

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, September 19, 1951.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

FREE MILK FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I noticed in the press yesterday that the Department of Education had commenced the distribution of free milk to school children. Can the Minister of Education say whether the whole metropolitan area is being served?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—Certain schools are not receiving milk because no tenders have been received for its supply. However, it is hoped that this position will be remedied by the beginning of next year. I have a report from the officer in charge, Mr. Marshall, whom many members will remember was transport officer in the Education Department for many years. He informs me that no complaints have been received to date regarding the distribution which started yesterday. I visited a school this morning to see the position for myself, and the whole procedure worked very smoothly and efficiently, and I have no doubt that also applied to the other schools.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 555.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I rise to support the measure for one specific reason. I take the same stand as I did when discussing increased salaries and other payments of Parliamentarians, namely, that it was the responsibility of Parliament itself to fix the salaries and emoluments attached to various committees of Parliament. The Government brought down a report from the President of the State Industrial Court, an outside authority, who made a recommendation to the Government regarding salaries of members of Parliament. Now, the Government is acting in reverse and is proposing to increase the salaries of the President of the Court by £500 a year and that of the Deputy President by £400.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Were you in favour of the report concerning members' salaries?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—To the extent that I knew that the services rendered to the community by members demanded that

there should be an increase in their emolument. The point I take now, and I took previously, is that instead of Parliament accepting the responsibility, the matter was submitted to an outside authority.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—It is not often that I agree with you, but I do on this occasion.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I appreciate my honourable friend's comment. There is no authority for the Government to ask an outsider to fix the salary of judges.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—Did an outside authority fix the salaries?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It is no use splitting hairs.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—The responsibility is still with Parliament.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—If that is so, that responsibility should emerge from Parliament and the Government should not merely condone a recommendation made by an outside authority which is the creation of Parliament. It will be interesting to hear the Minister explain why no inquiry was made by an outside authority as to the necessity of increasing the salaries of the President and the Deputy President of the Industrial Court. It seems an anomaly that the person who made a recommendation to the Government regarding the salaries of members of Parliament and judges should now have his salary increased without an inquiry.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—He could not recommend an increase for himself.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—But perhaps the Government could have submitted the matter to someone else.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—I thought you said Parliament should do it.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am merely putting the Government on the spot.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—I think the honourable member is on the spot.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am not responsible for this measure, but the Government is. If it thought fit to introduce a measure to increase the salaries of the President and the Deputy President of the court, then it should have acted similarly regarding the salaries of members of Parliament and the judges.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—Are you opposing the Bill?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am merely expressing my views, but perhaps they are not on the lines the Chief Secretary desires. I am not opposing the increased salaries, because I have always said that I have the

greatest regard for our judiciary. However, it is very unbecoming of any Government to ask an arbitration authority to make a recommendation to it regarding the payment of our judges, who are people who have given up lucrative practices to fill the office.

The PRESIDENT—Order! The Council has already dealt with the salaries of judges and I ask the honourable member to restrict his remarks to the Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It would be interesting to know, for the year ended June 30, 1951, the number of applications which have been made to the State Industrial Court for an award, the number of industrial agreements ratified by the President and the Deputy President, and also the total number of applications dealt with. This information has not been given by the Chief Secretary. There is another factor which comes into our industrial system, namely, the Board of Industry. It would be of interest to know the number of meetings that Board has held, and the number of applications and agreements dealt with during the current year.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Is not the function of the Board of Industry confined to the cost of living?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No. It enters into disputes as to the province of respective unions, for example. I would like the Chief Secretary to inform the Council on the points I have raised, *i.e.*, the reason for not submitting the work of this court to an outside authority for report, and the number of days it sat, a factor which the President took into consideration very fully when he made his recommendation in regard to the Land Settlement Committee.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment; Committee's report adopted.

IMPRINT BILL,

In Committee.

(Continued from September 18. Page 555.)

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—Yesterday Mr. Perry asked whether the word "print" covered all kinds of type, and I find that when I offered an explanation I was looking at the wrong section of the Act. The wording in this clause is exactly in conformity with section 8 of the principal Act, which has been in existence for many years, and apparently has been sufficient to cover the require-

ments of the Act. I do not know if the honourable member is aware of any particular difficulty.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I raised the point because there have been various improvements in the methods of printing since 1886. The typewriter, for example, is a development since that day, and the Gestetner and Roneo methods of duplicating are others. I gathered from the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition and Sir Wallace Sandford that the question of **libel was an important point** under this measure, and I know that pamphlets are issued but are not printed; that is, they are produced in some form other than what we understand as printing by means of a printing press. I gather from the Chief Secretary's reply that the words were inserted in the original Act in 1863, and if that is so it does not seem to me that the case is fully covered. However, if the Government is satisfied I do not wish to press the point.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—The point raised by the honourable member is important. I ascertained that the language in this Bill is the same as in the principal Act, and no difficulty has been reported to the Government. However, I do not wish to burke discussion of something which may be of importance. I suggest we proceed but I am prepared to submit this matter for the further consideration of the Parliamentary Draftsman and obtain information on the point raised by Mr. Perry. If necessary, the clause can be reconsidered.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 10) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment and Committee's report adopted.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Northern—Minister of Health)—This Bill deals with the topics of tuberculosis and dangerous substances and processes. I will explain the provisions relating to tuberculosis first. These provisions are very largely a consequence of the arrangement made in 1949 between the State and the Commonwealth. Under this arrangement we agreed to co-operate with the Commonwealth in taking steps to reduce, as soon and as far as possible, the incidence of tuberculosis and to provide adequate facilities for **diagnosis, treatment, and control** of this disease.

Before 1949 South Australia had by no means been inactive in this matter. Our Statutes provided for the compulsory notification of all cases of tuberculosis, and there were regulations providing for isolation, where necessary, of patients suffering from this disease. The State had made adequate provision for the reception and treatment in hospitals of persons suffering from tuberculosis, different institutions being available for different types of cases. The standard of our public institutions was at least as high as that of any of the Australian States. In addition, private institutions taking tuberculosis patients were subsidized. The Adelaide Board of Health had in operation its well known scheme for X-ray examinations of the chest in the metropolitan area and the Government had a similar scheme operating in country districts. The Government had also granted substantial financial help to the organization known as Bedford Industries Limited which provided facilities for the rehabilitation of persons who had suffered from tuberculosis, and gave them the chance of acquiring a new interest in life while, at the same time, earning some money. However, since the arrangement of 1949 was entered into tuberculosis has received special attention. Parliament authorized the appointment of a Director of Tuberculosis who is required to devote the whole of his time to the problems of this disease and a competent specialist has been appointed to this office. There has also been a steady increase in the amount of work done for the purpose of detecting early cases of tuberculosis, as well as constant attention to the treatment and after care of patients.

The Government is now advised that an increased measure of success in both diagnosis and treatment will now depend largely upon the grant by Parliament of further powers to the health authorities. The Government, of course, is not anxious to ask for further compulsory powers if that can be avoided. But ever since the agreement with the Commonwealth was made, the Commonwealth has been urging all the States to pass legislation providing for compulsory examination by X-ray and other means, and compulsory detention where that course is justified. All the other States except New South Wales have now passed or are in process of passing legislation on these lines. The Government, therefore, now feels bound both in the interests of the public as well as in fulfilment of its obligations under the arrangement with the Commonwealth to ask for similar powers in

this State. Another reason which may be urged in support of the proposed powers is that if other States have laws for the control of sufferers from tuberculosis and we do not, patients who dislike treatment will tend to come here from other States. Instances of this type of conduct are already known to our health officers.

The Bill now before members inserts in the Health Act a new part dealing solely with tuberculosis. The first provision to which I draw attention is, the proposed new section 146c. This provides for the examination of individual persons suspected of being infected with tuberculosis. It empowers the Director-General of Public Health, if he has such a suspicion, to serve a notice on the suspected person requiring him to attend at a specified time and place for examination. At least seven days' notice must be given. During that time it will be open to the person served with the notice, if he can, to convince the Director-General that he is not suffering from tuberculosis, or that he is or will be adequately treated for that disease, or that for some other sufficient reason the examination is not necessary. In any of these cases the Director-General may revoke the notice or may amend it, *e.g.*, by postponing the time of the proposed examination. But if the notice is not revoked it is binding on the person named in it, and if he fails to comply with it, he may be fined up to £25 for a first offence and up to £50 for a subsequent offence. A further remedy for non-compliance with a notice is that the Director-General may apply to a magistrate for the issue of a warrant for the apprehension of the person to be examined. Such a warrant will be sufficient authority for bringing that person to the place appointed for his examination. This provision may appear a little drastic, but it will be obvious that without some such power it would not be possible to ensure the examination of a recalcitrant person. If powers are to be given they should be made adequate for their purpose. The justification is the protection of the health of the public. Members will recall that we have legislation, very similar to that now under discussion, dealing with social diseases.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—It did not go as far as this.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—Yes, definitely, as you will see on comparison. The effect has been that the knowledge that the powers do exist is sufficient to ensure the co-operation of those odd cases which occur.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Are the penalties in the other legislation as severe as in this?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I have not compared the penalties. This legislation has been drafted as a result of repeated requests from the Commonwealth over the last three years. No doubt the other States already have similar legislation. Section 146e deals with what are usually called mass X-ray examinations, and enables the Minister, by notice advertised in a newspaper, to call up any groups or classes of persons for X-ray examinations of the chest. For example, age-groups could be called up, or groups of immigrants, or of persons engaged in any industry or occupation in which there is a special risk of tuberculosis. A notice will be binding on each person of the class or group to which it applies and failure to attend for X-ray examination at the time fixed by a notice or on any adjournment of the examination will be an offence rendering the offender liable to a fine of not more than £25 for a first offence or £50 for a subsequent offence. It is not intended that the holding of compulsory X-ray examinations will interfere with the present system of voluntary examinations. Arrangements will be made for both to go on concurrently. We have achieved some measure of success with our voluntary X-ray service, but the result has been very disappointing in some areas. The Government has sent expensive equipment under expert officers to tour the country, and has solicited the co-operation of the local authorities in publicizing the fact that the facilities are available, only to find that a minimum percentage of the people is willing to use the facilities offered. It is no more costly to have the equipment operating at full capacity while it is in a district than to have the expert officers in attendance to deal with only 10 or a dozen people in a day. It is most disappointing to the qualified officers, who are attempting to grapple with this problem, which they consider can be overcome, when they cannot get the full support to which they are entitled.

Sections 146f to 146j inclusive deal with a longstanding problem—namely, that of the segregation and treatment of persons who are definitely known to be sufferers from tuberculosis, and who are unwilling to undergo treatment voluntarily. Under the existing provisions of the Health Act there is power for the Governor to make regulations for the isolation and observation of such persons. But it is very doubtful whether this power extends to compulsory detention and treatment in an institution. A person can be isolated if he

merely remains in a room in his own house. The present law, therefore, cannot be regarded as a safe legal basis for compulsory detention and treatment in an institution. There is a further argument in support of some power of compulsory detention. For a good many years the medical officers in charge of our tuberculosis hospitals have felt strongly the need for some power to control the patients who have entered the institutions voluntarily. There have been a fair number of unruly patients—some in a highly infectious condition—who from time to time leave the institution and get drunk. Sometimes they have returned in an inebriated condition and behaved offensively to nurses and other members of the staff. In other cases they have left the institution either permanently or for relatively long periods and gone to live among other people, thus exposing them to infection. In one case not very long ago the patient on leaving the institution whilst still in an infectious condition went first to a coffee palace and thence to the home of a recently cured tuberculosis sufferer who had a family of young children.

The case for compulsory detention does not, however, rest solely on the danger to other people. Many tuberculosis sufferers need hospital treatment in their own interests, and it is no great hardship to them if they are compelled to undergo it. The clauses of the Bill dealing with the detention of sufferers have been drafted with care to ensure that persons are not detained without due cause, or any longer than is necessary. A patient can be detained against his will only on the order of a special magistrate. An order cannot be made unless the magistrate is satisfied—and this word implies a high degree of certainty—that the patient is suffering from tuberculosis and needs treatment in an institution either in his own interests or because he is living in circumstances in which he is likely to infect others. If a person is already a patient in an institution and a magistrate is satisfied that in that person's own interests, or in order to prevent infection to others, he should be detained in the institution, he may make an order accordingly. The period for which a person may be ordered to be detained must not exceed six months, but of course successive orders may be made in relation to the same person. Before any order for detention is made the patient will have notice of the intended application and will be entitled to attend before the magistrate and show cause why the order should not be made. An order for detention may be enforced by the issue of a warrant.

By section 146h the Director-General of Health is empowered to order the release of any person who is detained pursuant to an order, and to extend any period for which a person is released. Further, a detained person has the right to apply to a special magistrate for an order of release and the magistrate, after hearing the Director-General, may make such an order if satisfied that it can be made without substantial risk of infection to others. Any decision of a magistrate whether to make or refuse an order for detention or release is subject to a right of appeal to the Supreme Court. It is, of course, contemplated that few orders for compulsory detention will be made. But the fact that power of detention exists will, in most cases, be sufficient to induce people to undergo the proper treatment. This was the experience under the venereal diseases legislation which, in principle, resembled this Bill.

Clause 4 deals with dangerous substances (including solids, liquids, and gases) and dangerous processes. In recent years there has been a substantial increase in the number of dangerous and poisonous substances used in industry and sold to the public for general use. The increase is continuing. I will give members some examples of what I mean. X-ray machines, and radio-active substances producing ionisation are coming into very common use. X-ray machines are used for such purposes as to indicate the position of the feet in boots and shoes, or to take pictures of welds or castings. The persons using these machines or substances often have no knowledge of the effect of the ionising rays, which may be quite dangerous to persons in the vicinity. Many chemicals now being used to an increasing extent are poisonous when applied to the skin or absorbed into the body through the lungs, stomach or intestines. Among these chemicals are compounds of chromium and lead, benzol, and other like solvents. Until recently almost all paints were mixed with linseed oil or turpentine, which are relatively harmless, but there are now many special purpose paints, lacquers, thinners, and paint removers on the market containing a wide variety of solvents. Some of these solvents contain poisonous substances such as benzol, the acetones, ketones, terpenes and chlorinated hydrocarbons. These are all freely used by members of the public, many of whom are unaware of their nature or of the precautions which should be taken when they are used. The new organic phosphorous insecticides are dangerous poisons and many

accidents have occurred with them in other countries. Warnings and precautions are necessary in connection with the use of these. There are a number of substances used in industry and by the public which are harmless in themselves but when subjected to various kinds of treatment break down into poisonous gases or liquids. An example is the inert substance freon 12, which is used in aerosol insecticide bombs and as a refrigerant. When subjected to heat it produces the poisonous substance hydrofluoric acid.

The object of clause 4 in connection with substances such as I have mentioned is not to prevent their use, but to ensure that by proper handling and the giving of proper warnings they will not be a source of injury to those engaged in producing or using them. Members will readily appreciate that this is a matter which must necessarily be dealt with by regulation. Each substance will require special rules and the rules may have to be modified from time to time in the light of experience and the practice in other States. It is therefore proposed that regulations may be made on the recommendation of the Central Board of Health both for the purpose of declaring that substances shall be regarded as dangerous and what precautions shall be taken in connection with each substance. The regulations will, of course, be laid before Parliament and members will have the opportunity to disallow them. This legislation, in both sections, is very important and far reaching. I know that the first part deals with a very sensitive topic in that it involves some degree of control over the actions of individuals. However, like many other social questions, it is one we have to examine in the best interests of all concerned. In co-operation with the Commonwealth Government we have set about the task of reducing the incidence of a disease which we consider, in this climate and under our conditions of living, can be limited. I know the frustration felt by those whose responsibility it is to give effect to the purposes of such legislation and that they meet with a few recalcitrant cases which prejudice the success of the whole outlay and effort. In those circumstances I commend that part of the legislation to the earnest attention of members. The second part deals with new matters which did not exist even 10 years ago, and so as we advance with the assistance of research and science it is necessary that we protect the individual who is not educated in the use of new

substances and processes. I commend the Bill to the favourable consideration of members and move the second reading.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 552.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Central No. 1—Leader of the Opposition)—I sincerely hope that full employment will be found over the period of this loan programme, which provides for expenditure of loan money until June 30, 1952.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Have you any doubt about it?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Things may not always be so rosy as they are today, and therefore we have great responsibility in considering the programme. The Federal Government recently floated a security loan of £40,000,000, which was under-subscribed by £7,700,000. That is a pointer which should be seriously considered by the general public. Whether it is because the people are waiting for an increased rate of interest I do not know.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—They have had a low rate long enough.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The position can be made only more difficult by an increase of interest rates, and in my opinion it would not render the best services to the Commonwealth. Despite all of the difficulties we hear so much about company profits are still increasing. I notice only this week that one very large company had made a profit of 20 per cent in the last 12 months. Our loan expenditure 10 years ago was £2,500,000. Admittedly, during the war we were hampered in our public expenditure, but under this Bill we are asked to vote no less than £41,000,000, or 18 times more than the loan expenditure of 10 years ago. Every member knows that it is impossible to spend that sum in the next 12 months, and consequently it can only be a bit of window dressing on the part of the Government—a show pony.

The Hon. E. Anthony—A bit of a draught horse I think.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—This afternoon I shall offer a little criticism of the Government on its attitude of works priorities. It would be of advantage to members if they knew the Government's proposals instead of having to wait for the Estimates to be

presented. Last year we voted money for a certain volume of work, but much of it was never carried out and is not likely to be done in 1951-52. The Public Works Standing Committee was asked to treat certain references as urgent but, although it presented its reports expeditiously, some of them have been pigeon-holed and forgotten.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—The Government has not the material.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That is a matter of opinion. I know there are difficulties in that direction, but some of them are over-stressed for certain reasons. I regret that the Government has not given first priority to hospitals and that in this loan programme only £400,000 is provided for new hospitals. I realize that water conservation is also very important but I put hospitals as No. 1 and water conservation as No. 2 in point of urgency. Schools also are very important. It is proposed that quite a number of schools should be constructed during the ensuing 12 months, but there is not a possible chance of many of them being completed. It is wrong to ask for a large appropriation simply with a view to deceiving the public. The Government must know full well that not half of this programme can be completed, consequently this Loan Bill can only be a bit of window dressing, as has been the case in previous years, for there are quite a number of works which have appeared on the Estimates for several years. Consider the Western Districts hospital as an example. That was recommended over three years ago as one of the most important subjects before Parliament. How far have we got with it? That is true of other works which were mentioned last year and the year before, and will probably be mentioned next year. The Northfield Infectious Diseases Hospital is now under the control of the board of management of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The Director of Medical Services, the medical staff and the nurses and all connected with our hospitals are doing a magnificent job, but they have been working under difficulties for many years. Although the transfer of some patients from the Royal Adelaide Hospital to Northfield made more room available, accommodation is still overtaxed because we have no suitable provision for elderly patients. South Australia lacks a home in which old people can be cared for and consequently some of the beds in our main hospitals are occupied by elderly people simply because they have nowhere else to go. Money might well be spent in providing a resting place for those

pioneers who have done so much to build up our Commonwealth. People used to object to going to Northfield, but nowadays most people accept the position. Nurses' accommodation is a big problem, but the Government is erecting a nurses' home at Frome Road adjacent to the Adelaide Hospital which will overcome some of the difficulties. It proposes providing accommodation at Northfield for 30 patients at a cost of £67,250.

There has been criticism of bulk handling. Recently a recommendation was made for the establishment of a bulk wheat bin at Ardrossan. Fourteen months ago the Australian Wheat Board passed a resolution regarding the erection of a bin and equipment at Ardrossan which could be used in conjunction with the bulk loading plant of the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd., then nearly completed. The original submission was for the erection of a bin of galvanized iron and timber to hold 1,000,000 bushels of wheat and costing approximately £35,000. It was estimated that over 1,000,000 bushels would be delivered there from upper Yorke Peninsula and the storage capacity would be used one and a half times to twice during the period or harvest. In recommending this plant at Ardrossan Parliament has to consider other ports which will be affected—Wallaroo and Port Victoria.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Is this plant being established by the Government?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—No, by the Australian Wheat Board. However, when the Australian Wheat Board goes out of existence the Government will probably be compelled to take it over at a price. In dealing with any scheme the Public Works Standing Committee has a great responsibility and it is easy for people to criticize without knowing the facts. Conferences were held between the Australian Wheat Board, the B.H.P., and the Harbors Board representing the Government. The Government introduced the question of dredging. The Australian Wheat Board has to provide the funds for the construction of the bulk bin at Ardrossan. An agreement had to be entered into between the Wheat Board and the B.H.P. in case a general bulk handling scheme was introduced. The Wheat Board suggested 3d. a bushel for handling and shipping charges, but the B.H.P. suggested 4½d. The Committee asked the B.H.P. to review charges and a revised scale was submitted. The charges were to be for 50,000 tons, 2½d. a bushel; 30,000 to 50,000 tons, 2¼d.; and less than 30,000 tons, 3d. a bushel. The charges were

subject to variation in the event of present-day costs increasing. The adoption of the scheme will affect a number of Yorke Peninsula jetties, and wheat which would otherwise go to other ports will be drawn to Ardrossan. The Harbors Board will collect the usual wharf rates but other ports affected will have to be continued by the Harbors Board. The railways will also be affected.

Some time ago the Australian Wheat Board wanted wheat storing and handling facilities at Wallaroo and Port Lincoln, and on October 21, 1943, the committee was asked to inquire into and report on the terms upon which the Australian Wheat Board had offered to sell the Government those facilities which were proposed to be constructed, and to consider whether they were fair and reasonable, and if not, what would be a reasonable price for their acquisition. This matter was stated to be urgent, therefore an inquiry was immediately instigated. The Railways Commissioner, the Harbors Board, the Premier, the manager of Grain Elevators in Melbourne, and commercial men were consulted, and evidence taken. The scheme would probably have cost the Government £189,000, but before the inquiry ended, the Australian Wheat Board wrote to the Premier saying it could manage without it. If we had made a recommendation the work would probably have been started, involving the State in heavy outlay. In view of the changed circumstances the committee did not continue with the investigation. Only 5,000,000 bushels were to have been handled. Bulk handling is a difficult question in South Australia with its numerous ports. The committee made a recommendation regarding Ardrossan in order to get a lead as to whether favourable consideration would be given to a general scheme. The committee will not be flustered by any interests who, for personal gain, try to force the Committee's hand. It is the committee's responsibility to protect the interests of this State.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Do you regard this experiment at Ardrossan as an attempt to prejudice the committee in favour of the scheme?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Committee members have open minds and will bring in a decision according to the evidence submitted. In order to ascertain whether a satisfactory and economic scheme can be introduced expert advice from overseas and elsewhere has been obtained.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—The committee recommended the Wallaroo scheme?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Yes, but when it comes to considering a general scheme, a recommendation may involve the State in the expenditure of millions of pounds.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Isn't a company being formed outside State activities?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That is the whole trouble, but how are we to know that if a recommendation is made it may not eventually come under Government control? I often smile when I read the papers. Although people may run to the Premier, they will not in any way interfere with what the committee thinks right, and a decision will be made on the evidence submitted, no matter what the personal opinions of the committee members may be. There has been criticism because the committee has not submitted a general report on bulk handling, but it is necessary to consider everything. Next week a German expert is to appear before the committee on this matter. I am just as anxious to do something in the interests of farmers, if it is economic, as I am to protect the interests of the State.

The Government proposes to spend a considerable amount on improvements and additions at Leigh Creek coalfield, which has progressed beyond expectations. I have often wondered whether Parliament did the right thing when it handed the field over to the Electricity Trust, and thus prevented an inquiry by the Public Works Standing Committee into projects on the field costing more than £30,000. The Government now proposes to spend £750,000 on a reservoir at Aroona Gorge to supply Leigh Creek with water. The supply from Sliding Rock Mine has been of great value to the field, but the township's requirements are outgrowing the capacity of this supply. Three or four years ago the Government submitted a project to the committee for the construction of a reservoir to cost £57,000 to be constructed east of Copley to supply Leigh Creek. The committee reported against the proposition. It was considered it would be a waste of money as the holding ground was unsatisfactory. I only hope that the Aroona Gorge project is a success.

The Osborne coal handling installation was designed originally to handle 500,000 tons a year, plus another 100,000 tons to be taken overside from ships. Provision should be made at Osborne for a second working berth to increase the installation's capacity to 1,250,000 tons. The existing plant has returned an average of 1s. 7d. a ton, and with the increased tonnage to be handled should return 1s. 8d.

The fixed charge for maintenance is 4d. a ton, and the increased capital expenditure would increase this charge to only 5d. The actual handling costs total about 2s. 10d. a ton, but the charges made for handling coal amount to 2s. 1d. For the financial year ended June 30, 1950, there was a deficit in the operation of the plant of about £26,000, equal to 8d. a ton on the coal handled. Charges have not been increased since 1936, it being the Government's policy not to increase them while the Harbors Board was showing an over-all surplus on its operations. That is where the Government is wrong. It should have altered its policy, as any private employer would have done, and considered increasing handling costs. It is estimated that extensions to the coal handling plant will cost £318,000.

Water rates have not been increased for many years, although recently assessments were advanced by 40 per cent. Schemes which a few years ago were returning 11 per cent are now returning only 4 per cent, and that must be taken into account.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Is there any reason why country schemes should not return more?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That is a matter of Government policy. However, the metropolitan area should be prepared to assist country districts in meeting their water costs, and no opportunity should be missed of providing additional water schemes, not only for the metropolitan area, but also in the country. Shortly the Public Works Standing Committee will issue a report on water proposals for the West Coast. I consider that money spent on ensuring an adequate water supply is money well spent, as it results in not only increased production but also increased State revenue. We should not be narrow-minded on these things. I do not think South Australians have anything to complain about regarding water rates.

For many years there has been a shortage of cargo storage accommodation at Port Adelaide. Recently the Public Works Standing Committee considered an extension to the Currie Street cargo shed at Port Adelaide and recommended its construction at a cost of £36,000, making the total invested in this project £64,000. The committee considered it an economic proposition. The present storage rate charge is 4d. a ton a week, which is low. The average annual return has been 8½ per cent, but a return of 10 per cent is deemed necessary to cover interest, depreciation and maintenance. If the present density of cargo continued a charge of 7½d. a ton would be required, but the shed

would pay with a charge of 6d. Considerable trouble has resulted because cargo has been allowed to remain in the cargo sheds too long, but with the impost of an additional charge the position has been relieved somewhat.

The Public Works Standing Committee has recommended the purchase by the Government of photogrammetric equipment and this will result in a big saving in survey work. South Australia is far behind the other Australian States and other countries in this field. A committee appointed by the Government to consider the project submitted evidence to the Public Works Standing Committee and reported that a saving of £203,000 over a period of 15 years would possibly result by the use of this equipment, instead of the usual practice of employing surveyors to do the work. With the equipment surveying will be done much more quickly and cheaply. Earlier, I referred to the erection of schools. I consider that education and the erection of schools of great importance, and I place the latter as third in my priority of Government works, the provision of hospitals and water schemes being placed first and second. But, as the Minister of Education knows, quite a number of reports have been submitted during the last 12 months in connection with schools. The Public Works Standing Committee has made the following recommendations:—New Naracoorte high school; new primary schools for Barton Vale, Findon, Whyalla West, Taperoo, Morphettville Park. Oaklands, Woodlands Gardens, Paringa Park and Northfield, new infant schools at Brighton and St. Leonards and a new high school at Minlaton. There are quite a number of others. This shows that great interest is being taken by the Government in education, and I commend the work of the Education Department and all its officers, from the highest to the lowest, for I realize they have a very difficult task in these times. They are entitled to every encouragement because it is most important that our school children should be properly housed.

I regret that our housing situation is not much improved. It is true that a large number of houses were built in the last 12 months, but the demand is ever increasing, and when we will catch up with it I do not know. However, I suggest that instead of endeavouring to erect so many houses, the Government should persuade the Housing Trust to concentrate on completing those which are started. In the metropolitan area there are hundreds of houses which have reached a certain stage and have been in that condition for a considerable

time. There is not much value in starting a lot of homes which remain uncompleted for a number of months; so I think it would be better if efforts were concentrated on completing those which are started. There may be a good answer—

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—There is a very good one.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I think I know what the honourable member has in mind, but we are not responsible for what happens elsewhere. We in South Australia ought to be very proud of our position in comparison with that of some of the other States, and realize that the credit should not go to only one section, for all sections are responsible. Before we are called upon to consider the next Loan Bill I trust that our housing position will have improved. There are many more topics to which I could have addressed myself but I have selected what I thought the most urgent. What I have said has been conscientious criticism, and I hope that the Government will pay it some heed.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY (Central No. 2)—I congratulate the honourable member on his valuable contribution to this debate. Mr. Condon and I have been in various parts of this Parliamentary institution for a very long time and have seen quite a lot of things happen, but I do not think we have ever seen such a large loan programme as that which confronts us today. Many reasons are adduced for the condition of inflation we are living in and many solutions of it have been offered. My own humble opinion is that we cannot remedy this unhappy state of affairs until we get back to the Federal Constitution, and the first step in getting back would be to restore to all the States the taxing powers they formerly enjoyed. Those powers were taken from the States under the promise that they would be restored after the war. This has not been done, and I think that all the Premiers should combine to demand the restoration of those powers, for until the States are faced with the responsibility of taxing their own people to raise funds for public expenditure there will be the same complete disregard for the expenditure of the taxpayer's money as we are witnessing today.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Does not the State Government get a better deal under uniform taxation?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—A complete disregard of the taxpayer's interests seems to have grown up; today Treasurers talk about

millions as we formerly talked about hundreds of pounds. We are asked to approve of an expenditure of £41,000,000, a huge sum to place on the already over-encumbered taxpayer. The State debt of £138,000,000 was increased last year by a further £5,000,000, and it seems, as the Leader of the Opposition said, that conditions may not be so rosy in the future. I have always deemed it to be a canon of good government that private individuals should spend money in times of prosperity—and they seem to have it today—and that Governments should curtail expenditure, and save their money for when times are less prosperous. That is how Governments can help to prevent serious unemployment. On the contrary today we have competition between private enterprise and Governments to see who can spend the most.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—I presume the honourable member will suggest what works we shall cut out.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I am amazed that the Government should submit a programme of works which has been demonstrated by no less a person than the Leader of the Opposition there is no hope of completing. He told us that the Public Works Standing Committee made no fewer than 22 recommendations and that it has another 22 references before it. What is the urgency of all this and why should we have this reservoir of work? Why does the Government want to begin one job before it completes another? Take the Goodwood-Marino line duplication as an example. No work has been done on that for two or three months. Why start a job and take the men off to put them on another? That is not a very sound way of conducting public business. There again, the department is competing for the very limited amount of labour available. The Government is asking us to approve of a large expenditure of loan money for the purpose of indulging in a great deal of public work which we are led to believe cannot be carried out for many years. I think we all know the explanation, but I ask again why should the Government say that all this work is urgent and necessary when it cannot complete much of what it has already undertaken.

A sum of £1,200,000 is set down for advances to the State Bank. I have always approved of the excellent work the State Bank has done in providing homes and I could never understand why it was not given more money, or why it was deemed desirable to set up a new department instead of giving the State Bank

more money and a good deal more rein to extend its activities. There may be some satisfactory explanation of that, but I am pleased that the State Bank is to be given an extra grant this year. In the limited time at one's disposal it is not possible to refer to every important subject, but I should like to say something concerning transport. It seems to me that the attitude of the Railways Department has always been one of hostility to road transport. It is an admitted fact, I think even by the department itself, that the railways cannot possibly cope with the volume of traffic offering today. This Government has attracted many industries to the State, and those industries are producing a great volume of goods. Neither the railways nor shipping can handle the freight and, as a result, hauliers and road transport people have been called upon to help. Instead of an attitude of opposition to road transport there should be a greater feeling of co-operation. The Railways Department should regard road transport as a helping agency in the development of this country. Instead of complaining that transports cut up our roads we should make our roads more suitable. I hope the money voted under this Bill will be used in constructing stronger roads capable of handling the increased traffic. Road transport has come to stay.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—It should be cheaper.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Yes, but like other things it has become dearer.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Would you recommend a special tax upon those vehicles to pay for the upkeep of roads?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I believe they are paying a tax now and I do not think they would object to a heavier tax if they were provided with roads over which their vehicles could proceed safely and speedily.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—They are on the roads now and it is difficult to pass them.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I agree that at certain times of the day it is a problem.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—Those roads were constructed for coaches and horses.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Yes, but we must keep pace with the times. We will have to build roads to take the traffic and not expect traffic to condition itself to the roads. There must be an economic waste at the Mile End goods yards largely because it has not been made to conform to modern conditions to take increased traffic. The Royal Commission on Transport recommended that the yard should be completely re-organized.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Isn't that the responsibility of the Railways Commissioner?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Yes, but he can use only the money provided by Parliament and it is largely a matter of Government policy. If the Government said the yard had to be re-organized to take increased traffic it would soon be done. I realize that we are confronted with lack of labour and materials. Anyone concerned with trade and commerce knows that frequently goods are held up for hours and there have been cases when drivers have had to return later to obtain goods. The position has improved in the last few months because of agitation but there is room for improvement. If this State hopes to progress it will have to make its public utilities conform to the increased pressure.

I commend the work of the Education Department, which is faced with the problem of obtaining more accommodation and teachers. That is not entirely a local problem but is world-wide and there must be a reason for the scarcity of teachers. The teaching profession has been neglected over the years and has been regarded as the Cinderella of professions. Nowadays the teacher is better paid than previously but the profession is suffering because of its unpopularity and the department should do something to popularize it. Teachers should try to instil into the minds of children the importance of teaching.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—I assure the honourable member that teachers are doing that.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—It has not always been the department's attitude to encourage people to take on teaching.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—What about the shortage that will be created elsewhere?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Naturally shortages will occur elsewhere, but first things should come first and surely those who have the destiny of this country in their hands realize that the education of children is of prime importance. In order to recruit young people into the teaching profession the Education Department will have to increase the salaries of trainees. From a question I asked yesterday I ascertained that 186 entered the department under new emergency schemes but only 63 have any educational qualifications.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—I do not agree with that.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Only 63 have their intermediate or leaving certificates.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—If they have not those certificates they have no educational qualifications.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Quite a number who have not their intermediate certificates are teaching.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What classes are they teaching?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I do not know but the department should increase trainees' salaries and by doing so we would ensure that we would have teachers trained in the profession rather than people who merely fill in gaps.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Can the honourable member tell me what trainees at the Teachers Training College are receiving?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Approximately £170 a year. How does the Minister expect to get young people into the teaching profession by paying £170 a year when they can go elsewhere and receive £8 or £9 a week? As the department is in competition, if it wants its staff increased the State will have to meet a higher expenditure in order to pay increased salaries to trainees. Teachers work considerably more than a 40-hour week.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—But what about the holidays they enjoy?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—They need them.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—They do not work when children are on holidays.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—No, but it is important that we offer better inducement to get young people into the profession. I would like to know whether the £200,000 contemplated for Government buildings includes renovation and repair costs, because main Government buildings are in bad repair. Ten or 12 years ago a committee of which I was a member produced a plan for construction of new Government offices. That plan has never been put into operation and in some offices floors are so bad that members of the public have put their feet through them. Members should inspect the bad state of the Children's Welfare Department. The Government should be modern employers and provide the best possible conditions. The time is over-ripe for it to put its offices into a livable condition. Some clerks are working behind galvanized iron.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—A lot of people do that and live under it too.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—But they are not good conditions for people to work under. As some projects have waited a long time to be undertaken, surely they can wait a little longer. If all Governments were serious in their attempts to combat the inflationary spiral, they would not be spending large sums. I am suggesting that much more care should be

exercised in the expenditure of money by the Government, and thus a contribution would be made toward combating inflation.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern).—Some members have suggested that priority should be given to certain undertakings mentioned in the schedule of the Bill, but in looking through them I find it difficult to say which should have the highest priorities or to suggest the elimination of any of them. It must be admitted that every item has a greater or lesser degree of importance in relation to the general economy of the State. We are indebted to the Minister for the detailed information he gave in his second reading. He mentioned some of the items which he considered were of prior importance, and if we are to give priority we must agree with those items mentioned by him, namely, transport, water supplies, housing and power. The Minister was wise in placing transport at the head of any priority list. We are endeavouring to increase production, particularly primary production, which is of paramount importance at present, but it is not much use increasing production unless we improve our transport facilities to handle it. Suggestions have been made for the improvement of water supplies, which, in turn, would serve to increase production, but we still must handle that increased production through our transport system. Therefore, I think we are wise if we give priority to transport in the matters mentioned in the schedule.

I am particularly interested in the transport services operating in my district, which are chiefly concerned in the carrying of primary products. We also have a very important railway system which handles ore from the Broken Hill mines to the Port Pirie smelters, and although we do not have quite as much publicity concerning that aspect of our transport system, we surely must take notice of the report of the Royal Commission on Transport and its remarks concerning not only that system, but the whole of the railway systems throughout the State. The commission made an over-all recommendation that there was an urgent need for the overhauling of our railway system, particularly in some respects. It considered that the Broken Hill railway system was one worthy of consideration, as it recognized its importance to South Australia. I am not clear how much of such a programme would come within the ambit of this Bill, but I would assume that the items set down for the railways and costing nearly £4,500,000 would include provision for the renovation of rolling

stock and the railway system generally. The Eyre Peninsula railway system is one which calls for urgent reconstruction and overhaul. We are urged to increase primary production, and I claim that the people of Eyre Peninsula are doing their part in that regard, but whereas production in that area has increased, the facilities for transport have not been able to keep pace. At present some of the harvest before last is still awaiting transport as well as a great percentage of last year's harvest of barley and wheat, and on top of that we have the prospect of one of the best seasons for cereal production in the history of Eyre Peninsula. I almost shudder to think what the position will be when that harvest is gathered.

I know the present position is not all the fault of the railway administration, but has been brought about owing to a variety of circumstances. During the war we had to get along with the rolling stock available and nothing could be done about replacements. Since then we have been faced with a shortage of labour and materials and the Government has been forced to go overseas to get essential equipment. Through this and other circumstances it has been most difficult to keep up the desired standard of our transport system. I hope that some portion of the money to be made available to the railways will be expended on the Eyre Peninsula system. There is also the question of improved harbour facilities, not only at Port Adelaide, but elsewhere in the State. I am hopeful that improved shipping and harbour facilities will be made available at Port Lincoln. This is an essential part of any programme for the improvement of the transport system in the Eyre Peninsula area. It is not much use improving our railway system to transport produce to the seaboard when the facilities at ports are obsolete. It is therefore to be hoped that a comprehensive programme will be pursued to improve the handling facilities both on the railways and at Port Lincoln.

I understand that some relief is likely in the provision of rolling stock on the Eyre Peninsula lines when the narrow gauge conversion is completed in the South-East. However, I was hoping for something better. When Mr. Anderson was Railways Commissioner he said in evidence to the Public Works Standing Committee that a survey had been made of the age of the rolling stock in operation in the South-East and he mentioned that some of the trucks were more than 50 years old. Surely there cannot be much useful life left in them

today. It seems false economy to depend on the cast-offs from that system before much needed relief can be afforded to the Eyre Peninsula system. When the Government is considering the provision of better rolling stock on the Eyre Peninsula railways I hope it will start off with new engines and new trucks. Into the question of handling wheat comes the problem of bulk handling. As one who has watched with particular interest the development of that means of handling grain I appreciate that there are all sorts of difficulties in its adoption. Changing conditions compel the modification of perhaps preconceived ideas, but another factor which comes into the question is the requirements of the purchaser. I am not very sure of what provisions are available today in some of the eastern countries with which we did an extensive trade in grain in years gone by, but at one time they were without facilities for handling wheat in bulk and had to purchase wheat in sacks so that they could handle it at their end. This is something that many are inclined to overlook; it is not merely a question of dispatching our goods in a manner to suit ourselves, but of having regard to the convenience of our customers.

I have had the opportunity to investigate, not very fully I must admit, what has been termed the unorthodox system of bulk handling adopted in Western Australia. Here again, although it seems a simple matter to introduce it, quite a lot of difficulties present themselves. We can rely upon the Public Works Standing Committee to reach a proper conclusion. Knowing the personnel of that committee I am sure that, if the materials and manpower were readily available, it would be only too happy to recommend similar installations in South Australia. We have always been up against the problem of having many main shipping ports. In Victoria, and I think to a large degree in New South Wales, there is no such problem of any magnitude. We have the two gulfs and the shipping points on the West Coast, as well as the terminal ports of Port Lincoln and Port Adelaide, and have loaded overseas vessels from many of them. It seems that if we are to adopt the bulk handling system we will have to concentrate on two or three of the main terminals and leave out the remainder. However, I know that all these matters are receiving the consideration of the Public Works Standing Committee and the mere fact that it has not yet submitted its report, notwithstanding that the inquiry has been going on for a long time, indicates that

there are many difficulties to overcome. Generally speaking the wheatgrowers have confidence in the committee and they are looking forward to its report.

In looking through the schedules it is difficult to pick out one item of greater importance than others. Highways, irrigation, afforestation, and water supplies are all matters on which the State is dependant for a continuation of its prosperity, and I do not see how we could curtail this programme to any degree without seriously affecting the general welfare of the people. Whether we shall achieve the whole programme is, of course, a matter for conjecture. A large sum is involved and its expenditure is largely dependant upon material being available. As pointed out by the Minister in his second reading speech, it may be necessary to switch from one project to another. That is understandable. If, for example, steel is not available to make water pipes we will have to switch to other activities for which material is available. I cannot see any objection to that; it is a line of action anyone would follow if faced with the task of carrying out such a programme as this. Reverting to the railways, improvement is not only necessary in the goods section, but also in the coaching section on Eyre Peninsula. I know that the railway authorities have been concerned to get a greater volume of passenger traffic, but I have sometimes felt that they have pursued the wrong policy. I have formed that opinion because of the replies I have sometimes received to overtures for improved facilities. They have stated that the volume of business does not warrant improvements. A private businessman sets out to attract business. It may involve taking some risks, but he offers attractions to the people whose custom he wants, and this principle ought to be adopted by the railways. If they want to encourage passenger traffic they should offer passengers reasonable comfort and reasonable speed of transport. In other words they must advertise—go out after the business. If the results are not what they anticipated, then that is the time to review the position.

I have had the experience of travelling on the Eyre Peninsula lines on many occasions and, believe me, conditions are not improving. One of the vehicles employed is facetiously referred to as "Tumbling Tommy." It is a most obsolete dog-box of a railcar which runs up to Kimba twice a week. It is almost impossible to retain one's seat and utterly impossible

to read during the journey. I feel sure it would not be tolerated on any other line and the development of that country is certainly deserving of better rail transport. Admittedly that is the extreme criticism I have to offer, but there is nothing very enviable about the other railcar services, on which, too, the passengers find it difficult to read owing to the vibration. I am happy to know, as the result of a question I submitted recently, that an inquiry into this aspect is being made and I am hopeful that some improvement will result. It is long overdue. The people have been long suffering and deserve better consideration.

I once again emphasize the necessity to improve the rail service by the continuation of the weekly railcar service through to Thevenard. At present the railcar goes as far as Minnipa where the passengers have to transfer to a goods train. This is scheduled to reach Thevenard at about 2.30 a.m. but very often does not arrive until about 5 a.m. The journey is anything but comfortable for the passengers have to put up with all the shuntings at sidings, and altogether it is a most tedious journey. This is one of the instances where the replies to requests for improved conditions have been that the traffic does not warrant anything better. If improved conditions were offered, even if only as a trial, I am sure we could justify our claims, and that the people would show their appreciation by patronizing the rail services. They have other means of transport, of course, but these are, after all, in competition with the railways to the extent that the people prefer to use them.

This brings me to the question of road transport, which is an important aspect of our transport facilities, and has come to stay. Unfortunately road construction has not kept pace with road transport development. Twenty years ago we started a system of brattening our country roads and providing natural dirt roads. They were satisfactory and adequate for the weight and volume carried and have lasted a number of years. Traffic then never exceeded four or five tons in weight and most local owners carted their produce in trucks of two or three tons capacity. Nowadays interstate hauliers use those roads and carry anything up to 10 or 12 tons on big semi-trailers. The roads were not built for that purpose and we must construct roads which will carry the increased traffic. There are agitations for bituminizing many roads throughout the State and I am concerned with the road connecting Port

Augusta with Port Lincoln and that portion of the Great Western Highway which goes through Iron Knob and Kimba and connects with the Eyre Highway through to Perth. It is time we bituminized portions of those roads which carry so much heavy traffic.

Many of our older settled districts suffer great disabilities on account of lack of permanent water supplies, and in some of the north-east areas, even after a winter where the rainfall has far exceeded the average, residents are in the unsatisfactory position of having ground supplies of water depleted and are once more faced with a summer shortage. Many areas do not lend themselves to the construction of natural reservoirs and have no catchment areas. Where possible, water supplies should be augmented. Quorn, which is dependent upon a reservoir for its supply, has suffered a shortage for the past three or four years, and has had to manage with supplies from bores and wells. It is discouraging for people in country towns who desire to beautify their homes to find their efforts nullified because, as summer advances, their water supplies are restricted. They should be encouraged and sufficient water should be made available.

It is pleasing to know that the scheme for bringing Murray water to the city is progressing, although not as fast as the authorities would like because of frequent hold-ups in the supplies of steel piping. I would not like to estimate the ultimate cost but I suggest it will be considerably in excess of that contemplated, because much of the steel has been imported from overseas. Such importation is deplorable, because we have the necessary raw materials in our own State and other States have the manufacturing capacity to meet our requirements, but it is impossible to bring together the raw materials, facilities and labour. It has been necessary to import steel for some of the reticulation schemes on Eyre Peninsula. In these circumstances, satisfactory progress has been made with the provision of the main line along the eastern coast of Eyre Peninsula, and people in towns which have been waiting so long for water supplies are getting nearer to receiving them. It is gratifying to know that sums have been set aside for the continuation and extension of that work. I hope the proposed programme will be proceeded with and that necessary raw materials will be available.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

PHARMACY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 553.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I support the second reading, but there are some points the Minister may be able to explain. I asked the Minister whether the Pharmacy Board had been taken into collaboration before the Bill was propounded, and he said that the Government had, in effect, the benediction of the Pharmacy Board. That was not a direct answer as to whether the Board had been consulted. The Pharmacy Board is charged with the responsibility of granting certificates of competency to those students who qualify in the pharmacy course and members will agree that it has established and maintained a high standard. Mr. Lipshan, who is in charge of pharmaceutical chemistry at the University, has played a great part in raising the standard of the profession. The standard of qualification for South Australian students is much higher than that obtaining elsewhere in Australia. Some protection should be included in this Bill whereby those who obtain certificates of competency shall be safeguarded. This Bill provides an opportunity for a chain store set of pharmacies in country areas.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—There is a limitation at present.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes. I welcome the provision whereby chemists' shops can be established in country towns where there are none at present. That should be encouraged. The analogy made by the Chief Secretary does not actually occur regarding other professions such as lawyers and opticians who visit various country centres and consult clients and patients, because a chemist must have a centre for the compounding of the ingredients to be used in medicaments made according to the doctor's prescription. The Minister may be able to allay my fears, but I envisage that a chemist in a populous country town could, under the provisions of this Bill, open a series of three shops in an area, having his main shop as the centre with prescribed times for attending branch shops for the purpose of compounding prescriptions. He would also have the right of partitioning his shop and having it open for the purpose of selling cosmetics, patent medicines and fancy goods which are sold by most country chemists. He would thus have four shops under his control. If that can obtain then I have an objection to this Bill and suggest that premises should be closed

during a chemist's absence. The chemist could structurally divide his shop, one side being used for prescriptions, which would conform to the Act, and when he left, the other portion used for the sale of cosmetics and so on could remain open. That is a contravention of the Act and not in conformity with the desires of the Pharmacy Board.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—The Bill does not impose enough restrictions.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I do not suggest restrictions, but protection for the qualified pharmacist. If a young chemist starts in a sparsely populated area and attempts to build up a business, there is nothing to stop a chemist from a more populous area erecting a part-time shop in the same area, and by undercutting, affect the business of the young chemist. If the Minister will give an undertaking that this Bill will apply only to areas where there is no permanent chemist we can get over the difficulty. Under the present Act no chemist can operate a chemist's shop unless he has a qualified man on the premises, but under this measure one qualified man could operate four shops, although they might be only part-time. I suggest he could do that by partitioning off that part of his shop where he did his prescriptions.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—It would still be one shop.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—There was nothing in the Minister's speech, nor is there anything in the Bill, to indicate that that could not happen.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Under your argument, would there be one or two shops?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The position is not defined in the Bill, and under it there is nothing to stop a chemist from leasing part of a grocer's store at a town where no chemist is operating. I appreciate the difficulty of country people, but we must protect the registered chemists. I should like the Minister to indicate the full purport of the Bill.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—From the point of view of those living in sparsely populated areas it will be a great convenience to have part-time chemists, as is provided in the Bill. In many country districts where there is no chemist much of a doctor's time is taken up compounding his own prescriptions. This entails the carrying of an expensive stock of drugs. Those conversant with the operations of doctors in the country know that their time is very fully

occupied in their professional work without their having to devote additional time to dispensing medicines. The proposed change will be welcomed by doctors throughout the country, particularly in the sparsely populated areas. I shall be interested to hear the Minister's explanation on the point raised by Mr. Bardolph. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

PORT PIRIE PARK LANDS ACT REPEAL BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 553.)

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD (Central No. 2)—The Bill before us is literally a very short one and it is difficult to imagine one comprising fewer words. It is also a repeal Bill, not many of which come before us, although by a strange coincidence it is the second which has come up for discussion this afternoon. As the Minister said in his second reading speech, the need for the Bill has arisen because in 1932 an arrangement was made between the Port Pirie Council, the Commonwealth Minister for Defence, the South Australian Government, and the Catholic Diocese

of Port Pirie to grant to the diocese the use of certain land for the erection of a school. This project has not been proceeded with, and in order that the Government might have freedom to deal with this land it is considered necessary to repeal the Act. As a result the Government will be in a position to meet any requests made to it for the use of this land. It is desirable that the title to the land should be cleared of any outstanding rights, consequently I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—The Bill is the result of a mutual arrangement between the parties named by the Minister. Surveys of country town areas have always followed the admirable example set by Colonel Light when he surveyed the city of Adelaide in that certain areas were dedicated as park lands for use by the local people for recreational purposes. Therefore, when the alienation of any of these park lands is suggested much interest is created, and members of Parliament are active in seeing that the rights of the people are conserved. However, that does not come into question under this Bill. It has been mutually arranged to the satisfaction of all concerned that the land shall be transferred back to the Government, as it is not now required for the purpose originally desired by the Catholic Church at Port Pirie. The land is to revert to the Crown so that it will have authority to lease it to others. It is therefore desirable that the Act should be repealed. It is interesting to note that the authority for dedicating park lands is vested in the Minister of Lands under the Crown Lands Act, which sets out that the Governor may by proclamation declare certain areas to be set aside for that purpose. Like other members, I was interested to know where this authority rested. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment and Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.3 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, September 25, at 2 p.m.