted to the honourable member for the amount of research with which he prepares the cases he submits. His speeches show that he does much reading in order to provide the background against which members can form opinions, and that applies to his speech on this motion.

He has given references to many publications about the office of ombudsman for the guidance of members. He has told us that this was a fairly old office, that it was originally established about the turn of the 19th century, when it had its origin in Finland. Then followed

appointments in Denmark and Norway, two other Scandinavian countries in which so much enlightened legislation has been enacted in the last two centuries. More recently, the office of ombudsman has been established in New Zealand, a sister member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Indeed, much of what the honourable member said dealt with the office in New Zealand: the legislation there is similar to that which he envisages here.

He went on to say that, as a result of inquiry in the United Kingdom, an office was to be established there, if it had not already been established. We know that this matter has been considered in other countries, in many of which the creation of this office has not been proceeded with. So, there is a divergence of opinion all around the world about whether this office is of advantage to the public. Parliament is the correct place for the discussion of these matters so that members may have the right to agree or disagree with a proposition submitted. It is fairly obvious to me that, even within the ranks of the Parties on both sides of this House, some members are in favour and some are not.

It has also been established that, at a recent Australian Labor Party conference, a motion that the introduction of this office in South Australia should be considered by the Government was moved. However, earlier in the debate the Attorney-General rebutted the suggestion, and we can only assume that what he said, as a Minister, indicated the policy of the Government. I oppose the motion to set up a Select Committee. I think one of the real difficulties would be to get South Australians to give evidence to such a committee. I am referring to anyone in this State who had had personal experience of an ombudsman and who could help the committee to arrive at a recommendation. If no-one was available here and people from other States or from outside Australia wanted to give evidence, I wonder who would be able to pay their expenses. The present Government certainly would not: it is in enough financial difficulty as it is. I suggest that people in South Australia who could give evidence would depend mainly on literature and information that anyone, including members of Parliament, could obtain from the Public Library or from other sources.

I think the real difficulty is that people do not seek the help of their members as much as they should or could. I do not think people realize the extent to which members can help them regarding their many and varied problems. All members know the types of problem

that our constituents have. It is not that the people have not adequate Parliamentary representation, because they are represented by Legislative Councillors as well as by members of this House.

I was interested in the statement made by the member for Mitcham about the powers of what are known as administrative courts in some continental countries. The purpose of those courts is to safeguard the individual's rights. I wonder whether that is not the answer here, knowing how South Australia's courts are constituted and how hard-pressed they are to fulfil the type of function envisaged for an ombudsman. Members have their own particular ways of making themselves available to constituents. For instance, I hold clinics every other Saturday, and the attendances vary considerably. Sometimes many people attend; occasionally, I go to the appointed place and find perhaps only one or two people present. I may even set aside the morning to find that nobody attends, which can only lead one to conclude that my constituents have no problems.

Mr. Rodda: I know how you feel.

Mrs. STEELE: It is gratifying to think that constituents are happy and have no problems. Attendance is sometimes poor although publicity is given to the place at which a clinic is to be held, through the press (including the local press) and by exhibiting a conspicuous notice at the appointed place, for almost a fortnight before the event. Like many other members, I call on my constituents to offer help in any problems or difficulties confronting them. If a constituent is not at home I leave a card indicating that I have called, as well as indicating that if I can help in any way I should be happy to do so. Frequently, these people telephone me to say that they have received my card and that they were not at home at the time, and they ask what I desire of them. When I explain that I do not desire anything but that I am merely offering my services they have been absolutely amazed and have said that this was the first time a member of Parliament had offered to help with any problem they might have. That may be typical of hundreds of thousands of people throughout South Australia.

Members also offer a service to their constituents by attending naturalization ceremonies. Some weeks after such a ceremony, when lists of the naturalized people have been supplied, I usually write to each person concerned, again offering my services. In this way, members are really giving as much service as possible to those people in the community who wish

to take advantage of it. However, of the great number of people on the electoral rolls, an infinitesimal number of people bring their problems to me.

I believe that one of the great difficulties concerning the motion would be to find the right type of person to act as the ombudsman. He would have to have a strong personality and be politically impartial, as well as having a pretty strong constitution if, as we are led to believe, people were to besiege him with problems that a private member could not solve.

I think, too, that, depending on the authority given by Parliament to such an officer, his right to investigate could be resented and possibly undermine the efficiency of the Public Service. I suppose, conversely, that such an appointment could put both Ministers and public servants on their toes. However, I visualize resistance to the appointment, because the ombudsman would have access to official documents and dockets which, of course, would be necessary in an involved case in order to permit the ombudsman to examine the background. Under the New Zealand Act, the Ombudsman can decline to deal with any case referred to him, as the member for Mitcham mentioned, because, pursuant to the terms of his appointment (which, incidentally, is by the Party in power), he has no power to act in certain matters. Therefore, depending on his charter, the officer concerned is no doubt restricted in some aspects of his work. I think that must surely limit an ombudsman's effectiveness in the eyes of the people, particularly in the eyes of those who think they have a grievance.

Although I shall not quote the remarks made by the member for Mitcham, members are free to read his speech if they are interested and to examine the figures showing the number of cases referred to the Ombudsman, and the number the officer believed were not within his charter to examine. Of the number to be dealt with, many requests were refused, anyway, or were not able to be dealt with to the plaintiff's satisfaction. I believe that members of Parliament are true servants of the people. Indeed, we are sometimes forcibly told that in not particularly polite terms. The day has passed when members of Parliament were inclined to be placed on a pedestal and regarded as people of substance in the community. I think members, because of their very willingness to try to help constituents with problems, have brought on themselves the title of "servants of the people"; but whether this is derogatory or not depends on

the way the public interprets that title. A member is judged, I believe, by his success as a Parliamentary representative and by how he looks after the interests of the people he represents. Members are often quickly told about the tasks not undertaken to a constituent's satisfaction.

If an ombudsman were appointed, I think members would lose some personal contact with their constituents. Personal contact is the best way of getting to know the people one represents, and I should indeed be sorry to have it otherwise. In fact, if an ombudsman were appointed the member could even be by-passed; people might tend to go directly to the ombudsman, instead of first ascertaining whether their own members could resolve a difficulty. By our efforts on behalf of constituents, I think each one of us should improve the image of members of Parliament in the eyes of the people and ensure that we rightfully retain our position in the community. I believe that Ministers, too, have a responsibility to members in this respect, which responsibility is not always discharged to the advantage of members of Parliament in the general (and not in the Party political) sense. For the reasons I have advanced, I reluctantly have to say that I am not in favour of the motion.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MENTAL HOSPITALS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mrs. Steele:

(For wording of motion, see page 569.)

(Continued from September 21. Page 1738.)

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): In rising to close the debate on the motion standing in my name on the Notice Paper, I thank my colleagues on this side for supporting me in the way they have on what I consider to be a most important matter. By what they have said they, too, have agreed that this is something that should have been brought forcibly to the attention of the Government. Since I moved this motion some months ago, I have taken the opportunity of again bringing myself up to date on what is taking place at the various mental hospitals and mental institutions in South Australia. I have visited, therefore, the Hillcrest Hospital and the St. Corantyn Psychiatric Day Hospital on East Terrace; I have also had another look at the work being done for the younger people at the Minda Home. I spent all one morning at Hillcrest looking at what has been accomplished and the

difficulties being faced by the people superintending the work there while awaiting the building and coming into operation of the two new mental health centres that are to be, one day, established by the Government.

I want to say something about Hillcrest, because generally speaking members are probably not aware of the recent developments there. I was particularly impressed by work undertaken on behalf of geriatric patients. The name of the doctor there eludes me for the moment, but he is a new Australian, and it was most touching to see him working amongst the aged patients at Hillcrest. The affection they have for him and the delightful way in which he makes his daily contacts with them is something to be seen and appreciated. I thought he was doing extremely fine work. Much rehabilitation is going on at Hillcrest at the moment, although under some difficulties, and it was obvious that many of the patients there could be rehabilitated to a great extent if the hospitals on which this motion is based were operating at present.

All sorts of occupational therapy were being practised—for instance, the printing in the printing shop. This was interesting to see, because a magazine called *Revelation* was being printed on an old secondhand printing machine given to the hospital. If any members have seen this magazine, edited and published by the patients at Hillcrest, they will realize what a fine standard of work is being produced there, but under difficult conditions.

I also went to the school that has now been provided by the Education Department and is staffed by special teachers provided by the department. Here again, they were able to tell me of the great advances the children were making under this specialized kind of education. There were even one or two autistic children: those difficult, emotionally remote children, with whom great things are being done and from whom there has been some response. So at Hillcrest there is the germ of an idea that will be translated into much bigger things when the new Strathmont Hospital is established.

I was most interested at the St. Corantyn day centre to observe the improved techniques employed in the hospital, where some patients come in early in the morning, undergo shock therapy, and within an hour are able to take their place in group therapy and be given counselling advice by the trained staff there. Once upon a time the giving and taking of shock therapy was distressing, but these days it is done highly scientifically. The patient comes in, is

given a sedative and then an injection, and shock therapy is applied. He rests for about half an hour and then returns to group therapy. Here at St. Corantyn, of course, patients have the advantage of all sorts of recreation facilities; all kinds of occupations are provided, and some lovely work is being done by these patients. The opportunity is being or will be afforded to the public to see some of the work these patients are doing.

Then, on another day, I went to Minda Home so that I would know the whole range of the work being done for mentally retarded people before I came back to speak again and close this debate. Here again, most impressive work is being done amongst the younger generation. It was exciting to see the response of children who, not many years ago, would have been left to languish but who are now working under the direction of a devoted staff under the principalship of Mrs. Kaufmann, who is an absolute expert and wizard at this kind of work. Minda, too, is facing its problems, because it has a huge waiting list. As its President told me, it is reaching a certain critical point beyond which the officials are somewhat concerned for the future. This home comes quite prominently into the range of development in mental rehabilitation work that must be undertaken here in South Australia.

This motion is, of course, drawing the attention of the House to the fact that this State can and should benefit by one-third grants on capital expenditures on mental hospitals and institutions under the Commonwealth-States Mental Institutions Act. But it must spend the money before the end of June, 1967, if we are to take advantage of this offer. Point has been given to our inability to take advantage of Commonwealth grants in more than one way recently: South Australia has been unable to take full advantage of the opportunities given by the Commonwealth Government for financial aid. It is important to realize that Strathmont, the first of these new hospitals to be contemplated, was estimated to cost, according to submissions to the Public Works Committee, \$5,702,000. Therefore, it could attract from the Commonwealth Government, through this Act, the sum of \$1,900,666, not an inconsiderable sum, as all members appreciate. But if it is not taken up by actual expenditure on capital works of this nature by June 30 next year, that money is lost for all time, because it is available only in the three years up to that time.

After there had been one or two speeches supporting my motion from this side, the Premier spoke in this debate. It had been hoped that when he spoke he would be able to give some definite indication of what the Government's policy would be regarding Strathmont, particularly, and Elanora, the other project that was referred to the Public Works Committee. He said (and I confirm this, because I know from talking to Dr. Shea, the Director of Mental Health, that this is so) that whereas Strathmont is a vital necessity in as short a time as it is possible to provide it, the whole question of Elanora is being looked at again. As Dr. Shea explained to me, the trend now overseas (which he was able to establish when some weeks ago he attended a meeting as the Australian representative on the Executive Board of the World Federation for Mental Health) is towards smaller units situated geographically so that people from a particular area can be referred into a smaller hospital. This is better for the patient, and it is easier to provide the various services in these smaller units than it is in a very large hospital of, say, 500 beds. Therefore, although Strathmont is a vital necessity at the present time, ideas about Elanora are being revised.

The Premier did not say what was going to happen or when it was going to happen: it was all very vague and very evasive. This, in fact, has been the tone of answers given to members on this side when we have asked for information regarding the taking up of the Commonwealth grants that are available for capital works on mental institutions. When I asked him a question earlier this session the Premier said that he had written to the Prime Minister and was awaiting a reply. I asked another question later, and the comment he made was that the Government was asking the Commonwealth Government to extend the time in which South Australia could take advantage of these grants.

However, it is rather interesting that only in recent weeks the Minister of Health attended a conference in Canberra with other Ministers of Health and the Commonwealth Minister, and he came back from Canberra with no definite indication of what was going to happen in regard to Strathmont and Elanora. Therefore, this Parliament is still absolutely in the dark as to when work is to commence, although a vague statement has been made by the Minister of Health that it will not commence in this financial year but will commence towards the end of 1967. That lends point to my statement that we are going

to miss out entirely on the grants that could have been forthcoming for the building of either one or both of these hospitals.

It is revealing to see when we look at the Budget for this year that there is a very small amount set aside for extensions or additions to buildings or the provision of plant and equipment to mental hospitals. I think this amount is about \$112,000, which would attract to South Australia about \$37,333. This is the only amount that we could claim from the Commonwealth Government in this triennium. As I say, this amount is not for major works at all, and I do not even know for certain whether it attracts the grant the Commonwealth Government is prepared to make. It is interesting also to study what the Premier said when he replied in this debate to what I had said in moving the motion. He acknowledged the vital necessity to provide these hospitals, because he said:

At present, there are over 600 intellectually retarded patients in Parkside and Hillcrest Hospitals, but on the completion of the Strathmont training centre many of these will be transferred to that hospital. The accent at the proposed new hospital training centres will be on training rather than custodial hospitalization, and it is expected that there will be a much greater turnover of patients. There is also a considerable waiting list and, under present circumstances, the maximum service is being given to intellectually retarded patients who are not able to be admitted to hospital. Therefore, he accepts the fact that limitations have had to be imposed on the admission of patients to these hospitals, and, of course, this was one of the points I made in introducing the motion. In fact, it is actually written into the motion on the Notice Paper. He went on to say:

An Assessment and Diagnostic Clinic for the intellectually retarded was opened at the Outpatients Department of the Parkside Hospital about 12 months ago, but because of space limitations the intellectually retarded clinic is now located in portion of the premises at Fitzroy Terrace, Prospect. That is a temporary expedient to provide more space for this clinic.

That is an admission that more people are clamouring for admission to this kind of centre, and that the Government is in a real dilemma in having to provide temporary accommodation for them. The Premier referred to the waiting lists of children qualified for future admission to training centres for the intellectually retarded when these were established. We had been led to believe that work would be ready to proceed on these at the earliest possible time, because the Premier had said that approval had been given for the prepara-

tion of working drawings, etc., to enable tenders to be called for the new Strathmont Hospital and training centre at Hillcrest. His remarks were contradictory, because he then went on to say that detailed planning for the Strathmont Hospital was actually going on. It is difficult to know what is really happening, for it all seems to be very involved, and there seems to be an atmosphere of uncertainty about the whole project.

I could not help feeling as I read this that the Premier did not seem to be very well acquainted with or informed of what was going on, or that there may have been a change in planning. He further said:

The letting of contracts will depend on the availability of funds.

This is nothing new at all. He also said:

With the heavy commitment of funds on the rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, it will not be possible to let a contract for either hospital during the current financial year.

The last reference in the Premier's statement was to the Minister of Health's visit to Canberra. He said:

My colleague, the Minister of Health, returned the week before last—

this was on August 3—

from a two-day conference in Canberra of Commonwealth and State Health Ministers. Amongst other matters, the State Ministers submitted claims for greater Commonwealth aid for mental health institutions, and the Commonwealth Minister has agreed to submit the claims to Cabinet.

However, we still have not heard whether South Australia has been granted an extension of time so that it can benefit from these Commonwealth grants. I think that sufficient information has been provided, both by the members who have supported me in this debate and in what I have been able to tell the House as a result of visits to these various centres, which are overcrowded and which are looking for relief to the establishment of these two new mental institutions. The motion states that delay in putting the plans for building these two hospitals into effect will occasion continued hardship to mental patients. I believe this has been substantiated by the evidence I put before the House and by the speeches made in support of the motion.

Various new hostels have been established to accommodate discharged mental patients but there is great scope for development and improvement of other hostels. About two years ago, I was invited to give evidence before a medical committee under the chairmanship, I think, of the Director-General of Public

Health. I was asked specifically if I could suggest any remedy to the types of private accommodation provided for patients discharged from mental hospitals. I believe this matter is completely out of hand. Although there are good hostels and homes, many do not measure up to the standards that most thinking people believe desirable. Until some kind of model by-law is introduced in Parliament to set up a standard to which the people who run these homes should conform, I believe we shall always have dissatisfaction and disquiet in the community about the type of provision made for the welfare of discharged mental patients.

I appeal to the Government to hasten the provision of the two new mental hospitals. I believe the Government deserves censure because, in his policy speech before the elections in March last year, the Premier promised an entirely new deal for people suffering from mental disorders. He said he was going to "immediately speed up the rehousing of mental hospital patients in modern buildings adequate for their needs". Of course, that has not happened. In addition to its not going on with the building of these two mental hospitals, the Government has not fulfilled its promise to build two other general hospitals.

I believe the Government stands condemned for not pushing on with this work, which it stated so specifically it would carry out immediately if it won the election. Nothing at all has been done in this direction, and people who were to be the first recipients of rehabilitation and training in these mental hospitals are still inmates of either Parkside or Hillcrest or have been discharged and are living in homes for discharged mental patients under conditions which, very often, are unsatisfactory. Therefore, I commend the motion to the House which, I hope, will give a definite expression of opinion on this matter as a result of which the Government will do something to bring about improved conditions in this sphere.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke and Rodda, Mrs. Steele (teller), and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Brookman. No—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.
Motion thus negatived.

GAS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford:

That in the opinion of this House a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into and report upon what steps should be taken to expedite the construction of a gas pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide, and matters incidental thereto,

which Mr. Lawn had moved to amend by striking out "a Select Committee should be appointed" and inserting "the Government should be congratulated upon the action it has already taken in appointing a committee".

(Continued from September 21. Page 1741.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): In continuing my remarks, I should say immediately, on behalf of all members, that we were tremendously pleased with the Premier's trip to Canberra last Thursday and with the submissions made to the Commonwealth Government for financial support for a natural gas pipeline from Gidgealpa and Moomba to Adelaide. That trip, the submissions, and the tabling of them in this House, render quite innocuous and silly the motion moved by the member for Gumeracha, and I hope that he will now withdraw it. It is clear that, with the submissions made to the Commonwealth Government, should this House now agree to the motion, the Commonwealth Government would say to this State, "You have not made up your mind what to do and how you are going about it, and we cannot give you any decision on your submission unless the Select Committee that you have agreed to appoint to inquire into the matter has met and reported its findings." This motion, if carried at this stage, would not only cause further delay but would postpone the start of the construction of the pipeline. This should be obvious to all members, and I hope when the time comes that the member for Gumeracha will be man enough to admit the point and withdraw his motion.

Last week, I dealt with the capital costs of the construction of a pipeline, and emphasized the importance of keeping those costs as low as humanly possible. We would all like to see the capital costs of the pipeline financed outright by a grant from the Commonwealth Government, but we know from recent experience that this is not possible and that the submissions to the Commonwealth Government have not been made on that basis. Nevertheless, the submissions demonstrate clearly a fact

known to most honourable members, that the interest cost involved in the financing of the pipeline will make a substantial difference to total transportation costs of the gas from Gidgealpa to Adelaide. On page 3 of the submissions it is pointed out that with \$31,000,000 capital investment, the unit cost of transportation, with this extent of equipment, based on a 75 per cent load factor with 5½ per cent interest, and full depreciation on a sinking fund basis over 20 years (8¼ per cent debt service in all), would be about 9½c a thousand cubic feet of natural gas delivered to Adelaide. For each 1 per cent by which the debt service might exceed 8¼ per cent, the transport cost would be higher by nearly 1c a thousand cubic feet. If we have to pay 6¼ per cent interest, instead of transportation costs of 9½c a thousand cubic feet—

Mr. Nankivell: Isn't it a million cubic feet?

Mr. HUDSON: I think I am correct and that it is a thousand cubic feet. I stand correction, but I have taken it from the equivalent given of one thousand cubic feet, that is, Mcf, at the bottom of page 8 of the submissions. Whether one thousand or one million, the basis of my argument is not altered, namely, that each 1 per cent rise in the interest rate that has to be paid will raise the transportation cost an Mcf by 1c. This becomes particularly important if we consider the form of authority that could be established in order to transport the gas to Adelaide, and when the question of private enterprise undertaking the project is considered. In this morning's *Advertiser* appeared a letter from a so-called petroleum geologist that contained rude remarks about Government participation in such a scheme, and asked why it could not be left to private enterprise. It was rather a hysterical letter and hardly worthy of comment, except that it was published and could mislead many people. On page 7 of the submissions the possible consequences of commercial financing of the pipeline are clearly shown, as it states:

It has been pointed out by the producers (Delhi-Santos), that, should they contemplate completely commercial financing of a pipeline, they would probably be bound to specify the debt servicing (including equity capital earnings) of 9¼ per cent per annum plus depreciation on a straight line basis of 5 per cent per annum. In such case, in the early years pipeline charges would be about 2 cents per Mcf higher, and the producers doubt whether such charges could be less than 16 cents per Mcf.

In other words, in that kind of organizing of the pipeline the cost of transportation would

increase from 9½c a thousand cubic feet in the early years to about 16c a thousand cubic feet, and that proposition is supported by the producers themselves. I think that gives the complete lie to the desirability, if it is put forward by anyone, of organizing this pipeline and financing it entirely by private means, without the use of any Government funds.

The use of Government funds can ensure that the transportation cost is kept at a low level and only if that is done can we be certain that natural gas can be supplied to Adelaide at such a price to the consumers of gas that over-all industrial development will be stimulated. In my opinion, it is not enough to supply natural gas to Adelaide as a possible alternative to other fuels and barely competitive with them. If that were done, there would be no significant stimulus to industrial development in the State and the main saving would be in the substitution of natural gas for imported fuels.

There would be a saving on the balance of payments but there would be no direct benefit to the people of South Australia through greater industrial development. The profits from the production of natural gas and the piping of it would be taken by private groups, perhaps oversea companies with entire shareholdings outside this State and even outside Australia. South Australia would benefit little from such an arrangement. It is vital (and again I think the submission made to the Commonwealth Government makes this clear) that natural gas be supplied at a price in Adelaide that will stimulate the overall industrial development of the State, so that we get to the consumer a lower price for fuel than the present price.

In later years, when the capital costs of the pipeline may tend to be less than in the initial years, further economies should be passed on to the consumers. The use of natural gas is not to be for the sole benefit of the producers and the transporters of it to Adelaide. The reason why the Government of South Australia is interested in the project is that it realizes that we have a fuel that can possibly be supplied to Adelaide at a cheaper price than other fuels, and that this could give South Australia a competitive advantage in relation to other States and provide a great stimulus to the overall development of the State.

This is most important and I am sure that all honourable members, when they examine in detail the submission to the Commonwealth Government, will agree that, if possible, the

pipeline authority should be Government-controlled and financed, because in that way the capital costs could be kept as low as possible. Pages 8 and 9 of the submission are also significant, because they point out the relative prices of alternative fuels.

The most favourable price of alternative supplies for domestic gas currently supplied in Adelaide is about 42c to 45c a million British thermal units and this unit is about the equivalent of the heat value in one thousand cubic feet of natural gas. The most favourable alternative fuel for industrial heating purposes at present costs about the equivalent of 30c to 32c per Mef of natural gas, whilst for generation of electricity the most favourable alternative fuel can at present be secured on the basis of very large volume contracts for the equivalent of about 26c to 27c per Mef of natural gas.

Mr. Quirke: What does Leigh Creek coal cost?

Mr. HUDSON: I think Leigh Creek coal comes in at the lower level, about 26 or 27c or less. If it is less, that reinforces my argument. Furthermore, we know that the major consumer of natural gas in the initial stages will be the Electricity Trust and, therefore, it is vital that that the trust be supplied with natural gas at a price cheaper than the fuel it is at present able to obtain, which means at a price less than 26c to 27c a thousand cubic feet. I think the trust would need to be supplied at a price of about 22c to 23c a thousand cubic feet of natural gas in order to make it an economic proposition for the trust to change to the use of that fuel and, therefore, to make it an attractive proposition for the overall development of the State.

Mr. Quirke: What would you say would be necessary to pay in interest on the capital cost?

Mr. HUDSON: That is made clear in the submission. Natural gas for other uses, where alternative fuels were not as cheap as the fuels that the Electricity Trust is currently able to use, would be supplied at a slightly higher price, about 26c or 27c a thousand cubic feet. If the price of natural gas in Adelaide was that price to all users, on average, and if the cost a thousand cubic feet of transporting the gas from Gidgealpa to Adelaide was about 9½c to 10c a thousand cubic feet, it would enable Delhi-Santos to obtain a price at the well head (on which some royalties would probably be charged by the Government) of about 16c or 17c a thousand cubic feet, on average.

However, if the price of transporting the gas increased to 16c a thousand cubic feet because private commercial capital was used and equity capital costs had to be paid, the maximum price it could receive for gas at the well head would be about 10c a thousand cubic feet. In such circumstances, there may be much difficulty in getting any effective agreement with Delhi-Santos.

One of the problems at present facing the Victorian Government in relation to the exploration of off-shore discoveries is the difficulty in arriving at a satisfactory agreement with the B.H.P.-Esso group in respect of fuel at the well heads.

Mr. Casey: I do not think Victoria has an assured supply yet.

Mr. HUDSON: Whether it has or not, Victoria has been negotiating on the price to be paid, according to press reports, for over a year. To my mind, nothing could be clearer than this submission in bringing home the point, first of all that, in the total cost of transportation of gas, capital costs represent 90 per cent. The cost of transportation of the gas will tend to rise by 1c a thousand cubic feet for each 1 per cent rise in the debt service costs, or the interest rate. Therefore, if the Government can borrow at the normal Loan Council rate, 5¼ per cent, so much the better. Less attractive is borrowing at a semi-government rate of 6¼ per cent, or borrowing at the interest rate that may have to be paid if a private organization finances the pipeline, using fixed interest debentures at 7 or 8 per cent. Even less attractive would be the consequences for the overall development of South Australia if equity capital had to be used for financing the pipeline, and if it were to be controlled and built by a private consortium of companies.

I think that it is paramount, regardless of Party or political belief, to make it absolutely clear that on this issue we are concerned with the overall interests of South Australia, and with the overall stimulus to be given to industrial development. The construction of the pipeline means obtaining capital at the lowest possible interest costs. In the present Australian environment this means Government financing of the pipeline, if that is at all possible. That emphasizes again the importance of the submission to the Commonwealth Government. To the extent that the Commonwealth Government comes to the party on this question and treats it as a matter of national development, we shall be able in years to come to say to South Australians that 1969 was the year

in which natural gas was first delivered to Adelaide, and in which a vital change occurred in the industrial prospects facing South Australia. Nothing could be more vital than that. In order to avoid the kind of endless controversy that can result in the press from vague and poorly worked-out suggestions as to possible ways of financing the pipeline, which can lead only to clouding the issue and possible delay, I believe that all members should be prepared on this question to sink any differences they may have, to sink their possible desire to seek political advantage, and to support wholeheartedly the submission made to the Commonwealth Government.

For my own part, I support it wholeheartedly; I think it is a first-rate document, and I hope the Commonwealth Government is able to agree to it. I hope it sees its way clear to answer "Yes" in every respect to the representations made by the Premier on behalf of South Australians, so that we can finance the pipeline in the cheapest possible way and get the whole project off the ground and started. Indeed, if the project is not implemented in a large way, we shall not obtain the kind of stimulus that we need, or the kind of industrial progress needed. I support the amendment, and I hope the member for Gumeracha will see fit to withdraw his motion.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Nankivell:

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that a Public Accounts Committee be established to:

- (a) examine the accounts of the receipts of the State and each statement and report transmitted to the Houses of Parliament by the Auditor-General, pursuant to the Audit Act, 1921-1957;
- (b) report to both Houses of Parliament, with such comment as it thinks fit, any items or matters in those accounts, statements and reports, or any circumstances connected with them, to which the committee is of the opinion that the attention of the Parliament should be directed;
- (c) report to both Houses of Parliament any alteration which the committee thinks desirable in the form of the public accounts or in the method of keeping them, or in the mode of receipt, control, issue or payment of public moneys; and
- (d) inquire into any question in connection with the public accounts which is referred to it by either House of Parliament, and to report to that House upon that question—

which Mr. Ryan had moved to amend by striking out all words after "established" and inserting:

"which shall consist of five members of the House of Assembly, two of whom shall belong to the group led by the Leader of the Opposition in the House, for the following purposes:

- (a) to examine the accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the State, any report transmitted to the House of Assembly by the Auditor-General pursuant to the Audit Act, 1921-1959, as amended, and such other accounts laid before Parliament as the committee may think fit and to report to the House of Assembly upon any items in those accounts or any circumstances connected with them to which the committee thinks that the attention of the House should be directed;
- (b) to inquire into and report to the House of Assembly upon any expenditure by a Minister of the Crown made without Parliamentary sanction or appropriation;
- (c) to report to the House of Assembly upon any alteration which the committee thinks desirable in the form of the public accounts or the method of keeping them or in the method of receipt, expenditure, control, issue, or payment of the public moneys;
- (d) to inquire into and report upon any question in connection with the public accounts on its own initiative or which is referred to the committee by resolution of the House of Assembly or by the Governor or a Minister of the Crown;
- (e) to carry out any other functions assigned to the committee by any Standing Order of the House of Assembly; and
- (f) to inquire into and report upon any matter relating to the public accounts which in the opinion of the Auditor-General requires immediate investigation and is referred by him in writing to the Committee."

(Continued from September 21. Page 1745.)

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I do not support the proposal to institute a public accounts committee in either of the forms appearing on the Notice Paper. The appointment of such a committee would intrude into the political and administrative life of South Australia. I have four points to make, although this matter has more points than has a porcupine. In the first place, one of my major objections to a public accounts committee is that it would be a post-mortem examination. The committee would commence to investigate a matter at the end of 12 months, and may or may not find fault. Secondly, such a committee is aimed at departmental heads more than at Ministers. It has been my experience (and I am sure Government Ministers will

agree) that it is an extremely slow job to obtain final replies from the Commonwealth Administration, simply because of the presence of such a committee. High-ranking officials there are hesitant about the advice they give to Ministers until they are absolutely certain that they are unchallengeable by the committee.

Some may say that that is a good thing, but it is not a good thing; it can easily delay urgent applications to the Commonwealth for State works. Indeed, I had just that experience, and I should not like to see anything continued along those lines. When approaches are made, an officer has to get down to the minor details in every way, because it is not the Minister who is challenged or rebuked by the committee: it is the departmental officer on whom a particular Minister (and this applies to every Minister) depends for the analytical advice given to him on all matters raised. This motion is aimed at those officers; they will take the knock. That has been proved, and officers are often so scared that their replies and advice to Ministers are delayed sometimes to an extent extremely embarrassing to State Administrations.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: In other words, you can be too careful.

Mr. QUIRKE: Far too careful! Our departmental heads are careful people, who have a knowledge, in addition to their natural talents, born of vast experience. They do not make many mistakes. Occasionally, something will come in and a Minister in South Australia at any time has been able to rely upon his chiefs of staff; he can take it from them that what they are doing and the advice they are giving him are carefully considered.

The other factor about these departmental officers is that they can be called up for a most exhaustive examination on these things. They are actually paraded before what is tantamount to a court martial, even if they are found innocent and prove their case up to the hilt. Why should they be subjected to these pin-pricking inquiries?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: And why should time be wasted on them?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. I could never support that. I have too high a regard for the type of people appointed to these offices in administration. In addition to wasting their time, it goes right down through the department to the people who have to handle the dockets and do everything in connection with them. There is general research and general hubbub throughout the department in order to satisfy

questions that are, in many cases, of no importance. It is the duty of Parliament to take heed of any comments of the Auditor-General, in whom I think every member of this House has complete confidence. He does not flinch from making candid comments: that is his job. He is an officer of Parliament; he is our custodian and issues his mammoth report year after year. If there is the slightest wrong, he comments upon it and is completely independent. His job is to indicate to us what is happening in the financial world in these departments.

If that is what we have here, why do we want a lot of busybodies holding up the work of the State and of departments while they investigate not one thing but things in every department? I do not agree with that. I have sufficient confidence in the officers of the State in administration, because of their quality and because of the Auditor-General, who is responsible for reporting to Parliament, which he does without fear or favour. I see no reason why we should intrude this body, no matter of whom it is composed, whether members of Parliament or anybody else. I would hate the lot of them because of the job they would be expected to do. I would not have a bar of any of them. I do not support the motion.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): This has been an interesting debate. Various opinions have been put forward from this side of the House but no actual opinion has been expressed from the other side, except an amendment that materially alters the substance of the motion as originally moved. Those members who have been critical of the establishment of such a committee used principally as their argument the fact that it would embarrass senior members of the Public Service, that it would reduce people's confidence in the Public Service, that competent people would not wish to be placed in a position where they might be interrogated by incompetent members of Parliament, that it would make it an unattractive job to be in the Public Service, because members of Parliament on this committee could so embarrass them by their questions that they would feel unhappy in their jobs and would want to vacate them. That seems a spurious argument.

After all, this committee is to be formed of members of Parliament. Surely they are responsible people. If they are responsible people, they will not unduly embarrass members of the Public Service, with whom they have to work. But there is no reason why they should

not have the right to ask questions of members of the Public Service, who are responsible for administration, or why they should not ask them why they perform certain functions in a certain way, and in certain cases why they took certain actions and did certain things. Then it has been suggested that there are insufficient members in this House to form a committee, but my motion refers to a joint committee, not of a single House. I do not think this is any valid argument for opposing the formation of such a committee, or that the duties of the committee would be so onerous; nor do I think that the present members of Parliament are so overworked that they could not sit on two committees, if necessary. Therefore, I cannot see that it would grossly overload the working of Parliament or place an undue strain on members of Parliament to sit on two committees, whenever they were summoned at the same time. There is nothing, as far as I know, in the Constitution that prevents a member of Parliament from sitting on two committees.

Certain remarks were made in this House by the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) when he moved his amendment to the original motion—remarks for which I cannot find any support. His principal reason for bringing in the substantial amendments to which he referred was that he did not believe that the Legislative Council had the right to take part in the activities of any committee dealing with a fiscal matter. He said that the Legislative Council did not have powers in this matter. Under the Constitution Act I find that another place does have powers, which the member for Port Adelaide said it did not possess. It does not have exact equality of powers but it can amend, and make recommendations to amend, fiscal matters. Therefore, it does in some measure have an influence over financial policy if it wishes to exercise it. On these grounds I do not see that there is any reason why the members of another place should be entirely excluded. I think the only reason for their exclusion from such a committee would be to try to isolate them (every other committee we have is a joint committee) in this matter.

I point out that the reason (and it was pointed out by the member for Port Adelaide) why this matter failed when it was introduced in 1933 was that another place took exception to the fact that it was being excluded from the committee. In those circumstances, if the Government is interested in introducing a Bill similar to the one introduced last year

and I imagine it is, it would be a Bill drawn on the substance of the motion moved by the member for Port Adelaide, but it would be well advised to consider the inclusion of members of another place in this matter. In conclusion, I say again that our finances are not complete, and that Parliament has not done its duty in the study of financial matters, unless a committee is able to review the expenditure that has been voted. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) supported the suggestion put forward by the Auditor-General in his report that such an authority as this should be not a Parliamentary body but a departmental group. The Auditor-General said:

In my opinion there should be some authority (possibly attached to the Treasury) competent to review projects such as public buildings, schools, etc., to ensure that these provide necessary requirements at the lowest possible cost. In the case of works to be submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee, a review before submission could save a considerable amount of committee time.

I do not doubt that a review of this sort would save considerable time for the Public Works Committee before it carried out an investigation. However, after an investigation has been carried out and this House has voted the money, there is no competent person or body, other than the Auditor-General, to pass any comment on how that money has been spent. In no way does this House have the full access of inquiry into the facts relating to the expenditure of those moneys; and unless it has those powers and can exercise them it does not completely fulfil its function, in my view, and it does not accept its responsibilities to the community for not only the voting of money that is collected and provided by taxes but also for the way that money is spent.

Therefore, I believe there is considerable value in the motion as I moved it. I consider that the arguments put forward by those members who have opposed the motion are not very well considered arguments but are just arguments born of prejudice rather than of fact. I disagree with the alternative proposals that have been put forward, because this is a bicameral system of Government and we have two Houses; irrespective of what the present Government might think or do, we still have another Chamber which has powers under the Constitution, and its financial powers cannot be overlooked. There is no reason why that Chamber should be excluded from the consideration of financial matters or of any discrepancies that might occur in the management of this State's finances. It has powers

(and it exercises them) to suggest amendments on financial Bills, so it should have the right to refer financial matters to such a committee as is envisaged for investigation and report.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

THE ESTIMATES.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 27. Page 1872.)

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF FORESTS.

Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation, \$127,758.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The sum of \$1,180 is provided under the line "Purchase of boats and engines and initial costs of new research vessel", and this is \$3,323 less than the actual expenditure last year. At one stage the provision of a new research and investigation vessel for the Department of Fisheries was discussed. I understood this matter was actively considered last year, and I think some of the money on the line then was devoted to the initial planning of this vessel. Can the Minister of Agriculture indicate the time table in respect of the priority of the new vessel?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I noted the comment the Leader of the Opposition made at a meeting he attended in the South-East, I think at Port MacDonnell, when he was rather critical of the Government's attitude in respect of its research vessel. I believe he said on that occasion that the former Government had spent money on the old *Investigator* to place it in a seaworthy condition. Apparently it was true that certain moneys were spent because the vessel was totally unsuited for use as a research vessel. It did certain work relating to research at that time (mainly associated with the crayfish industry), but it certainly was not a vessel of the type really required for this purpose. The present situation is that the exact type of research vessel needed has not yet been determined.

One suggestion was that a smaller, faster vessel would be more acceptable than a larger vessel that could, perhaps, stay at sea longer. A smaller vessel could go to sea with not quite such a large crew but still be effective in the type of work it could do. This matter is still being considered. The sum provided in the Estimates this year is for the purchase of vessels and so on for work of the Fisheries

Department. The Leader said the allocation had been reduced somewhat from the sum provided last year but, nevertheless, the sum provided is what was requested by the department for this purpose.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister said that the *Investigator* was totally unsuited for research purposes. Before that vessel was purchased competent officers of the department made inquiries and, in addition, a survey was made and suggested modifications were eventually made to the vessel. For a time it gave every appearance of serving the purpose for which it was purchased. It had been designed originally to be used for fishing, in which it had been engaged. The Minister's statement surprised me because I have been on the vessel, and no complaint was made about inadequate performance while I was associated with it. Indeed, the vessel was economical to run and had every facility for the investigations required to be undertaken. Strangely, when the new Government assumed office, the vessel was tied up. If the vessel was unsatisfactory, why was it not sold and a more suitable vessel put in its place? This industry is assuming great importance in South Australia and provides export income, so why was the purpose for which the vessel was purchased abandoned when this Government took office?

The vessels for the purchase of which an allocation is made in the Estimates obviously will be nothing more than internal patrol vessels. The sum total of the allocations for last year and this year would not begin to provide enough to purchase a vessel suitable for research work. However, Russia has sent exploratory vessels to make tests along the southern coast of this Continent, which illustrates the importance of research. The differences between the Commonwealth and the State Governments on fishing rights and so on have now been largely smoothed out. Can the Minister say whether research on the State's fishing resources has been dropped permanently or whether it has been dropped for only a short period?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: We do not intend to abandon research work. The *Investigator* is being kept in workable order should a need arise for it to go to sea for a particular purpose. We are still considering whether it would be better to sell this vessel and buy another. At the last Fisheries Council meeting held in Queensland research vessels were discussed. The Ministers from Victoria and Western Australia were both critical of the Minister for Primary Industry that no

money was made available for research work in a way similar to that in which money was made available for the Agricultural Council. One suggestion made was that a dollar-for-dollar subsidy could be made by the Commonwealth to the States for this purpose, and that suggestion is being considered. In fact, a committee comprising Fisheries Directors of all States is to report back to the Fisheries Council with a recommendation on research, particularly in relation to the cost of vessels for this purpose. Both the Leader and the member for Gumeracha realize that a vessel of this size would cost more than the sum now allocated. I assure members that we have not lost sight of the need for research and it is taking place even with the equipment we have. Of course, I agree that this research should be stepped up. At the next Fisheries Council meeting this matter will again attract lively interest.

Line passed.

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

Chemistry Department, \$196,905—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$1,307,369.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to advances to the Citrus Organization Committee for which provision of \$10,000 has been made. Under the Citrus Industry Organization Act passed last session no provision was made for payment of compensation to those whose businesses were adversely affected by the actions and decisions of the committee. This was relevant to the case I raised a couple of weeks ago, but I am certain that all fair-minded people, and, therefore, all members of this Committee will agree that if a person's business is affected and his assets are depreciated there should be some provision for compensating that person for his loss. This is a well established principle. It seems from what I know so far of the workings of this committee that the effect of some of its decisions and refusals to license have already been to depreciate assets and cause financial hardship to people. Does the Minister consider that provision should be made by anyone for compensating those affected in this way, and if he does, what does he intend to do?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No provision was made for compensation in the Act. The situation occurs when organized marketing is taking place, not only in this but in other instances, that it affects people's livelihood and some suffer because of the overall benefit to a number of others. I should like to give this question more mature consideration than I have time to do tonight, and I cannot comment any further now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not satisfied with that answer. The Minister has been aware for many weeks that this was happening because it has been brought to his notice by me and other people, so that it is hardly fair of him to imply that it has been sprung on him tonight and he needs time to consider it. This is the point at which we should ask for (as I do now) some satisfaction. If we let it go now and do not get an answer, I do not know when we will get another opportunity to ventilate this matter. From what the Minister has said he admits this is happening. He said that in the interests of many people some individuals may have to suffer. This is a dreadful thing to say if nothing is to be done about it. Why should some individuals pay with their assets, their life savings, and their hard work for the benefit of other people? That is not what we do in a democracy and it is not our idea of fair play.

Had I known when the Bill was before the House that the committee to be set up, and which the Government eventually appointed, would act in this way deliberately to cut off people's businesses, I would have strenuously opposed it. The Minister admits this is going on and that it is wrong. This matter has not been raised for the first time now and the Minister does not need time to consider it. In the light of the admission he has made that this is happening and that he has known about it for a long time, I ask him again what he or the Government intends to do to right what is an obvious and admitted injustice.

The CHAIRMAN: "Minister of Agriculture, Miscellaneous"—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought the Minister was about to say something, but I am not content to let this line go without a better answer. We are here as members of Parliament to protect the rights of individuals, and it is admitted by the Minister that they are being flouted. This is not good enough: it is our job to discuss these things and work out what is going to be done. I ask the Minister not to hope that the line will be passed if he just sits tight: it will not go through until I receive a proper answer. I ask him again—

Mr. Hughes: That is not the way to get information.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the member for Wallaroo think this is not happening, or does he think we should not do anything about it?

Mr. Hughes: You should not make threats to get information.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not: I am asking the Minister to give a reply when he admits there is an injustice. I am saying I will keep going until I get a reply.

Mr. Hughes: Then keep going.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the Minister again if he will answer my question.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I thought I had given the honourable member an answer but, apparently, it would not matter what I said, he would not be satisfied. He has said that he is not satisfied and will keep going until he is. I can see that this line will not be passed, but I have not much more to say. I did not say that an injustice had been done: I said that some people must naturally be at a disadvantage when orderly marketing is introduced. This has happened in many instances. Every effort was made by the Citrus Organization Committee to have some other arrangements made to offset any disadvantages to people.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you tell us what the arrangements are?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Certain things were offered to the people concerned who did not qualify for the licence. I am treading on dangerous ground because this matter is still *sub judice*. To answer this question is difficult, and that is all I can say now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If we let this go, we are condoning what is now admitted to be an injustice. The Minister admitted it straight out before and now he has admitted it by implication, because he has said that certain things were offered to those who did not qualify. We know that the main reason why many people have not qualified is simply the location of their businesses and nothing else. The fact that they happen not to be packing in the River Murray area is the reason why they have been refused licences. In the case that I have mentioned before in this House, an asset of about \$40,000 or more is involved. What arrangements are proposed by either the committee or the Government to compensate the man who may lose the lot simply because of the location of his business? If I cannot get an answer here—and I put this to you sincerely, as Chairman of Committees—this Committee is falling down on its job.

The CHAIRMAN: I might agree with that, but that is not the Chairman's fault.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am addressing the Chair. I am surprised that you have reproved me for that.

The CHAIRMAN: I said that I might agree with that but that it was not the Chairman's fault.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We are here as members of Parliament to see that justice is done and, if justice is not done, to try to insist that it be done. Surely the Minister can say that he does not propose to take any action on this matter and intends to condone the ruination of a number of people through no fault of their own or he can say what he proposes to do, what plans he has in mind. In other legislation we are careful not to ruin people without giving them some measure of compensation. Why should it not be the same here? If the Minister prides himself on being a good Minister of Agriculture, let him say either that he is going to allow injustice to be done by a committee over which he has some control or that he proposes to do something about it.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I can see that I must say something more on this matter and I shall endeavour to keep within bounds for the sake of the case before the court. The honourable member is no doubt referring to one of his constituents named Eitzen.

Mr. Millhouse: He is the man I have in mind.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I claim that the Citrus Organization Committee and I (as Minister) have done everything within our power to help Mr. Eitzen. When the honourable member raised this matter in Parliament initially by way of question, I took it up with the Citrus Organization Committee, which gave Mr. Eitzen a provisional licence that operated for some time. It was then found that, with the system that had been adopted, the committee could no longer continue this provisional licence. At the time, I went to the trouble of getting a full report from the committee and I submitted that report to the honourable member to enable him to read it. He had it in his file for some weeks and I had to ask him to give it back, because it was something that had been written to me. I eventually got it back.

The honourable member came to me again with the gentleman concerned and I could appreciate the young man's difficulties. I told the honourable member that I would arrange for the main members of the committee to meet Mr. Eitzen and myself in my office. I did this and we discussed the matter. I asked Mr. Eitzen whether he could measure up to what was required. A booklet has been prepared setting out the marketing and policy administration under the Citrus Industry Organization

Act. That sets out the policy of the Citrus Organization Committee, and I asked the young man whether he could do what the committee desired.

I point out that an inquiry committee was set up by a former Minister of Lands and that I entirely condoned his action, because I knew the dangerous position facing the citrus industry. That position was as serious as that faced by the sugar industry in Queensland. Before the Citrus Organization Committee was set up, one of my constituents sent 26 cases of first-grade oranges to Victoria and received the magnificent amount of 1s. 1d., which works out at ½d. a case. This and other cases were brought to the notice of the Minister at that time. Similar instances were occurring on the soldier settlement area at Loxton. The Minister at that time set up the inquiry committee with the full concurrence of the Cabinet and of Parliament.

One of the things laid down in the report is that the citrus fruit should be packed near the source of supply and the report also said that everyone packing for the home market should also pack for the export market. The reason for this was that the greater percentage of our citrus was exported overseas. As the production increases, this percentage will be greater. I gave all credit to the Minister for setting up the committee, because I knew the situation in the industry at the time.

The Citrus Organization Committee has two members who were on the inquiry committee and it is the policy of the committee that citrus should be packed by a packer who has all the material for packing for export near the source of supply. This was explained to Mr. Eitzen in my office and, naturally, he still had some differences with the committee. I can appreciate that, because of his circumstances. One thing that was gleaned was that Mr. Eitzen was in severe financial difficulties, even before this had happened. In fact, my information was that he was indebted to the Balhannah Cold Stores for \$2,000, which he had some difficulty in paying, even before this matter had arisen.

After he said he could not measure up to providing this equipment and going to the river area (and Mypolonga is not far away), I offered to try to find him other employment to tide him over the time when the apple season was not on, because he handled apples at one time of the year and oranges at the other.

He said, "I cannot take another job, because I can neither read nor write." I would not have said these things had it not been for the insistence of the honourable member. I hold nothing against the man concerned. He is a little gentleman.

Mr. Curren: You are not referring to the member for Mitcham, are you?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No, I am not. I am referring to Mr. Eitzen. Subsequently, the honourable member brought this matter up by way of a grievance when the House was about to go into Committee. On that occasion he said things I found it difficult to reply to because the matter was *sub judice*. I raised this point of order on three occasions, I think, and on the last occasion the Speaker upheld my point of order. The member for Mitcham abused a privilege: he gave an assurance to the Speaker three times that he would not say anything that was likely to affect the matter before the court, and yet he finally quoted remarks made by Justice Travers who was trying the case. His was a bold and blatant misuse of an assurance he gave to the Speaker at that time. The member for Mitcham also quoted from a letter he had received from a friend of the Premier, and said—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member cannot refer to a previous debate in this session.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am sorry for having transgressed, Mr. Chairman, but I think I should read this letter. Addressed to the Premier, it states:

Dear Frank, This letter was originally intended to be one of sincere appreciation for your personal consideration for me on behalf of my friend Mr. Eitzen at Hawthorndene. It now appears that it must be an apology which I earnestly offer even though my honest endeavours have been misused. I would like you to believe that allowing the letter from you to go to Eitzen (who was concerned with the inquiry) was an act of honest intent. I realize fully that the letter was my personal property and innocently believed other parties would have used the common courtesy of regarding and treating it as such. Your phone call so amazed me that I am still unable to adjust myself to its consequences—

Mr. Millhouse: That's the understatement of the year from what I've heard.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The letter continues:

I cannot reconcile the attitude of Mr. Millhouse. My concern for the treatment (so undeserved) meted out to you is profound. My opposite view is one of utter disgust for those who could associate themselves with so complete a lack of ethics and etiquette. How

Mr. Millhouse could take my letter to Parliament and use it against you without my permission amazes me. My make-up does not allow for things of this nature. I do not use people up. To say I am truly sorry while wanting to thank you for your effort seems ludicrous—yet I have nothing else to submit. Yours sincerely, Ray Hughes.

I do not think I need say any more than that. I would not have said many of these things except for the insistence of the member for Mitcham.

Mr. HALL: I am not concerned with personalities, or with a revelation contained in correspondence. Nor have I knowledge of the full details, as the member for Mitcham has in regard to his constituent's plight. However, three people recently came to see me and said their livelihood had been taken from them. One of those was involved in the court case to which the Minister has referred, but the other two who were not said they represented 15 people in the packing industry. Therefore, I suppose I can mention 14 of those who were not involved in litigation concerning the Minister, his department, or any other aspect of citrus organization. I have not taken the opportunity to make political capital out of this, as I could easily have done weeks ago; I have waited on the sidelines, hoping someone would explain what is to be done for these people, or at least get some information, so that I could tell them what could be done. Apparently, however, no definite information is to be given to me. What am I to tell these people? I ask the Minister to give me definite information that I can pass on to these people, who have come to me in force to tell me they are being deprived of their livelihood.

Mr. HEASLIP: Last year \$1,080,000 was granted for the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, whereas \$1,064,000 is to be granted this year, involving a reduction of \$16,000. In reply to a question I asked last night, the Minister could not say why the line for research centres was reduced by \$37,000. South Australia still depends on agricultural research and advancement, and it is most important that our producers receive the latest information resulting from research activities, in order to be able to produce economically, to the best of their ability, and to compete with the rest of the world. Has the Minister any information on this matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This line is part of the total university grant approved by the Treasurer after the submission of the budget for the calendar year. Being fully

aware of the activities at the Waite institute, the honourable member, I am sure, would find no quibble about the allocation, if he visited the place. The budget was submitted by the institute and is, of course, handled by the Treasury. In fact, the budget is not submitted to me at all, but to the Under-Treasurer, who works out with the institute the sum to be allocated, which is exactly what has been granted this year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not involved in any way in the citrus industry in my district; nor am I involved with an applicant for a licence, but I am concerned with the Minister's statement that packing licences would be issued only to one place in this State, namely, the Murray River area and that, as Mr. Eitzen did not operate in that area, he would not receive a licence. As the very title of the committee is the Citrus Organization Committee of South Australia, it seems to me that the matter should be carefully examined. I am also concerned at the fact that the Minister said no-one would receive a licence unless waxing equipment was attached to his organization. That may be suitable for oversea exports, but it imposes a heavy cost on South Australian industry producing oranges for local consumption. Indeed, I know that the Agriculture Department was completely opposed to this scheme in respect of produce consumed locally, and it did not benefit local consumption. One packing shed having installed such equipment, others felt obliged to follow suit. It imposes a substantial cost on the industry—

Mr. Curren: How much a case?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: About 2c.

Mr. Curren: That's a heavy burden!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It involves much money to the industry, over all. But, apart from that, I point out to the Minister that provision is made in the Act for licences to be given for different purposes: there is no need to confine the licences to the Murray River area, because equalization and compensation funds are provided for the industry. If growers who sell their oranges overseas do not get a price equivalent to that for oranges for home consumption, compensation is provided for. Provision is also made for various conditions to be attached to the licence. I cannot agree with the Minister. When the Bill was before members, it was never stated that the packing of citrus would be confined to one area only. If it is, it will

ultimately prove costly and not in the best interests of the industry.

In another industry with which I am associated, bulk handling is an important way of saving costs. I do not agree with the Minister's conception of the position. In fact, when the Bill was before members he gave me all sorts of assurances (and they are in *Hansard* for all to see) that everyone associated with the industry would be looked after, and that even the small growers would have special facilities. I strongly support the citrus industry. With other Ministers, I was instrumental in forming the committee. Never, to my knowledge, have we passed legislation putting reputable people out of business without giving them some form of compensation or redress. I do not stand for that. Parliament should always look after the rights of the minorities. It is easy for the Minister to shelter behind an organization. We are not looking after the interests of the minorities. The Citrus Organization Committee was appointed substantially from one area of the State, and at present all the preference in administration by that committee is going to that one area.

I am disappointed with the attitude adopted by the Minister. He is obliged to see that legislation passed by Parliament does not harm the individual, unless that person is doing something not in the best interests of the State or the industry, or is doing something unlawful. The Minister should see that legislation is not abused, as this legislation is being abused. The Minister can sit tight as much as he likes but he cannot escape the fact that reputable people who have given service to the community have been ruled out on two grounds: first, because they are not members of a certain association.

Mr. Casey: Is that why you were against the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities plan?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: People should have the right and freedom to enter any association and, if they do not want to be members of an association, they should not have to join it. If they are reputable, why should they have to join an association if they do not want to? However, in this particular case the association is behind a closed door, and the Minister knows it.

Mr. Coumbe: You could not get into it if you wanted to.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Exactly. Here we have the position that by administrative action the packing is confined, according to the Minister's own words tonight,

to the Murray River area. I know for a fact that other people have been refused because they are not members of the particular association.

Mr. Curren: What association is that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The association of fruitgrowers in the east end of Adelaide. They are reputable people. I have nothing against them but, equally, I have nothing against other reputable people who are not members of the association.

Mr. QUIRKE: I was the Minister at the time and I knew that one of the factors operating against the growers meeting their commitments to the Lands Department was that the price of oranges was too low. It was when I realized this that I instigated an investigation, in consequence of which this C.O.C. was set up.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: And the citrus industry was indebted to you for doing it.

Mr. QUIRKE: It was because I knew that there was no hope for the soldier settlers when the major part of their income was to be derived from citrus. They were receiving only 22c a case, after incurring a cost of about 40c for the case, so there was no hope for those soldier settlers whilst those prices obtained. That committee submitted a report, and legislation based upon it was passed. The position still obtains. The organization was set up in May, in the middle of the navel orange season. The C.O.C. has not had sufficient time to do all its work. I was completely dissatisfied with the way oranges were being handled, particularly when they were going to bury 400 tons. I said, "You cannot bury them", and I succeeded in getting 67c a case for that fruit. There was no reason why it should be buried if the sales organization in this State had been such that the people got the oranges they wanted. Today, people are still not getting the oranges they should be getting at a price that would return something like the cost of production to the growers, but we have to give the C.O.C. time. It is hard up against it. One thing that prevented it from getting into action was that so many small packers everywhere were going out and buying from the growers oranges that were not immediately saleable to the organization supposed to take them. They were buying oranges and supplying them to people who were making a profit out of the growers, who in turn had to meet their commitments for irrigation costs and everything else to the Lands Department. While those people were operating, and while the people that were supposed to handle the show and get the grower a decent return were falling down on

their job (I make no apology for saying that), the grower was actually getting a return of 22c and 28c a case, which of course was completely unpayable.

To cover his costs of production a grower needs at least \$1.40 a case, yet many growers in those days were getting only 22c, and it simply would not work out. The people who were getting a return were those who were going to growers and offering them a little above what they could get through the normal channels. Of course, some growers sold their oranges, and I did not blame them, because they had to live and therefore they had to sell where they could get the best price.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: It is no good for orderly marketing.

Mr. QUIRKE: No, of course it is not, and it is not going to be any good to orderly marketing if we persist in conditions whereby people can buy oranges from growers at a price that is a little above what they could get before, and a little below what they can get now. In those circumstances, the growers receive cash. The crux of it is that there is not enough money in the industry. I do not want to refer to things that might be before the court, but now the question has been raised it must be answered. These people who buy outside do not buy for the benefit of the growers: they buy so that they can make a profit, and while that position can obtain I have no quarrel with it. However, we passed legislation to prevent that sort of thing. As the honourable member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) would tell honourable members, with wheat and barley and everything else, unless we can get a price to the grower that will return him the cost of production we are not going to get out of that man his irrigation costs. Heaven knows, those costs are high enough. Anybody who buys to his own advantage and to the grower's disadvantage is not doing any good to the industry along the River. I say that from my personal knowledge.

I would not have entered into this business at all unless I had been certain that the only way to stabilize this industry was to get a report upon which legislation would be based to enable growers to at least cover their costs. Some fruit goes for export and some goes for the local market, but as yet I am not satisfied with the distribution of fruit in South Australia. I am still convinced that the industry needs the services of a highly paid man to handle this distribution. No matter how highly paid he was, he would still not cost anywhere

near as much money as is lost at present by the growers getting nothing for their fruit. Such a man could be highly paid as an organizer.

We have not yet under the C.O.C. organized the position so that the distribution of oranges is made to every part of South Australia to give an advantage both to the grower and to the consumer, each of whom is equally important. The price of production, of course, is consumption. We must distribute that fruit and get it in to every nook and cranny in South Australia at a price which is reasonable to the consumer and which will pay the grower. The C.O.C. started only in May, and it has not had time to do that. It has not made the success of the job that I thought it would, and this is because of the strife that existed in the industry prior to its coming into the picture. The industry still has to get over that strife. The committee is facing opposition everywhere, mainly from those people who were benefiting from the exploitation of the industry before the committee came into existence.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: And they are the people who are mainly affected now.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. The people who have built up a trade should be allowed to carry on with that trade, but I will never be convinced that people are entitled to carry on with trade when the victim is the grower. The C.O.C. and the various other organizations connected with the industry still have to put their house in order. I followed this matter closely, and I know that there are things they have to do at present. One of these things is to see that there is sufficient money in the industry, and at present there is not sufficient money. Most of the co-operatives along the river are operating under a system that is no better today than it was before, and money has to be put into the industry today on a basis of stabilization to enable these co-operatives to pay their growers the market price for the fruit. Also, it is essential that there be no delay in the receipt of money. The time is passed when we could expect people to put money into packing sheds and be prepared to take so much and look for a Kathleen Mavourneen payment in the dim and distant future, for costs today will not allow that.

The position today is that people have to receive payments in order to meet their costs when they fall due, and that applies to irrigation charges, water and everything else necessary to enable oranges to be grown; and those people are not getting it. I do not wish to

hurt anybody, but I am prepared to be opposed to people working against the best interests of these growers. Some people go out to penurious growers and offer a certain price, and when a grower is desperate for money he is apt to sell, say, 500 cases of oranges. These buyers then send the oranges down to Adelaide, pack them, and make money, which the grower loses. I understand that the gentleman under discussion has access to registered sheds from which to draw oranges and pack them. Provided he turns out an article that conforms with the standards, is there anything against it?

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: He can buy from registered places.

Mr. QUIRKE: What is the use of his buying oranges if he cannot pack them? If he buys them and does not pack them he would not make as much money. I should like that man to be able to go to Mypolonga or a similar place, buy his fruit in bulk, and pack it. That is only fair. If any disability exists in his buying the fruit and packing it, I would remove that disability. I understand this gentleman has fairly good packing equipment. I do not think it matters that he does not have a waxing plant, because such a plant is used mainly for export fruit.

I have been amazed at some of the late season navels (which are subject to bruising) shown to me by fruiterers in Clare. They have been sent this fruit by so-called registered packing companies and some of it should never have been packed under the standard marked on the case. Somebody, somewhere in this system is falling down on his job. I have looked at the registered names on some of these cases but I do not intend to refer to them here. However, those companies should be ashamed to have sent such fruit to country areas. One of the difficulties is that, because of sheer pressure, the C.O.C. has been forced to rely (and I make no apology for saying it) on an East End marketing organization to market the fruit. The sooner this aspect is removed the better the job that will be done. This is not the way to organize the citrus market, and I am completely dissatisfied with the way the market is being run at present. The committee has not had time to handle the navel crop because it was appointed only in May and could not possibly have done the job in that time. In sheer desperation, it took the offer of these people at the East End Market, who offered to market the fruit for the committee and who have fallen down hopelessly on their job.

No-one has yet suggested that a semi-trailer be contracted to market citrus in bags. I sent citrus in bags on semi-trailers to Sydney, and when the fruit arrived fewer than three or four oranges in a dozen bags had to be rejected because of damaged fruit. The matter should be organized so that fruit can be sent to Eyre Peninsula in this way. For instance, two depots could be established, but, when I say that, I do not mean that we should get away from local retailers. I would not harm them. The fruit would be sold through them. It should be delivered to their doors; they should not be expected to obtain it from the market, to have it transported all the way, and to carry the cost. If the fruit were taken to them in the way I suggest, it would be sold in quantities undreamed of at present. It could be sold in small 50 lb. bags, known as pea bags because they are used in pea picking. I sent my oranges to Sydney in those bags, and I received 67c a case for fruit that was going to be buried. A depot could be established at Lock, which is a central town, with another depot at Port Lincoln. Semi-trailer loads of fruit could be sent to these places, where it would be sold. Then, instead of the lousy little oranges sold in these places now for 5c each, the people would be able to buy perfectly fresh fruit.

An idea that has grown up in South Australia is that because fruit is large it is fit only for juicing. However, it is beautiful fruit to eat; unfortunately, people are not getting an opportunity to eat it. Although I exonerate the C.O.C. for the position up to now, in future it will have to pull up its socks. It was appointed to do a job and it will have to do better than it is doing now. The only people who should be considered in this matter are the people producing the fruit and not receiving a price sufficient to meet their cost of production, and the consumers who are being slugged because of an insufficient supply.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Most of them are growers.

Mr. QUIRKE: There are growers and growers. We could appoint a man and pay him about \$14,000 a year to organize marketing. However, he should be employed on the basis of "sell or sack". A man experienced in merchandising should be appointed and perhaps he could sell the fruit. Distribution in South Australia at present is not complete and could be improved. If the people appointed do not improve the position then they should be sacked.

Mr. Curren: Give them a go first.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, and the committee has not had time since May to handle the navel crop. The Valencia crop will soon be ready, and I hope the committee will do a better job with that fruit.

I do not think Berri Fruit Juices Co-operative Limited has sufficient money in it. The member for Chaffey should not look down his nose; we cannot expect people in these positions to operate under conditions where they do not have enough money to do the job. Berri fruit juices—

Mr. Curren: Best in the world.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not disagree; they are good juices but the company does not have enough money. With the ideas I suggested, there would not be the pressure on the company that there was today. Most fruit processed into cans could be sold fresh, but as organization is necessary and a man who can merchandise fruit, that means paying him a substantial salary to do it. Get the right man and there will be no difficulty for Berri Fruit Juices Co-operative Limited. I am concerned about the future of growers. Much citrus is grown outside the soldier settlement irrigation area and when that reaches the market there must be an organization to handle it; if not, the whole industry will be dragged down. I want an organization set up in this State to accept responsibility for what it does, but at present there is some default. I give it the opportunity to correct this as up to now it has not had time.

I sympathize with the person referred to by the member for Mitcham. He should be able to go to Myponga or somewhere nearby and buy oranges in bulk, and pack them himself if his packing is in conformity with the rules of the Citrus Organization Committee. If he is able to sell 20,000 or 30,000 cases of fruit, we should not deprive him of the opportunity. However, I do not sympathize with him if he wants to buy oranges at a price that would not return the grower his cost of production based on figures issued by the Commonwealth Statistician. If he cannot do that, he should not be permitted to buy oranges, because if he is not buying them at that figure he is exploiting growers who are desperate for money in order to provide a livelihood. If he buys oranges from the sheds in bulk and packs them efficiently, he should not be prevented from doing so.

Every avenue of sale in this State should be exploited to the full but at present it is not. I have spoken in the interests of people for whom I was responsible when Minister of Lands. I knew in that administration that

these people could not possibly be solvent while the conditions that obtained at that time remained, and something had to be done to place them in a position where they could meet their costs, although that is not sufficient as something extra is needed. The appropriate price can be obtained under an orderly marketing scheme, without exploiting the consumer. If I had not believed that I would not have taken the action I did when Minister. Returned soldiers with families are living on a hand-to-mouth existence. I applaud them for their efforts, and I will not take any action that will keep them down. I am speaking in the interests of primary producers who are up against vicissitudes, but they are a valued section of the community that I am perfectly happy to represent tonight.

Mr. HALL: The member for Burra has demonstrated his great knowledge of the problems of this industry and the concern that he has for it and growers, a concern that was translated into action when he was a Minister because he had some influence on the marketing of citrus fruits. He expressed perfectly the Opposition's concern that growers through orderly marketing should receive a proper price for their products, and expressed many Opposition members' views when he said that those who were packing prior to the introduction of this system should be able to continue as long as their standards of price and presentation were maintained.

Mr. McKee: He did not explain how it could be done.

Mr. HALL: The member for Burra has done more for marketing citrus in this State than any other person has done in recent years. I commend him for his speech and say that he represents the views of Opposition members who have always shown a proper regard for the orderly marketing of primary products. This industry is being marred because participants on the marketing side are being debarred from continuing with their livelihood. We want to know why they cannot be given standards.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thank the Minister of Agriculture for having gone through the facts of Mr. Eitzen's case. I cannot understand why he prevaricated at the beginning of the debate when he said that he had not had time to consider the matter, because he then took a sheaf of papers from his pocket. He gave the facts, but they were already known to me and to many others. I do not know whether he is trying to say that Mr. Eitzen's financial position is some excuse for ruining him. To me that is

just as irrelevant as the statement that Mr. Eitzen has difficulty in reading and writing.

This man has conducted a business properly for seven years and is in danger of losing an investment of more than \$40,000 because of the action of the Citrus Organization Committee. I do not know whether we are prepared to condone ruining a man and sending him bankrupt. If we are and if the Minister is using the man's financial situation as an excuse for putting him out of business, are the creditors to be ruined, too, because the man to whom they have extended credit cannot pay them? The whole position is untenable.

I do not regret having cited in full the letter written by the Treasurer to Mr. Hughes. If the Treasurer is prepared to write a letter he ought to be prepared to stand up to it. I know that after I had cited the letter the Treasurer telephoned this man, and I should think he practically put the telephone equipment out of order. The result is the letter that the Minister of Agriculture has been carrying around in his pocket (even though he had not had time to consider the matter). The Minister entirely begged my question. I asked, if it is necessary to do something to re-organize the industry and if individuals suffer as a result, what action will be taken to compensate those people.

The Minister said that he tried to get another job for Mr. Eitzen. Is that sufficient compensation for having taken away a \$40,000 investment? To suggest that is ridiculous. The Minister did not attempt to answer my question. Let him put himself in Mr. Eitzen's shoes. If he had been packing citrus and conducting a nice business in a decent manner, how would he like the committee to say to him, "Sorry, chum, but you are working in the wrong location. You are not going to have a licence to pack citrus any longer"? Would he take that as calmly as he is now taking Mr. Eitzen's case when he says that some individuals will suffer? I wager my bottom dollar that neither the Minister nor any of us would accept that. Mr. Eitzen does not like it, either, and he should not be expected to like it.

It is our duty to see justice and fair play meted out to everybody and to ensure that this industry is not reconstructed upon the ruin of individuals. The Leader of the Opposition has referred to other cases. I have only one in my district but I should be doing less than my duty to a constituent if I did not raise that matter and try to get a fair deal for the man concerned. The Minister is prepared

to discuss this matter in this place. Let him now discuss the vital point, which is the action that is to be taken to compensate those who are injuriously affected by this legislation. Let the Minister say he cannot do anything about it!

He referred the Committee to a little booklet dealing with policy and administration of the Citrus Organization Committee. I also have a duplicated copy of the publication by the committee and in the back of that we find the organization chart of the South Australian citrus industry, phase 1. I do not know how many phases there are in this operation. At the top of this organization chart, above the Citrus Organization Committee, is the Minister of Agriculture, at the apex. Apparently, he is the man to whom other people are finally responsible. Under the committee is the Executive Officer and Secretary, and so on to the production division, marketing division and administration division. The whole chart is worked out like an establishment table in the army. My point is that the Minister is at the top, above the committee. Let him say that it is not his responsibility! He is above this committee and it is up to him to do something about the position.

It is up to members of this Committee to ask him to do something and to see that action is taken so that individuals are not ruined. One of the duties of members of Parliament is to see that everyone is given a fair deal, no matter how difficult it may be to do so. This Parliament comprises fair-minded men, and I do not know how Government members can ignore the plight of Mr. Eitzen. The Minister of Lands may look at me in that way if he wishes. I challenge him to say whether it is fair that Mr. Eitzen and other people should be put out of business and that their assets should be ruined.

I do not mind whether the Minister of Lands or someone else gives me an answer, as long as my question is answered. The Attorney-General is sitting there. How many times has he pleaded the cause of some individual who was in trouble? He was right in doing that. What are Ministers going to do about this matter? The Minister of Agriculture has not given any answer. It is no good his giving facts that we all know. What will be done to protect the livelihood, property, investment and hard work of individuals affected by this legislation?

Mr. McANANEY: I am in favour of the orderly marketing of citrus. It is essential to primary producers. I am not quite as

starry-eyed as the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), who thinks that an orderly marketing scheme gives a return equal to cost of production. I know of no orderly marketing scheme that guarantees the cost of production.

Mr. Quirke: What about wheat?

Mr. McANANEY: I thought the honourable member would slip up; that scheme guarantees a price only for a certain quantity of exported wheat. About two years ago 150,000,000 bushels of wheat was exported, the price of which was below the determined cost of production. However, no orderly marketing scheme for primary production guarantees a cost of production plus a reasonable margin of profit for everything produced. An orderly marketing scheme is best for everybody concerned, but it can also create monopolies that lead to certain difficulties, including inefficiency. Restricting the selling avenues is detrimental to the system; avenues must be kept open as much as possible if the highest possible price is to be obtained.

Growers of a certain commodity who believed in orderly marketing are now the most dissatisfied growers in South Australia, and have even applied to have their marketing board disbanded. I do not think they will vote against the board, however, because of their faith in orderly marketing. Those growers do not desire to operate only through certain channels. What can be more stupid than a situation in which a growers' co-operative is allowed to wash potatoes, but is then not granted a wholesaler's licence to sell them. The whole idea is to channel a commodity from the producer through to the consumer as quickly as possible. Restricting the selling organization is beneficial neither to the industry nor to the consumer. I support the Citrus Organization Committee wholeheartedly. We should not be too critical of it at this stage, as it has not had sufficient time in which to establish itself. It will ultimately benefit the producer and consumer alike.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can see it is useless to try to get justice in this instance, and there is little more that I can say about this. All I say is that I think it is disgraceful that a man should be put out of business in these circumstances and that the Minister should say, as he has said on another occasion in this place, that if this man obtained a licence other people would have to be licensed, too. I say definitely before this matter is ended that it is to the Minister's shame that he should condone such a rank injustice as this and refuse even to discuss it in this Chamber.

It is also to the Government's shame that it apparently intends to take no action at all to protect the rights of individuals who have been harmed in this way. I can scarcely believe that, even with the record of this Government in the last 18 months, it would stoop to this, and simply refuse to discuss what is admitted to be a rank injustice, to let it go and not to take any action at all. It is shameful and disgraceful, and even I am surprised that the Government should let it go.

Mr. QUIRKE: I can agree with the member for Stirling and with the member for Mitcham, but not all the way. I do not agree that the little man in the hills has been entirely deprived of the major section of his livelihood. If he is prepared to abide by the legislation in this State, as administered by the Citrus Organization Committee, to the extent that the committee will permit him to buy oranges in bulk from a registered packing shed and pack them in his own place (after all, that is what he used to do before, but he previously went to the grower instead of to the packing shed), will the Minister use his best endeavours to prevail on the committee, so that this difficulty may be resolved? I assume that the Government does not desire to place restrictions on people who are able to sell, provided they abide by the first principle of the legislation. That principle requires that a person shall buy from registered packing companies and not from individuals who, in times of distress, may be prevailed upon to sell their produce at a lower price.

Mr. Millhouse: He is not going to do a thing. You can see what is going on over there.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Minister can make representations to the people concerned that that is the way in which the Government, in the interests of the people of South Australia, wishes the system to function. If I was in that position, I would do it, but I know that everybody does not agree with me.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: In this matter of compensation that the member for Mitcham claims I have not answered, I could cite many instances where a similar situation arose—for instance, orderly marketing, something vitally affecting many members opposite. When Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. was set up, many people, including the waterside workers in the district of the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), lost considerably; but did the Government of the day offer any compensation?

Mr. Hughes: None at all.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) is a director of a company that lost considerably when Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. was established. That firm was handling bagged wheat and barley before that, but did it get any compensation when that organization was established? Certainly not. The Government of the day did nothing about it, and those people lost money. This kind of thing always happens when some new system is introduced.

During the war years I had an excellent business, which was ruined because I could not get petrol. I had no redress from the Government because of that. I was not the only one affected. What the member for Mitcham says is all eye-wash. I have done all I can to assist this person and I will still do everything I can to help him in his present situation.

Mr. Millhouse: What are you prepared to do?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The member for Burra made an important statement when he started to speak but, unfortunately, towards the end of his speech he wandered away. This is what he said that is important: give this committee time to settle down. It has made mistakes and I have criticized it in my office for its mistakes. There are some things that it has changed because of my criticism but in the matter of packaging and marketing it has put up concrete arguments in support of its attitude. One of the things it has stated is that under this system it is necessary to pack near the source of supply and each grower must nominate two packers, one of whom is to be allocated to him and shall stay with him for 12 months. This is beyond the request of the member for Burra, because that cannot be done. Growers nominate their packers. No-one has nominated Mr. Eitzen as his packer. The growers have nominated the various packing sheds along the Murray River, and this applies to the people in Mypolonga.

Some growers have criticized the C.O.C. They are those who previously complained that there was no orderly marketing. Some of them have gone back on their former request, because they cannot get the ready money in their pockets that they used to get from some people who used to buy from them. There are two people in my own electoral district in similar circumstances to Mr. Eitzen's, and they have gone about something else. They have not come even to me as their member of Parliament asking for assistance. Would they not be just as entitled to compensation? The

Leader this evening referred to 14 people who had been to see him. The same people have also been to me; some of them have been to the Minister of Works and the Premier. When these things have been explained to them, they have appeared to accept them.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh!

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This is true. Subsequently, one man took advantage of his right to appeal to the court, exercising his proper right. Any one of them could have done this. I am just about sick of the insinuations and actions of the member for Mitcham. I think I have answered specifically the situation he has put forward tonight.

Mr. Millhouse: You still have not said what you will do for my man.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I did say what I would do.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, what is it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have said what I have endeavoured to do. There are two things I did not mention previously. After Mr. Eitzen met the C.O.C. in my offices, I asked the Chief Horticulturist to see whether he could find something outside the citrus organization that could be of assistance, bearing in mind the disabilities. Subsequently some work was given to Mr. Eitzen by the C.O.C. This we shall endeavour to do. All these people who have been affected have been offered some other form of employment. I do not know what else by way of compensation the committee can endeavour to do. It has laid down conditions and has had a reason for doing so. Four of these people on the committee are growers' representatives.

I selected those four and believe I made a good selection. It is all very well for the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) to laugh, but would he claim that any one of the persons on that committee was not representative, was not a person of the highest repute with much experience of the citrus industry? I refer him to one man who spends day and night on this work. The member for Burra claimed, rightly, that these people had done a terrific amount of work in a short time. They have done much of it at their own expense; they have worked day and night. They have made mistakes, and they know they have, but don't we all? Some electors make mistakes when they elect some members of Parliament, too. I believe that this committee should be given the opportunity to settle down and get on with the job, but instead of that it is getting all the hamstringing in the world for its efforts.

Mr. Quirke: It does not hurt to give the committee a little encouragement.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I agree. It is right to tell it when one disagrees with it, but, after all, we passed the Act, and it was agreed to by the growers. The committee was appointed and the growers' representatives were appointed by me. Two of them had served previously on the Citrus Industry Inquiry Committee, so they virtually selected themselves. The other two men are highly respected and reputable in the industry. They, in turn, selected the other two people on the committee.

Mr. Quirke: I am not criticizing that.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I appreciate that but I am trying to justify the personnel of that committee. Its members are all respected in the community. They are honest in their deliberations and are as anxious as is the member for Burra or anybody else to see that the people in the citrus industry get a fair go, which they have not had for a long time. Let the committee get on with the job. I hope the debate on this is now closed.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF MINES.

Mines Department, \$1,969,868.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I refer to the line "Overseas visit of Premier, Minister of Mines and party". It was I who suggested it would be a good thing for the Premier to go overseas and get first-hand knowledge of the big developments taking place in natural gas throughout the world so that he could use that knowledge in the developments now taking place in South Australia. If I were Leader of the Opposition again and the circumstances were similar I would just as strongly advocate that the Premier take that trip and obtain the information that is so essential to this State. However, I do not believe it was a good thing for the Premier, the Minister of Mines, the Director of Mines and the Deputy Director of Mines all to be away at the same time. This is an important department, and I do not believe it was necessary for its two senior officers to be absent at the same time, nor do I believe that absence can be justified. This department is engaged in most important duties, and surely one senior officer should have been left behind.

It was only a short time ago that the Government I had the privilege of leading sent the Director of Mines overseas to look at conditions in other countries, so it could not be said that he had not had an opportunity of seeing those conditions and obtaining some direct knowledge

of matters concerning natural gas. I am not criticizing the fact that the Premier and Treasurer took adequate officers with him, for I believe that he should have done so. However, to take away the two principal officers of the department at a time when it was engaged in important duties is something that should not have happened, in my opinion, and it was certainly not within the scope of the suggestion I made that the Premier should undertake that trip. I do not know the reason for taking so many officers. However, I can say that while the officers were overseas certain people approached me and told me they could not get service from the Mines Department because there was no-one there at that time who was able to provide the service they required. I do not require any answer on this matter, although if the Minister representing the Minister of Mines wants to comment that is his business. I now wish to point out a slight mistake in the latest report of the Mines Department, and I think it might be a good thing to have it sent back for this mistake to be corrected. I refer to the last paragraph in the report which states:

The lively and practical interest displayed by the new Minister of Mines (Mr. S. C. Bevan) in all aspects of departmental activities has been a greatly appreciated stimulus.

I think it should be pointed out to the Director of Mines that the correct title of his Minister is "The Hon. S. C. Bevan". Evidently that is something the Director has overlooked, and I think he should have that corrected. I understand that it was resolved that the report be printed. However, I think it would be a good thing to have this matter set fully in order.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I appreciate the remarks the member for Gumeracha made concerning my visit overseas. In my opinion the Minister of Mines was fully justified in accompanying me. The Minister pays particular attention to his departments, as do all the other Ministers. I take it that the honourable member is criticizing the oversea visit (the second visit, as he said) of the Director of Mines (Mr. Tom Barnes, as he is known to most people). The member for Gumeracha will admit that, even since this Government has been in office, he has been very well treated on the inspection trips arranged by the Director. Incidentally, Mr. Barnes told me that the changes and improvements that had taken place overseas even since his visit a short time previously were a revelation to him. In my opinion, this State is more

than compensated by the value obtained as a result of the interest in this matter of both the Director and the Deputy Director. To attempt to say that the department was neglected in any way because two senior officers were absent is a reflection upon the Public Service. Dr. Miles is a most competent officer, and the department did not suffer in the least as a result of the absence of the two most senior officers.

In company with the Director of Mines and Dr. Miles, I paid a visit to the interior last November in connection with natural gas at Mereenie and Palm Valley. I went because I believed I was obliged to make the trip, even though I did not enjoy it by any means and would not desire to do the same trip again, in any circumstances, at that time of the year. I think I should say in fairness to the officers of the Mines Department who accompanied me overseas that they obtained much further information regarding natural gas. I believe that their visit was necessary, and that the knowledge they gained will prove of great value to this State.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Representations have been made to me that in one lease in the Morgan area there are deposits of upwards of 1,000,000 tons of commercial gypsum. Could the Minister representing the Minister of Mines say whether the Mines Department has done any research or survey work at Morgan, whether there are deposits there, and whether those deposits are of commercial consequence?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I do not have any information on this matter, but I will obtain it for the honourable member.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I refer to the line "Underground water investigations—Test boring in undeveloped areas, conservation of underground water, etc." I asked a question the other day (and I have no doubt that the Minister is preparing information for me) about what activity is at present taking place in the Poldia Basin. That is a large area of water-bearing country which is of such great importance to that part of the State that it should be fully explored. In a number of other places in the State underground water investigations are equally important. Will the Minister of Agriculture ask the Minister of Mines to produce a report on this activity generally because, of the two important activities of the Mines Department, this activity is of great importance?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF MARINE.

Harbors Board Department, \$3,591,819.

Mr. COUMBE: A sum of \$2,600 is provided for the Chairman and Commissioners of the board, which is the same sum as that provided last year and in earlier years. As the Governor's Speech indicated that the Government intended to introduce a Bill to abolish the board, does this allocation mean that the board will continue for this year or that the policy announced is to be abandoned?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Marine): In accordance with the statement made in the Governor's Speech, the Government has prepared a Bill which is ready to be submitted to Parliament; it provides for the abolition of the board and the establishment of a Marine and Harbors Department. At this stage, it would be quite improper to anticipate a decision of Parliament, and therefore provision has been made for the continuation of the board until Parliament has reached a decision.

Mr. FERGUSON: I refer to two jetties situated on the western side of Yorke Peninsula, namely, the Port Rickaby and Minlacowie jetties. Soon after the Government came into office, the middle section of each of these jetties was removed, which caused some resentment amongst people in the area. The Minister will say that an agreement was entered into between the previous Minister and the Minlaton council for a certain number of bents in these jetties to be maintained. However, many people believe this agreement has been ruthlessly put into operation. Why is the same treatment not meted out to jetties at various seaside resorts? For instance, since the Government came into office the maintenance of the Port Hughes jetty was considered. However, I understand an agreement was made whereby the whole of the jetty will be retained and will be used solely as a place on which to promenade. An agreement was made concerning the Port Rickaby and Minlacowie jetties whereby the planking on the outer ends of the jetties would be used by the councils if it were needed for the repair of planking on the shore end of the jetties. Can the Minister say whether the seaward ends of the jetties are being demolished or whether they will be demolished in future, and if they will be, whether the planking will be stored for the use of councils?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I assure the honourable member that the Harbors Board (or whatever body may in future be constituted) will honour the agreement to the letter.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$9,100.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Provision of \$1,500 is made for investigations of port sites. Last year an intensive inquiry was made by departmental officers into the advisability or otherwise of the establishment of additional ports around the South Australian coastline. Certain deputations will be ready to meet the Minister when he visits my district in a week or so. Can he say just what activity is envisaged in these investigations this year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The provision is for the operation of a machine at Port Neill.
Line passed.

MINISTER OF TRANSPORT.

Minister of Transport Department, \$20,032—
passed.

Railways Department, \$30,936,112.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Present movements on the single line between Taillem Bend and Serviceton have been restricted because of the present signalling system and the inability to give fast movements on sections of the line. As electric signalling will increase substantially the number of movements, can the Treasurer say what sum has been allocated to commence this work?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I shall obtain the information.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I noticed a substantial reduction in the proposed usage of coal and heavy fuel oil but a slight increase in the usage of diesel fuel oil. The Commissioner must be aware that a heavy movement of grain and superphosphate will occur this year, but I doubt whether this provision is consistent with that movement. I doubt whether it reflects any real intention by the Government to get increased business for the department. Why is the reduction necessary?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is because of improved efficiency following the introduction of diesel electric locomotives.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister information on the progress of the rebuilding of the railway lines on Eyre Peninsula, and if he has not will he obtain a report?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I believe that special information will be required, but if it is a question of the increased payments it is due to increased maintenance. As separate details are not shown for Eyre Peninsula and

the metropolitan area, I shall ask my colleague for the necessary information.

Mr. SHANNON: Why is there such a large disparity between the salaries of the Railways Commissioner and the Assistant to the Railways Commissioner? In Mr. Fargher's day there was not the same disparity. An amount of \$7,857 is proposed this year for the Assistant to the Railways Commissioner, whereas \$8,098 was actually paid last year. On the other hand, the amount proposed for the Secretary this year is \$9,296, as against an actual payment last year of \$9,158. It seems that the Assistant to Railways Commissioner has been demoted in salary and the Secretary promoted.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: An amount of \$350 is provided for Mr. R. J. Fitch, as a salary increase. There is a decrease of \$241 in the case of Mr. J. M. Doyle, who succeeded Mr. Fitch on March 14 last. He is the Assistant to the Railways Commissioner. Mr. Fitch held the position of Deputy Railways Commissioner until January 22 last. I have no further information at present but shall be pleased to supply it later.

Mrs. STEELE: An amount of \$20,000 is proposed for legal and incidental expenses for the Royal Commission on Transport. Can the Treasurer say whether it is expected that this amount will cover the whole proceedings of the commission and the incidental expenses involved?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not know how far the Royal Commission has proceeded, but shall obtain any further information available.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer told members on June 28, in reply to a question, that the estimated cost of the Royal Commission on State Transport Services was \$50,000. The member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) has referred to an amount of \$20,000 proposed. The sum of \$50,000 has been provided in the Miscellaneous vote for the Chief Secretary and Minister of Health. An amount of \$833 was actually paid under that vote last year. Therefore, although the original estimate was \$50,000, an amount of \$70,000 is provided this year. Will the Treasurer obtain information about how long the Royal Commission is expected to continue and about the present estimated cost? I ask the Treasurer to give me a copy of his reply to the member for Burnside.

According to the Treasurer's statement on the financial position for the first two months of this year, the amount normally paid to the Railways Department has not been paid.

For many years, that department has received from the Treasury a subsidy in connection with cartage at unremunerative rates. Can the Treasurer say whether there has been a change in policy regarding this matter and, if there has been, whether it arises because the substantial increases in Railways Department charges enable the Government to relieve the Treasury of payments that have previously been made?

Mrs. STEELE: An amount of \$366,244 is proposed for refreshment services in the Transportation and Traffic Branch. That is an increase of \$25,511 over actual payments last year. Although the Auditor-General's Report shows an increase in earnings last year as compared with the earnings in the previous years, there is still a loss of about \$250,000 on those services. Can the Treasurer give any information on that?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: An additional \$26,933 has been granted because of increased business, but I shall try to get the information for the honourable member.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Treasurer say whether the policy of paying a subsidy to the Railways Department has been changed?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am sure there has been no change in policy, but if there has been a change I will get the information for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Transport Control Board, \$27,708—passed.

MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND MINISTER OF ROADS.

Minister of Local Government and Roads Department, \$26,068.

Mr. CUMBE: It is difficult at times for members to appreciate the complexity of the Highways Fund. Often, the only way in which to ascertain details of the fund is to examine the Auditor-General's Report. The matter is even more complicated this year because a large sum has been paid into General Revenue out of the Highways Fund. Will the Treasurer ascertain whether a simple appendix could be attached to the documents presented to the Committee showing how the fund operates? I suggest a document similar to the one containing details of Housing Trust activities or the one referring to schools to be erected.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: One aspect of this question has been answered as late, I think, as this session, in regard to the report of the Commissioner of Highways. I will see what I can do to help the honourable member.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I support the member for Torrens. At long last the Highways Fund is becoming better able to take care of road construction and maintenance needs. Coincidentally with that development, the Highways Fund, in its new-found affluence, could be better explained to the Committee. We should have more precise information about the expenditures and revenues of this department. Can this information be furnished more promptly than hitherto? This statement should clearly define the various departments grouped under "Minister of Local Government and Minister of Roads", the Highways Department being one.

Line passed.

Highways and Local Government Department, \$3,163,975.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I see that the proposed allocation for the wages of administrative employees is \$262,000. I cannot follow the explanation given that this was previously charged direct to the Highways Fund. All these moneys come from the Highways Fund, so what is the purpose of the transfer? It is difficult to follow a department's figures from year to year if they are juggled around like that. What is the purpose of this readjustment?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): My only explanation is that it concerns weekly paid staff engaged upon administrative duties. There is a rider that this was previously charged direct to the Highways Fund. I will try to obtain more specific information.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Financial Statement revealed that the Treasurer was proposing to take from the Highways Fund this year \$1,000,000 for General Revenue. Are we to assume that this \$262,000 is some kind of offset against that, or what is the reason for it?

Mr. CUMBE: I ventilate a serious matter, though it is not contained in any specific line under these headings: the rebuilding of Hackney bridge. After much representation this work was commenced and the substructure was completed in November of last year. Suddenly, the work on this bridge stopped. On February 9 last the Minister of Education, on behalf of the Minister of Roads, replied to a question I had previously posed, in the following terms:

The Minister of Roads has reported that the substructure of the Hackney bridge was completed late last November and that it was expected that fabrication of the steel girders would have been completed early in December.

However, in the course of inspections during the fabrication certain faults in the form of laminations were discovered in the steel from which the girders were being made. Extensive testing was carried out in December by the use of sonic testing equipment, and the tests revealed considerable lamination in various sections of the girders. Consultations were held with Professor Bull and other officers of the University of Adelaide, who recommended further testing with special equipment in the university laboratories. These were completed on January 26, and fabrication of the girders is expected to resume next week. Work on the site, however, cannot resume until the girders are completed, probably late in February.

As nothing appeared on the site, I asked further questions on notice on June 28, after having waited four months. The replies I received were frank, and were as follows:

1. The reason for the cessation of work is faulty steel used in the fabrication of the girders.
2. Remedial measures are in hand.
3. Additional investigations and laboratory tests were necessary.
4. Work is currently proceeding on the bridge and on the girders.
5. It is expected that the girders will be erected by September 1, 1966, and the bridge completed by early December, 1966.

I drive over this bridge almost every day, and I keep my eyes open to see what progress has been made. Up to this date there is not a sign of any girder on the site, and there is no sign of any work at all being done. This causes me concern, as it probably does the Minister and the Commissioner. I raise the matter now because it was stated here in the last reply to me that it was expected that the girders would be erected by September 1. Obviously, something has gone wrong here which I should imagine is partly beyond the control of the Minister or the Commissioner. If there is something radically wrong in the specification, or in the fulfilment of the work to the specification laid down, it should be stated clearly where the fault lies and what is being done to rectify it.

Furthermore, we should have information on what is the position with the contractor, whoever he may be. The last thing we want is a repetition of what happened in Melbourne a year or two ago. Knowing the thoroughness of the Commissioner and his officers, I imagine that they are taking every possible step to see that this bridge is made completely safe. The delay that has occurred here, however, is costing somebody some money; therefore, I think it is right to air the matter at this stage. I should like to know whether the Government is to be involved in extra expen-

diture through compensation to the contractor or to the supplier of the steel, or whether these people have to bear the whole cost.

The delay in this matter is causing concern to a number of residents on both sides of the river, because not only was the original bridge far too narrow for the traffic that travels along Hackney Road and Park Terrace but the road farther up to the south is being widened adjacent to the Botanic Park and the tramways depot. The position is aggravated because the bridge has been partly demolished and partly erected in sections, and there is a fairly severe restriction on parts of the road. As many children have to cross this bridge on their way to schools (to St. Peters College and Prince Alfred College in one direction, and to Wilderness school in the other direction), there is a great deal of traffic congestion in the early morning and in the late afternoon. I would appreciate it if the Minister could obtain for me and the Committee a complete report on this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do as the honourable member has requested. I draw the attention of the members for Gumeracha and Flinders to the Treasurer's statement on these Estimates on August 31 in connection with the question they raised regarding wages of administrative employees. The Treasurer said:

Under "Special Acts" the provision for the transfer to the Highways Fund of the net proceeds of motor taxation shows an estimated decrease of \$728,000 as compared with last year. The main reason is the different treatment of certain administrative expenses which in the past have been met directly from the Highways Fund, but which appear this year in the Estimates of Expenditure as part of the provisions for the Highways Department. The different treatment has the two effects of increasing the apparent expenditure of Highways Department and reducing the net transfer to the Highways Fund. The latter is calculated by taking the receipts from motor vehicle taxation, and deducting therefrom certain payments including those for administrative expenses of the Motor Vehicles Department and the Highways Department. The Highways Fund itself will be relieved of the direct charge for the administrative cost in question. The net effect is to put before Parliament a more complete picture of the administrative cost of the Highways Department, while leaving unaffected the net funds available to the department.

I take it that is the matter referred to, and that the explanation will clarify the situation. I was rather surprised myself to see that amount. No doubt my colleague, the Minister of Roads, would have expected that as this had been explained in the statement it possibly

would not require any explanation other than the one with which he supplied me.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I appreciate the Minister's comment. Since turning over the page and totting up the figures I have found two additional items, each marked with an asterisk, and the total of the two items so marked runs out to about \$728,000, to which the Treasurer's statement refers. I heard the reasons which the Minister gave and which were included in the Treasurer's financial statement. However, quite frankly I do not think the reasons given justify the change in accounting, and I do not know either whether they would be strictly in accordance with the Act, because it has always been a provision that the total funds collected by the Motor Vehicles Department were paid directly into the Highways Fund, and that from that fund was deducted the administrative expenses of collecting that revenue. I do not think it is a good thing to start bringing revenue from the Highways Fund into this Estimate statement at all.

Mr. Nankivell: It is completely misleading.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I appreciate the reason that has been given, but I do not think the advantages outweigh the problem that can arise when we start mixing up these two accounts. Even if this method of accounting is in accord with the Act (which I doubt), I do not think it is a good policy. We have always made it a point in this State of being able to tell the people who pay various road taxes that the whole of the proceeds, less the cost of collecting them, is paid into the Highways Fund. I do not suggest that the alteration in procedure this year makes any difference to that statement, but I suggest that any process of mixing up these two accounts and bringing the administrative expenses of the Motor Vehicles Department into this statement is not good. I doubt whether it is in the interests of the Highways Fund as a whole in the long run. I believe that the accounts would be better served and better information would be provided to the Committee if an appendix to the Treasurer's financial statement could be provided to give a full accounting of the Highways Fund.

Provision of \$6,400 is made for oversea visits of officers of this department; this is an increase of \$5,603 on the provision of \$797 last year. Although I do not generally oppose sending officers overseas for experience, I believe that perhaps an unnecessary number of officers of the Highways Department have been overseas in recent years. From my own

observations overseas, I believe that some of the major highway works completed in past years in some countries (I refer particularly to the United States of America) are causing the people in those countries some concern. In the State of California, where colossal complexes of freeways and overpasses have been constructed, motorists pay 6c on every gallon of petrol they buy which goes directly into a fund for the provision of freeways.

While I was in Los Angeles, both individuals and the press were discussing this matter. They have come to the conclusion that these things will not necessarily be the solution to the road congestion problem, and the people are becoming restive about the volume of money they are being called on to pay for these facilities. I do not know whether we are solving our problems here by sending people overseas to gain this sort of experience and information about things which, as I have tried to point out, the people in those areas are now beginning to regard with some concern. Will the Minister say who is to go overseas and what is the purpose of the visit?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Highways Commissioner (Mr. J. N. Yeates), and Assistant Highways Commissioner (Mr. H. E. Roeger) and the Assistant Engineer for Materials (Mr. A. G. Cooke) will be going overseas. Mr. Cooke is to go to New Zealand where he will deliver a paper on a specific subject. The actual reason for the oversea visit of the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner escapes me at the moment, but I will obtain the information for the honourable member. In the light of what the honourable member said about the difficulties people are experiencing in California, with which he dealt in some detail, I am rather surprised that he is opposed to too many officers of the Highways Department going overseas. On the contrary, I should have thought that if these officers can be made available to go overseas not only the department but the State generally will benefit from the experience these officers gain. The very knowledge gained by the honourable member would be useful.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I suppose they could learn from the mistakes made overseas.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Well, why not learn from possible mistakes made in respect of freeways overseas? If we can afford the luxury, I suppose, of sending these officers overseas (not only regarding the cost of their travelling and expenses but also regarding their valuable time), then I think we should make

every effort to send them. In fact, I believe members of this place should be given every opportunity to go overseas and to see some of the things that would not only be of interest but would also be of great value to them in their deliberations and considerations on various matters that come before Parliament from time to time. If I considered that no benefit would be gained but that this was just a "swan", I should not be happy to let anybody go. I am sure the Minister of Roads would view this matter in the same light and that, for the reasons I have given, he would be happy for the officers to make the trip. Mr. Yeates and Mr. Roeger are certain to go to the U.S.A. and the Continent, and Mr. Cook is to go to New Zealand.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I recall that, some time ago, a brilliant officer of the Highways Department travelled overseas and, having learned much at the taxpayers' expense, he left the department. This cannot be prevented, but I hope the practice will not continue and that the services of officers who make these visits are available to the department for some time after their return. Good value will be obtained from the oversea visit of the Commissioner, and I recommend that he visit Germany where overpasses, access roads and run-offs, and in some cases the autobahns, are worthy of inspection. The Germans have developed something effective and the system has many advantages.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am sure the Commissioner will consider the honourable member's suggestions. The solution to the problem of people going overseas and the department losing their services is, perhaps, that we do not send anyone in case we lose their services!

Mr. HEASLIP: The allocation for office expenses, etc., of the department provides for an increase on last year's expenditure of \$465,300. This money is for overhead expenses, which are non-productive and are used in running the department. The Government is in trouble, for it has a deficit of \$8,000,000 and, if it is going to reduce that deficit, the first thing it must do is to cut down overhead expenses. I see there has been some juggling with this line, because \$310,000 was previously charged direct to the Highways Fund; it has been transferred from one account to another. However, even if that sum is subtracted the increase in overhead costs is still \$155,300. As no benefits will be obtained, can the Minister justify this substantial increase in overhead expenses?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I referred to this matter in answer to the members for Gumeracha and Flinders. This is not an increase in the cost of running the department but is a transfer from the Highways Fund (which originally provided for it) to the Estimates, and there is no substantial increase. This amount was never shown on the Estimates of Expenditure but was dealt with out of the Highways Fund. If the honourable member examines the Treasurer's explanation he will see why this has been done.

Mr. Heaslip: I do not think that is an answer.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The second paragraph on page 11 of the Treasurer's statement, made on August 31, will explain this procedure.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not understand that answer, but I do know that there is an extra, overhead, non-productive charge made, and it should be explained.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The alteration in the method of accounting makes it difficult to follow, and it seems that the Highways Fund has suffered a severe loss under the new system. The net receipts to that fund from motor vehicles this year appear to be about \$500,000 less than last year. This is a serious regression and appears to arise from the adoption of a new accounting method. The Auditor-General's Report makes it clear that all except certain specific amounts must be paid to the Highways Fund. The proposed transfer to the Highways Fund pursuant to the Highways Act is \$7,825,000. The Auditor-General's Report shows an excess of receipts over payments of \$11,214,245 and that amount was paid to the Highways Department. Therefore, it appears that the Highways Fund has been seriously depleted as a result of the new accounting procedure.

Mr. McANANEY: Recently, the Commissioner of Highways stated publicly that he was receiving about three-quarters of what he should have received under the provisions of the road maintenance tax. On what did the Commissioner base this figure, and what steps are being taken to ensure that the full amount is collected?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask the Commissioner on what he based his assumption and obtain information from him about the steps being taken to ensure that he receives the full benefit of the collection of this tax.
Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$283,008.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Can the Minister explain the reason for the provision this

year of \$17,435 less than was actually paid last year as grants to councils under the Electricity Supplies (Country Areas) Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The provision is for the payment of subsidies as recommended by the Electricity Trust and, although I do not know, I assume that the reason is the diminishing demand.

Mr. HUGHES: I refer to the line regarding the payment of subsidy towards the repair of storm damage to foreshores, etc. A heavy storm along the coast near Moonta Bay late last year undermined much of the foreshore and the corporation applied to the Tourist Bureau for a subsidy. I think the application should have been made to the Highways and Local Government Department.

However, the Director of the Tourist Bureau visited Moonta Bay and was taken to Port Hughes by the person who accompanied him. They inspected the foreshore there and later a payment of \$600 was recommended in relation to damage to that foreshore, whereas it should have been allocated in relation to the undermining at Moonta Bay, where the damage had extended as far as the electricity cables. The member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) enviously referred to the retention of Port Hughes jetty in its entirety for promenade purposes. However, I think the strong representations by the member who represents Port Hughes influenced the Harbors Board decision.

The member for Yorke Peninsula will be more envious about the promising negotiations now taking place between the Harbors Board and the Moonta council in regard to the Port Hughes foreshore. The honourable member also mentioned the Minlacowie and Port Rickaby jetties. I also received a telephone call regarding those matters and courteously referred the local government representative to the member for the district, because I did not think I should interfere in a district represented by another member. However, perhaps better results would have been obtained if I had intervened.

Line passed.

PREMIER, TREASURER, MINISTER OF IMMIGRATION AND MINISTER OF HOUSING.

Premier's Department, \$303,115.

Mrs. STEELE: An amount of \$100,000 is provided for publicity and information, documentary films, etc. for industrial promotion and this seems to be an extremely high amount to provide for publicity purposes. In the amounts proposed for the Publicity and Tourist Bureau, \$57,192 is provided for advertising the

State and this amount is in excess of actual payments last year. Can the Treasurer give a dissection of the amount and say whether it includes the cost of radio talks and television appearances by Ministers?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): This is a completely new item. I have already said that money is being provided in order to make documentary films in colour that would be appropriate to be sent overseas. I was surprised, when in London, to see that South Australia House was so dilapidated, despite the efforts of officers working in that building, including the Housing Trust representative. The officers concerned seemed to be ashamed of the lack of provision for advertising displays, as well as with the small number of personnel employed, compared with the conditions existing in the offices being maintained by other States. People in the United Kingdom should be fully informed of South Australia's potential. For example, the Housing Trust has provided accommodation at Whyalla to coincide with the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited's expansion programme. The opportunities being provided by our rural industries as well as our secondary industries must be fully advertised overseas, if South Australia is to compete with the other States. The documentary film being produced will be an entirely professional undertaking, and honourable members will be invited to attend a screening as soon as it is completed.

As Premier of the State, I have been provided by ADS Channel 7 with opportunities to make a weekly telecast similar to those provided for my predecessor. I find that the telecast is entirely beneficial and necessary in the interests of the State.

Mr. HEASLIP: The sum of \$100,000 (plus an increase of \$10,749 for salaries and wages) is to be spent on "publicity and information, documentary films, etc., for industrial promotion" to attract people to South Australia, but one only has to read an article in today's *News*, headed "Workers quit South Australia—'starving'"—

The Hon. Frank Walsh: Write it down, as you always do.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HEASLIP: I am merely being realistic. Is it right to spend \$100,000 of taxpayers' money to bring to South Australia people we cannot employ? We have a 1.7 per cent rate of unemployment in South Australia, the highest in the Commonwealth. Why should we

waste money to bring to this State people who will be disappointed?

Line passed.

Treasury Department, \$95,874—passed.

Prices Branch, \$154,368.

Mrs. STEELE: The sum of \$2,916 is to be voted as an *ex gratia* pension to the former Prices Commissioner—an increase of \$2,284. The word "pension" confuses me. Is it an *ex gratia* payment, a pension, a final payment, or what?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The former Prices Commissioner had done a good job. He was offered the opportunity to pay into a Treasury fund to provide for his retirement, as he was not eligible to pay into the Superannuation Fund. Because of sickness, he was found employment in the Highways Department. The Government decided that, because of his former work and his need to provide for himself, it would retire him on a pension. Since being on a pension, he has also obtained employment as a clerk at the university, so he has built up an income that provides a reasonable standard of living for him.

Mrs. STEELE: I am glad the Government was able to do this for the former Prices Commissioner, who was a constituent of mine. I hope he appreciates what the Government has done to help him in the situation in which he more or less placed himself. Is this a yearly pension or a straightout grant to him?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I understand it is paid either fortnightly or monthly and will continue for the rest of this life.

Line passed.

Superannuation Department, \$164,430—passed.

Motor Vehicles Department, \$720,658.

Mr. McANANEY: Does this appropriation come from the General Revenue of the State or from the Highways Fund?

Mr. HEASLIP: The sum of \$197,350 is provided under "Office expenses, motor vehicle expenses, insurance, telephone charges, recoups, traders' plates, labels, reimbursement of travelling expenses, fares, advertising, court fees, expenses of Insurance Premiums Committee, automatic data processing services, minor equipment and sundries". The increase in this line of \$38,541 represents non-productive expenditure. Surely, in the position we are in today we could cut down on these overhead expenses. Can the Treasurer explain why we are incurring these extra overhead costs?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The additional cost of printing and postage and the increased volume of machine hire account for \$12,541 of

the increase, and there is an extra cost of \$26,000 in respect of public services. Incidentally, a motor vehicle is being provided for this department, the first time this has ever occurred.

Mr. Heaslip: What—\$38,000?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I remind the honourable member that other expenses are involved. The Registrar is expected to attend country areas on matters associated with his department.

Mr. Heaslip: He has done it before, hasn't he?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Of course he has, and in the past he has had to use his own motor car or depend on some other officer in the department for transport. He is supposed to be able to trace traders' plates, the use of which has been so much abused. He is required to keep such matters as these under control, yet the honourable member challenges the expenditure that is necessary in the interests of the department by saying it is non-productive expenditure. Not one dollar is provided here that is not necessary.

Mr. McANANEY: Is the Registrar of Motor Vehicles paid out of General Revenue, or does his salary come out of the Highways Fund?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I thought the honourable member would have realized that the Highways Fund is entirely separate from the Motor Vehicles Department. The Registrar is the head of his department, and like all other officers of the department he is paid out of the departmental vote. The department's surpluses are transferred to the Highways Fund.

Line passed.

Agent-General in England Department, \$163,565.

Mr. HEASLIP: An increase of \$10,858 is shown under the line "Office expenses, exhibiting at shows, advertising the State, rent, rates, insurance, reimbursement of travelling expenses, fares, receptions, subscriptions, publications, minor equipment and sundries". Again this is all non-productive expenditure. Surely as a State we could cut down on these overhead expenses. We see increased overheads in every department, and much of this extra expense is non-productive. Government is the biggest business in South Australia, and the first thing any business has to do when it is in difficulties is cut down costs. These are costs that we can reduce. Why have we incurred the extra expense of \$10,858 in this department this year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: When the Treasurer was dealing with the Premier's Department he touched on a matter relating to the Agent-General in England. I think the Agent-General is endeavouring to do a very good job, and I believe that his Secretary, whom we all know very well, is working very hard and very conscientiously. Although I do not really know all that is involved in the department, I wonder whether the Agent-General and his staff can cope with all the work. I visited the office in London a number of times when I was there, and I believe the office is in a better location than any of the other States' offices. Although none of the other buildings in the Strand is very tall, most of them are two storeys or three storeys high, and our building seems a bit diminutive. I believe that aspect could be improved at very little cost. I refer now to the line "Structural improvements to office premises". I believe some internal reorganization of the office is desirable. Of course, I am not an expert in these matters, and in any event how that reorganization is to be achieved is not my business.

The various States' offices are all located in the Strand: the Western Australian office is at one end and the Victorian office is at the other end, and the New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmanian offices are in between. I believe that we could with advantage to the State make some improvements to South Australia House. For instance, I think we could improve the presentation in the front window. I daresay that when the Treasurer was in London he saw the Western Australian premises and he would have been impressed (as I was) with the magnificent mural there. I thought this was a masterpiece. It displays practically the whole of that State's industry in one condensed presentation. I believe the front window of South Australia House could be brightened up. The material placed in it should be distinctly South Australian. Some expert assistance should be given to the Agent-General to change, at frequent intervals, the display in the window. Therefore, I do not criticize the allocation of \$21,314 for renovations to the office premises. The Agent-General promotes South Australia in the United Kingdom and therefore, because of the need to advertise South Australia at this time, this provision is wise. The Agent-General is giving good service to people going to London from here, but he could do with an additional male

on his staff and the building would benefit from expenditure on its interior.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: When I was in London, I recommended to the Agent-General that he engage a consultant to make definite improvements to the interior of South Australia House. I suggested that the receptionist be moved to a more convenient place in the office and that the basement (which was used to store luggage of South Australians free of charge) be used to store literature for the use of people who desired to spend time in the building. The accommodation provided for the female staff was below modern standards and there was a need for a rest room. Further provision should be made for the senior officer of the South Australian Housing Trust. I was told that the display in the window was changed month to month. The Housing Trust was doing a good job in its advertising efforts.

Mr. Nankivell: Had Mr. Turner arrived at that stage?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No, he would have been on his way at that time. I believe he is qualified to do the job effectively. I suggested that the Housing Trust could give a better idea of the houses it has available. I agree with what the honourable member said about the need for a totally South Australian content in the window display. The Agent-General wastes no time in informing us of anybody interested in setting up an industry in South Australia. He is doing a good job indeed in his efforts to prevail upon people to set up industries in South Australia.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I think it would be helpful if he could go to the Continent on occasions.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In fact, both he and Mr. Pedder were given an opportunity to go to the south of France. They went to Lacq and saw at first hand the operations of the gas field there. They went as far as Hanover to attend a world-wide presentation of industry. The information they gathered was extremely useful; they were able to present a good case for South Australia and were well received. The Agent-General visited Holland, so he will be conversant with matters going on there. He is a capable man and is acquiring much knowledge. It is in our interest that we should make as much money available in this connection as possible. If members desire further information from Mr. Pedder he is at present in South Australia for the purpose of acquiring knowledge. He is responsible for the sale of fruit and other

commodities, and will be in this State for another month.

Mrs. STEELE: From time to time we read about complaints from migrants who say that they have been ill advised and given wrong information prior to coming to this country. Miss Olive Barton, who was Information Officer in the British Government's Office in Adelaide and a resident in Australia for 18 years, serving in Western Australia, Queensland and South Australia, recently retired and returned to England. In a private letter to Mr. Milne I suggested that he should see her, because, being an Englishwoman and having lived in Australia, she would be able to give good advice on many problems. I asked him whether good use could be made of her services. He informed me that he thought this was an excellent suggestion and had actually seen Miss Barton and told her of my idea. However, as she was a retired public servant she would not be acceptable as a State Government employee; also he could not employ her because of the lack of funds.

He suggested to the Agents-General for Queensland and Tasmania that this capable woman would be an excellent person to employ in an advisory capacity, and I now understand that the Agent-General for Queensland was to interview her. It occurred to me that such a person could be employed at South Australia House, as she would be the ideal person in this position, and that money could be provided for her salary.

Mr. McANANEY: I support this increased expenditure because our office in London is the show place of the State overseas. I pay a tribute to previous Agents-General Sir Charles McCann, Mr. Howard Greenham and Mr. George Pearce who, despite lack of facilities, did an excellent job selling South Australia.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to ask the Public Service Commissioner to consider the matter raised by the member for Burnside and to see whether funds can be made available to implement her suggestion.

Line passed.

Land Tax Department, \$350,187; Stamp and Succession Duties Department, \$143,646—passed.

Publicity and Tourist Bureau and Immigration Department, \$681,614.

Mr. McANANEY: Tourism in this State is being neglected. As tourism is a great money spinner for the State if we can encourage tourists to visit here, additional provision should have been made on this line. In Victoria, councils are subsidized

up to \$4 for \$1, and a definite percentage of revenue from motor vehicle taxation is set aside for tourism. In Western Australia the subsidy is \$2 for \$1, and that State provides better roads to attract tourists. We pay only a \$1 for \$1 subsidy, and perhaps this is not sufficient. It is a mistake to reduce the subsidy to councils for development.

Mr. CASEY: The sum of \$57,192 is provided for advertising the State—an increase of \$5,553. Recently, people I know well opened a tourist office at St. Kilda in Victoria and I told them to write to the Tourist Bureau in Adelaide and ask for pamphlets of our tourist facilities in the Flinders Ranges. The reply they received was indeed poor: they were told that any information required could be obtained from the Victorian branch of the South Australian Tourist Bureau, in Melbourne. The encouragement of tourists will be retarded if the Tourist Bureau is not prepared to assist agents in other States who desire to advertise South Australia. I ask the Treasurer to take action to prevent a recurrence of what happened in this case.

Mr. McANANEY: There is an increase in the provision for accommodation, fares and other expenses of migrants. Does the Treasurer expect as many migrants to come to South Australia this year as came last year?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The State Immigration Department deals only with British immigrants. Some British immigrants and immigrants from other countries are handled by the Commonwealth Immigration Department. The British migrant intake under State auspices is expected to continue at the 1965-66 level. I give the following figures for the information of the Committee:

Year.	Nominees approved.	Actual arrivals.
1962-63	6,702	3,109
1963-64	11,866	7,601
1964-65	13,222	9,310
1965-66	13,653	10,128

The amount of \$69,000 provided for accommodation, fares and other expenses of migrants includes the cost of food, laundry, and also, where needed, the first week's accommodation, which is provided free in most cases. The South Australian Housing Trust nominees also receive fares and freight from Outer Harbour.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$14,956,432—passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

The Estimates were adopted by the House and an Appropriation Bill for \$191,435,753 was founded in Committee of Ways and Means,

introduced by the Hon. Frank Walsh, and read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is for the appropriation of \$191,435,753, details of which are set out in the Estimates that have just been dealt with by the House. Clause 2 provides for the further issue of \$131,435,753, being the difference between the amount authorized by the two Supply Acts (\$60,000,000) and the total of the appropriation required in this Bill. Clause 3 sets out the amount to be appropriated and the allocation of the appropriation to the various departments and functions. The clause also provides that if increases of salaries or wages become payable pursuant to any determination made by a properly constituted authority the Governor may appropriate the necessary funds by warrant, and the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased accordingly.

The clause further provides that, if the cost of electricity for pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide main, from bores in the Adelaide Water District, and through the Morgan-Whyalla main should be greater than the amounts set down in the Estimates, the Governor may appropriate the funds for the additional expenditure, and the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased by the amount of such additional expenditure. Clause 4 authorizes the Treasurer to pay moneys from time to time up to the amounts set down in monthly orders issued by the Governor, and provides that the receipts obtained from the payees shall be the discharge to the Treasurer for the moneys paid.

Clause 5 authorizes the use of Loan funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Commonwealth and the General Revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by clause 3 of the Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1966.

Clause 7 authorizes the expenditure of \$350,000 from the Hospitals Fund. Members may recall that the legislation dealing with lotteries and a totalizator agency board provides for expenditure from the Hospitals Fund for certain hospital purposes but subject to the necessary appropriation by Parliament from time to time. As I explained in introducing that legislation, it is intended that information be put before Parliament each year in the

Estimates of Expenditure. Upon the expectation that about \$100,000 may be available from the Hospitals Fund in 1966-67, proposals for grants totalling that amount have been shown for information in the Estimates of Expenditure for this year. If \$100,000 becomes available late in 1966-67, as anticipated, further and increasing amounts will become available early in 1967-68. To give the necessary appropriation for expenditure in the first few months of 1967-68 until the new Appropriation Bill becomes law, it is desirable that this clause should also cover that period. Therefore, an appropriation of \$350,000 has been included, being \$100,000 for late 1966-67 and \$250,000 for the early part of 1967-68. Clause 8 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated. I commend the Bill for consideration of members.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill contains at least one new provision, namely, the one dealing with the Hospitals Fund. I am rather surprised (perhaps I am not familiar with the procedure) that we are dealing so early in this financial year with appropriations for early in the next financial year. I intend to ask the Treasurer several questions, particularly about the Hospitals Fund and the sum of \$350,000, when the Bill reaches the Committee stage. Although I wish to co-operate with the Treasurer, I believe that the Bill is a departure from the normal Appropriation Bills as we have known them in the past.

[Midnight.]

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): Clause 7 contains a most unusual provision for the appropriation next year of money that will presumably be available. However, the whole system of budgeting for a State is based on an Appropriation Bill for the financial year in which the Estimates are considered. Here, we have a totally different provision from those applying elsewhere in the Bill where no specific sums are provided. The provision relating to the pumping of water is an unknown item. The Minister of Works could not know whether he had to use a large sum of money to pump water, or not. He could only make an estimate of the sum involved. Obviously, if the money on his vote ran out and were not available for pumping, water would still have to be pumped. That is the reason for an unspecified sum in that regard.

Similarly, some years ago, the Parliament, at the suggestion of the Government of the day, inserted a provision in the Appropriation Bill

enabling an award to be paid without waiting for an appropriation of Parliament. A proper wage-fixing tribunal having determined an award, the sum involved was able to be paid without further Parliamentary provision. Here, without any item in respect of which the expenditure is to be made, we are making provision for expenditure next year of money that is not yet known to be available. I cannot believe that any reason exists for this particular provision. Clause 5 provides:

If the moneys paid to the State by the Commonwealth of Australia and the General Revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by section 3 of this Act, moneys may be issued to make good the deficiency out of Loan funds or other public funds or out of moneys raised by way of bank overdraft.

That is not a new provision; it has been in the Appropriation Acts for a long time. It does not differ from the relevant provision in the Appropriation Bill passed last year or from the Bills introduced by me probably on at least a dozen occasions. However, the interpretation of the term "public funds" is different in this Bill. The clause is being used to take trust funds held by the Treasurer and appropriated for the purposes of making good not a temporary deficiency but a deficiency extending over years. That is an entirely new use of this provision. I should have thought that public funds would cover trust funds, but I am informed that the Treasurer's authority to use trust funds comes from this particular provision. Under this clause, it has been used previously but only as a temporary measure. As soon as the moneys from the Commonwealth have come in during the year the trust funds have immediately been replenished. Now, however, this money is being taken from the trust funds and used no longer temporarily, because it is being carried forward from year to year. This needs to be looked at, because I do not think that these are public funds in the generally understood sense of the term: they are private funds in the hands of the Treasurer. The Treasurer pays interest on them. I do not object to their being used temporarily but I do object to their permanent alienation.

The present indication is that these funds will be carried forward and used next year. I want from the Treasurer an explanation of clause 7, because I know of no reason for its inclusion in the Bill. At the beginning of the year Parliament has to be summoned and a Supply Bill has to be passed irrespective of whether or not this clause is included in this legislation. The Supply Bill provides for

the expenditure of money and it also recoups to the Government any payments made under the Governor's appropriation. So this provision is not necessary. It is undesirable, because it breaks away from the accounting procedure of keeping each year separate. In this year's Budget there are moneys that will be spent next year. How hopeless will this be for future accounting! Any appropriation for this year not spent by June 30 next is automatically cancelled, but here we are providing next year for an unknown requirement. It is money not voted by Parliament in the sense that Parliament knows what it is doing; it is only a blind appropriation. It is not in accordance with the provisions of the Bill for the introduction of the totalizer agency board system. I suggest that the Treasurer look at this again.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): In my view, clause 5 is necessary to make effective legislation being passed this session, including the setting up of T.A.B. in South Australia. When that Bill left this place, we indicated there would be an appropriation from the T.A.B. set-up. While this provision in this Bill may be different from usual, if we are to receive money from some source expected to return revenue to the State, at least we should be able to appropriate it to the organization needing it. We are not trying to hide anything; we do not intend forever to borrow trust funds. It is essential to retain the Bill as it was introduced.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Power to issue money other than revenue or money received from the Commonwealth."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer did not deal with my specific point about the definition of "public funds". This is not a new clause; I have introduced Bills with a similar clause many times. It ties in with certain provisions in the Audit Act and the Public Purposes Finance Act, which enable the Treasurer to use money temporarily. However, this present appropriation appears to be used not temporarily but permanently. That is not justified. Ultimately, it will cause much difficulty, because those funds in deposit accounts are only held by the Treasurer and are liable to be called up by their rightful owners. Is there some way in which this position can be met?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): The clause authorizes the use of Loan funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Commonwealth and the General Revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by clause 3. Clause 3 is no different from clause 3 of past Appropriation Bills. The honourable member used the words "trust funds". When he was Treasurer he had the opportunity to use trust funds, and he did so, in the same way as I have. There is no ulterior motive behind this, and I ask the Committee to accept the Bill as it is printed. If it can be shown that this is any different from what we have done in the past, I am prepared to give the Committee the fullest information.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I do not accept the Treasurer's statement that the former Treasurer used trust funds in the same manner as he has used them.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: I did not say "in the same manner": I said that he used them on other occasions.

Mr. HALL: I beg to differ, and I wish to go on record as saying that I do not accept the statement that they have been used in the same manner as previously.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—"Power to make payments."

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This clause differs in one respect from clause 6 in previous Appropriation Bills. The Appropriation Act (No. 2) of 1964 is identically worded down to the end of subparagraph (i), but unlike the present Bill, it includes subparagraph (ii), which states:

At a rate in excess of the rate which, during the period in respect of which the payment is made, was in force under any return made under the Acts relating to the public service, or pursuant to any regulation or any award, order or determination of a court or other body empowered to fix salaries or wages.

If it was necessary in previous Appropriation Acts (and I think it has appeared in all of them), why has it been omitted from the Bill now before us?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I indicated that this clause gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1966. I am not sure just what the honourable member desires.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Subparagraph (ii) in the 1964 Act does not appear in the Bill before us now.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Last year we had an arrangement in respect of the period prior to July 1, 1965. However, rather than be in any difficulties over this, and in case something may have been inadvertently excluded, I have no alternative but to request that progress be reported so that I may ascertain the position.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Order of the Day No. 22: The Hon. Frank Walsh to move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1965.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 12.20 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 29, at 2 p.m.