

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, October 21, 1958.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Acts:—Appropriation (No. 2), Fire Brigades Act Amendment, Fruit Fly (Compensation), Kingston and Naracorte Railway Alteration, Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act Amendment, and Weights and Measures Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS.**ASSAULTS ON POLICE.**

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I ask leave to make a brief statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Recently, near the Adelaide railway station, an attack was made upon a police officer when he attempted to direct some questions to a person about to cross the road, and the result is well known. Will the Government consider providing the police with adequate protection in the form of a truncheon or similar weapon for their self-preservation in cases of this sort?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—In the case referred to the policeman had a truncheon and used it, but the advantage lies with the aggressor, as was the case in this instance. I think we can all take comfort from the fact that assistance from a bystander was forthcoming on this occasion; that is one of the most commendable aspects of the affair and prominent recognition has been made of the fact. Whether some better weapon can be designed is a matter worthy of consideration. I have raised it on previous occasions and I promise the honourable member that it will be examined again.

ELECTRICITY TRUST DEPOSITS.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (on notice)—

1. What is the total amount of consumers' deposits held by the Electricity Trust of South Australia?

2. Are the deposits held in a special depositors' trust account or placed in the general account of the Electricity Trust of South Australia?

3. What is the rate of interest paid on such deposits?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The Chairman of the Electricity Trust reports:—

1. £67,400 as at September 30, 1958, in respect of 8,380 consumers in a total of 240,000. The policy of the trust is to refund the deposit without request where the consumer's account is paid within due dates for a continuous period of two years.

2. Deposits are paid into the general account of the trust. Separate deposit records are maintained and are subject to audit by the Auditor-General.

3. The ruling interest rate of the Savings Bank of South Australia, which at present is 3 per cent per annum.

ADVANCES FOR HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

COLLECTIONS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES ACT (CHEER UP SOCIETY INC.).

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary) moved—

That this House approves of the making of a proclamation under section 16 of the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947, in the following form:—

SOUTH AUSTRALIA, } *Proclamation by His Excellency the Governor of the State of South Australia.*
to wit.

BY virtue of the provisions of the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947, and all other enabling powers, I, the said Governor, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, being satisfied that moneys or securities for moneys to the amount of one thousand five hundred pounds (£1,500) held by the Cheer Up Society Incorporated, a body incorporated under the provisions of the Associations Incorporation Act, 1956-1957, and a body to which a licence has been issued under the said Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947, for certain charitable purposes within the meaning of the said Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947, are not and will not be required for the said purposes, do hereby by proclamation declare that the said moneys or securities for moneys shall be applied by the said Cheer Up Society Incorporated to the payment to the bodies and for the purposes set forth in the first column of the schedule hereto of the amounts respectively set forth opposite to them in the second column thereof:—

THE SCHEDULE.

The Missions to Seamen—War Memorial Building Appeal	£750
The Soldiers Home League Inc.—(War Veterans Home) Building Appeal	£500

The Home for Aged Trained Nurses
—Appeal by the Returned Sisters
Sub-Branch of the Returned
Sailors', Soldiers' and Airmen's
Imperial League of Australia
(South Australian Branch) Incorporated £250

The making of this proclamation has been approved by resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

Given under my hand and the public seal of South Australia, at Adelaide, this day of , 1958.

By command,

Chief Secretary.

C.S.O., 141/1940.

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN!

The Hon. R. R. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 1208.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Central No. 1)—I support the Bill, which confirms the view I advanced when speaking on the Road Traffic Act last year: that that Act in its present form is most confusing. I did not then think that within a short time some cases would arise, at least two of which have reached the Police Court, confirming my view that the Act was not easily understood. On examination, one can readily appreciate that the average person finds it difficult to understand. It was consolidated in 1936, since when it has been re-printed and consolidated in 1939, 1950 and 1954; yet it is not easily understood. It has seven parts, 181 sections and many subsections. Although it was consolidated as recently as 1954, it is already riddled with amendments unintelligible to the average person.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—It is worse than the Local Government Act.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—If the Local Government Act is worse than the Road Traffic Act, the Minister has my sympathy. I have tried to read into this Act what I think should be there but am completely at a loss.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Don't you think a Minister should be in charge of the administration of this legislation?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Yes. The Road Traffic Act and its consequences are so important today that I believe not enough consideration is given to it in the interests of the community at large. We have not enough Ministers, for they are grossly overworked.

This Bill is introduced as a result of a decision given by His Honor Sir Herbert Mayo in the Supreme Court, when he doubted whether motor cyclists should have the right to make the short right turn. The fact that such an eminent gentleman as he should be in doubt as to the precise meaning of the Act underlines the necessity for some deliberate, clear thinking about it. That is not the only case that has come before the courts. It appears, however, that a case has to reach the courts before notice is taken of these things.

Members will remember that, when speaking to the Bill last year, I said I could not understand the new right turn amendment and that it would cause confusion as it was not clear in its wording. Since then two cases have come to my notice, one of which reached the Police Court, the other of which did not, to confirm my views. I trust that the Minister in charge will note what I am saying because the position is becoming embarrassing for all concerned. The first case occurred on the Government Road-Port Road-John Street intersection. Arising from a collision there in February this year, a prosecution was undertaken by the police at the Hindmarsh Police Court. It is interesting to read the judgment of L. D. Hunkin, the Stipendiary Magistrate, sitting at Thebarton. This report appeared in the *Advertiser* some time in April:—

The magistrate convicted a motorist without penalty for failing to stand at an intersection, because he said the legislation governing the incident was confusing. Edward James Field, textile worker, of Chamberlain Avenue, Clarence Park, pleaded not guilty to having failed to stand while driving a motor car at the intersection of John Street and Port Road, Hindmarsh, on February 25. The prosecutor, F. H. Golding, said the car driven by the defendant and another car had collided at the intersection. Field had been travelling along Port Road towards Adelaide and had turned right into Government Road to cross Port Road into John Street. The magistrate said that had the defendant been travelling from Government Road straight ahead into John Street he would have had right of way when he reached the intersection of Government Road and the down track of Port Road, but because he had first made a right turn from the up track of Port Road, he had lost that right. This, he said, was confusing because Field had travelled about 50 yards through the Port Road plantation and drivers travelling down towards the Port would have difficulty in knowing where he came from.

There was another case of a friend of mine at exactly the same spot. He got across the road. Two vehicles travelling to the Port on his left had stopped and he got hit by the third one as he was almost in John Street. If

this person had not been honest and admitted that he had come from the other side of the Port Road, action would have been taken against the motorist travelling to the Port, but because he said he would not tell a lie, he lost all chance of recovering damages. Both drivers in that case finished in hospital and no action was taken, because of the confused state of the Road Traffic Act.

When I referred this matter to Sir Edgar Bean he told me there was no answer to it, but I will not believe that. It needs common-sense thinking and reasoning to devise a means whereby all motorists will know what they are expected to do. I could suggest a solution, but I think something better should be defined.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—There is no harm in making a suggestion.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—My suggestion is that stop signs be erected on the plantation side of both the up and down tracks of the Port Road. Every motorist crossing the intersection would then have to stop before reaching the down or the up track. If the language of the legislation cannot be improved, that is a solution, and at least people would know what they had to do. The Act at present is most confusing. I frequently travel down that road and notice that the hesitancy of motorists at that corner causes confusion and uncertainty. It may be because of the angles at which Government Road and John Street join the Port Road, but it is noticeable that the same difficulty does not appear to exist at the Woodville Road crossing, which I think is a more direct one.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—I think there are quite a few accidents there, too.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—I put these points to the Minister because I feel the Act needs a thorough investigation. Last year Sir Edgar Bean prepared a long report for the Minister in which he agreed in the main that the position was most confusing, and said that if any member could suggest better language Parliament ought to accept it. I am not going to pit myself against Sir Edgar Bean, but surely some person of his calibre, perhaps his successor, could put the Act into easier language and make it more straightforward. I appeal to the Minister in charge to look at this Act again and see whether something can be done to improve the wording of the legislation and assist the people who wish to do the reasonable thing.

I will mention several things that I saw on my recent trip overseas which may assist people towards better thinking as to how we can solve

one or two of our problems. I do not think our traffic problems in the metropolitan area are nearly as bad as we are led to believe. They are becoming worse simply because they have been allowed to flow on their way without any clear thinking on the subject to correct them. The problem that exists in the main city streets could quite easily be overcome with one-way traffic. Whether the City Council likes it or not, and whether or not it is blinded by the fact that it must keep things as they are in the interests of business people within the city, it will sooner or later have to realize that we must have one-way traffic in alternate streets of the city. That also applies to the north-south roads, with the exception of King William Street. The city is growing rapidly, the volume of traffic is increasing, and our east-west streets, with the possible exception of Grenfell Street, are too narrow for the traffic on a two-way basis after allowing for parking. If we had one-way traffic there would be much more room for parking and the traffic would flow much more easily.

Since my return from overseas I have spent one or two afternoons looking around the city, particularly Rundle, Hindley and Pirie Streets. At a busy period in Rundle Street the traffic can be described only as chaotic. Why two-way traffic in these streets is persisted with is a mystery to me. I am trying to put forward in good faith some suggestions to help the people responsible who are apparently having some difficulty.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—They are having no difficulty at all.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—I have noticed in the last two or three years that some people are experiencing considerable difficulty. I have been invited to make a suggestion. I have told the City Council that in my opinion there should be a total prohibition of parking in King William Street, and I reiterate that. I was pleased to learn that the council had abandoned the idea of permitting taxicabs to rank in the centre of King William Street.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—It never had that idea.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Somebody did. I suggest a total prohibition on the parking of cars in King William Street. Taxicabs have no right to parking space in that street, which should be kept free and open for the flow of traffic. Those cabs can be on call to pick up and let down passengers. One realizes how difficult the position in King William Street is with the advent of buses. When the tram lines are taken away I should like to see a

plantation, perhaps five or six feet wide, between the intersections. Lawn, flower beds or small shrubs could be included in the plantation. I would also like to see fountains, which would add a little beauty to our city. When one travels overseas, particularly on the Continent, one sees these things. The city of Cologne, which was in ruins at the end of the war, has been rebuilt; the centre of the roadway has beautiful plantations and fountains, which are brightly lit and at night are very attractive. I think it is time we emerged from our doldrums and added something like that. What gave me the idea that King William Street should be planted with trees, lawns, and perhaps flowers is that terrible thing no-one seems to worry about—the U turn between intersections. If it were not serious, the position would be farcical. After 4.30 p.m. a motorist is not permitted to make a right-hand turn at an intersection, and yet between intersections people continually make U turns, and no-one seems to make any effort to stop it.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—It is unlawful.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Then, why don't the police take action? In Washington, U.S.A., I saw a subway that took three lanes of traffic and if a similar system were adopted on North Terrace at the railway station traffic could travel east and west by way of the subway. I am not an engineer, but looking at the slope of the road, that perhaps may be against my suggestion; but there would be nothing to prevent an overway bridge being constructed at the railway station and then seven-tenths of the traffic along North Terrace could continue without any trouble to pedestrians wishing to cross to the railway station. If a series of traffic lights were installed pedestrians would have a much safer means of crossing North Terrace to the railway station.

No doubt the Town Clerk of Adelaide (Mr. Veale) saw some of these things I have mentioned during his tour overseas, but I do not know whether he has recommended them. I was not happy with the reply by the Minister of Local Government last week when he said this matter was not the responsibility of Parliament, but of local government. However, when an important subject such as a subway or an overway bridge is under consideration, it is a matter for Parliament; if not, some action should be taken to assist the local government to provide a proper service for the community.

I do not agree with centre-of-the-road parking, although it may be all right for a

single line of cars. I believe that Grote Street, where centre-of-the-road parking is permitted, is worse today from a traffic point of view than when trams were running. If we have parking on the sides of the street and a double line of ranked cars, with buses travelling along, a motor driver has difficulty in getting his car in or out. I believe that an underground parking station could be established at Victoria Square. Because of its present use, I think that the square is a gold-mine being wasted. While abroad I took the opportunity to examine a couple of underground parking stations. The one at Los Angeles was a small type, but worked efficiently. A perfect parking station has been established at Union Square, San Francisco, and would be about half the size of Victoria Square. I inspected it and ascertained that it could handle 1,750 cars at any given time and the daily average had reached 2,250. Motorists entered on one side and left at the other. If a similar system were adopted at Victoria Square it might mean interference with traffic at Grote Street and Wakefield Street, but that would not matter much if it resulted in overcoming our parking problem. Victoria Square is not very picturesque in its present form and steps should be taken to provide an underground parking station. If the problem is too big for the City Council, surely the Government could assist it. I am told that the Union Square station at San Francisco pays handsomely.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—It is of four or five floors.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Yes. If we had a parking station which could accommodate 1,750 or even 3,000 cars, which I assume could be accommodated at Victoria Square, it would help overcome our parking problem. A worsening problem in Adelaide is the turning to the left of motor cars at corners. Before going abroad I watched the position in Adelaide in an attempt to solve the problem. In a speech last year I said that one could walk from Parliament House to Grote Street on practically any day and witness either near accidents or a motorist colliding with another car. I spent a month at Geneva, visited the busiest street in that city and often watched the traffic at intersections. Underneath the traffic lights they have a blinking light outlining the words "Don't Walk." While the vehicular traffic is proceeding these lights appear at the four corners of an intersection. When the north-south traffic has passed through

and the red light goes against the other oncoming vehicular traffic, the east-west traffic proceeds and when their time is completed a red light appears and the pedestrians can then cross the four roadways. When they are doing this, no vehicular traffic is in motion.

That is the complete answer to the problems associated with vehicles turning left, and it could be adopted without any trouble in Adelaide. It might be said that this would slow up traffic, but does it matter if traffic is slowed a little at busy intersections if it is safer for the pedestrians and prevents accidents, such as the one that happened last week in Adelaide when three people were knocked down by a motor car? I do not say the lights caused the trouble on that occasion; indeed, doubt was expressed about the brakes of the motor vehicle. If the Geneva system were in operation, that accident would never have happened. In certain overseas cities, particularly in Switzerland, pedestrians are in the wrong if they use the roads. The footpaths are to walk on and if they do not use them, no excuse is accepted. By education, motorists could be taught to do the reasonable thing and pedestrians to use the footpaths, and after a short time our traffic problems, particularly in the city, would be diminished considerably. I put those points forward because they may be of advantage to someone, and if they were accepted, I would think I had done something worthwhile in the interests of the community. I support the second reading.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—We are obliged to the honourable member for his interesting and instructive speech, following on his visit overseas. Likewise, the Town Clerk of Adelaide (Mr. Veale) recently returned from a visit overseas and has suggested certain things that will be of great advantage in handling the traffic problem. The Bill has been introduced following on a recent decision by Mr. Justice Mayo concerning the short turn at intersections by motor cyclists. The decision has been widely discussed and it would appear that the present law applies differently to motor cyclists compared with motor drivers. The legislation should be uniform in this respect. Motorists who drive with their elbow protruding through an open window are often the cause of misunderstanding to other motorists. Often the driver who is smoking draws his arm in and then puts it out again, and this leads to uncertainty. The law should be amended to prohibit this habit, because it is only a habit, and

a very dangerous habit at that. With reference to trailers, we remember the unfortunate incident on the North-East Road recently where a man lost his life because a trailer became detached from the towing vehicle and crashed into a car in which a man was seated, killing him.

The Hon. A. J. Shard—I am told that could not have happened had the law been observed.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—This legislation puts the onus on the driver as well as on the owner of such vehicles. The Act prescribes that safety chains must be used on trailers, but I ask what is the value of that if, as has been known, people use dog chains merely to comply with the law? This provision should be tightened up by prescribing a minimum standard breaking strain of chains used for this purpose.

I observed traffic in the city of Wellington when I was in New Zealand not so long ago, and there the pedestrian can cross a street much more safely than in Adelaide. There are numerous zebra crossings and any motorist who sees a pedestrian in one of those crossings must stop to allow him to pass. This does not seem to hold up the traffic any more than is the case here, and the streets of Wellington are much narrower than those of Adelaide. The number of accidents occurring is most alarming and a Bill that will bring the law regarding the right-hand turn into uniformity must be of great value.

Another thing that causes much confusion is the procedure of many drivers wishing to turn to enter garages on the right-hand side of the road; many adopt the same practice as when turning into another street, namely, moving as near as possible to the centre of the road prior to making the turn into the garage whereas, as I understand the law, the driver must keep as near as possible to the left-hand side of the road before making the turn into a private entrance. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—I, too, support the Bill as the clarification of the law regarding the rights of motor cyclists and the drivers of vehicles hauling trailers is a good thing. Obviously, it has been misunderstood in many cases and this Bill will bring the question before the public and enable them to conform to the law.

I commend Mr. Shard for his sensible and constructive speech. It is amazing what people can do if they set their minds to do it, as has been instanced in the last few days by the

immense effect that the drive by plain clothes policemen has had upon the traffic. I have often observed how difficult it is for a motorist driving down the Port Road, when it is crowded, to know whether he is approaching an intersection or merely a side road, and this creates a doubt in his mind at almost every crossing on the Port Road. I have often thought that in a road as wide as that the law in regard to giving way to right-hand traffic should be observed at all road junctions or crossings. The great number of accidents at the John Street intersection is no doubt due to the volume of traffic at that point. Something of the same nature occurs at the Woodville crossing, but most accidents could be avoided if motorists obeyed the law in respect of crossing intersections. However, they always seem to be in a hurry to get across, and instead of slowing down they speed up. This is another thing which could be easily rectified if they simply observed the law.

I commend the diagrams that have been published in the papers from time to time informing motorists of their traffic obligations. Every time these diagrams have appeared they have caused much comment, and people have said that they had not understood some of the problems illustrated. I think it would be desirable if these diagrams could be published more frequently, for these things must be kept before the public continuously to make the desired impression; there are young drivers and others getting new licences continuously coming on and we would greatly benefit by having a repetition of these diagrams at frequent intervals—perhaps once a month for the more important and every three months for the less important. There seems to be a growing tendency to fail to give way to traffic on the right; frequently, there is no policeman about and many motorists seem to think that they can squeeze through or frighten the traffic coming from the right. Another provision that is frequently not observed is that which requires the motorist to drive as near to the line of the left-hand kerb of the street he is about to enter before making the right-hand turn. Many veer to the centre of the road far too soon and make the turn too early, thereby creating some difficulties for other drivers. Strict observance of the law is essential if we are to have orderly traffic and we can commend the police for the way they have slowed down traffic and made it much safer in recent days. By and large, the law provides for all the essentials of safe driving and if properly observed accidents should be few. Once again I say that I appreciate

very much what Mr. Shard put before us and I am sure that it should provide considerable food for thought.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government)—I should like to make a few comments regarding some of the carefully considered remarks of honourable members on this matter. The John Street intersection was referred to by Mr. Shard, but he may not be aware that the council is about to install traffic lights at this point, where the weight of traffic is very badly balanced. No doubt some confusion exists on both the Anzac Highway and the Port Road. Mr. Shard referred to one-way traffic in Rundle Street, but I remind members that traffic in Rundle Street is not dense by world standards; counts show that the trouble in Rundle Street is the pedestrian traffic. The time will come, undoubtedly, when the methods of turning through pedestrian traffic will have to be carefully considered, but I think members agree that it is only at one or two peak periods of the day and on Saturday mornings that it is particularly bad.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—It is all day.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I am not disputing that the matter will have to be considered, but on a density basis possibly the time is not yet for complete control throughout the day and in any case it is a matter that can well be left to the council with which it is entrusted. I agree with Mr. Densley with regard to the publication of traffic diagrams. They are of great assistance and could well be published repeatedly in the interests of keeping the people informed. We have young drivers coming along all the time and I regret that many are not as conversant with the traffic rules as they should be. A tremendous part of the problem at intersections is due, as suggested by Mr. Densley, to the failure of motorists to slow as required. We should learn from some of the older countries, but there seems to be a basic idea here that if we put in a roundabout it should be of such a nature that the traffic can get around it just as fast as it moves on the straight road approaching it whereas, of course, the basis of good driving is to reduce speed so that if someone makes a mistake there is a chance of getting out of trouble without loss of life or serious accident. I thank members for the consideration they have given the Bill, the actual detail of which, I am sure, will clear up the anomalies that existed.

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

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 1210.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—Much could be said about the River Murray Waters Agreement and how it was handled in Parliament but the less said the better; there is no need to go into the past. I am happy to be associated with the part played by the Labor Party together with everybody else. There is no difference of opinion about the action taken to ensure South Australia receiving her just rights.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—I thought the Premier had something to do with it.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I do not intend to enter into an argument about it now but I give credit to everybody concerned because, as I have already said, there is no difference of opinion about the action taken in issuing a writ to safeguard our rights.

The Bill ratifies the amending of the River Murray Waters Agreement dealing with a share of the lower Snowy Mountains water. The Federal Government was not kindly disposed to South Australia because we had threatened proceedings. South Australia does not make full use of the powers available to it under the Agreement. We have to look to the future when the water will be required. The Agreement, a schedule to the Bill, is fairly long. The definition of Murray water is clear. An assurance about a share of the Snowy waters means that South Australia can develop its present usage of water from the River Murray without running any risk of shortage during years of drought.

Over a period of years South Australia has done much to supply the public with water. In 1934, when I was a member of another place, the late John Fitzgerald, who represented Port Pirie, advocated connecting the northern towns and Whyalla with water from the River Murray. Well I remember certain honourable members at that time saying that he did not know what he was talking about. Now, we all realize what that meant to South Australia. Since those days various water schemes have been put into operation and we shall have to provide for several more soon. The Baroota reservoir failed to hold water for many years but our whole trouble is lack of rain. The average for South Australia over 119 years was 21 inches for the metropolitan area. The average for last year was 3 inches below the fall for this year. The total rainfall so far

this year is 16 inches, so we are still far short of our average rainfall with less than 2½ months to go.

Increased population has meant that it is necessary for the State to incur considerable expenditure in providing water. We are fortunate that the South Para reservoir is slightly over half full. Another project is the Myponga reservoir, the estimated cost of which was £3,000,000. Judging by the actual costs of the South Para reservoir and the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline, when the Myponga reservoir is completed it will probably cost £5,000,000 or £6,000,000. When a work is recommended at an estimated cost, there is no control afterwards. Parliament makes a great mistake in not supervising not only water supply but other schemes.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—You mean from the finance aspect?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Exactly. If something is estimated to cost a certain figure, it always costs much more by the time the project is finished. I need refer only to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline and South Para. The first estimate for South Para was £1,800,000. The cost doubled over four years. Parliament is lacking in that respect: there is no supervision.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Once you are committed to a job you have to do it.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Everybody realizes that, but it is the additions and alterations that cost the extra money after a recommendation has been made. The estimates are made, the work is set out, and then what happens?

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—Does your committee ever check to see if there is good reason for increased costs?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—We cannot. A public accounts committee would probably play an important part there. Once the Public Works Committee makes a recommendation, it is finished with it unless the matter is referred back, as happened in the case of bulk handling and the Jervois Bridge. When we make a recommendation we go into the economics of it, consider it fully and arrive at the lowest possible cost. The Government of today is not satisfied with that. Often, twice the amount of money is spent by the time a project is finished because it does not suit somebody, because somebody disagrees with the findings of the committee. We agree, make a recommendation, set the work down and say what it will cost and where the work should go.

Then busybodies come along and say "We want it somewhere else." The weight of evidence, however, has proved that the committee makes a right decision. Undue influence has been used with the Government to have the matter referred back to the committee. There is nothing else to do then but reconsider it.

The Hon. E. Anthony—That is a strong statement.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I instance bulk handling at Wallaroo, the Birkenhead Bridge and the Jervois Bridge at Port Adelaide. I hope those three examples satisfy the honourable member on that. I can give him more if necessary. During the year 1957-58, payments amounting to £636,900 were made, mainly on rehabilitating areas and works damaged by the floods on the Murray. A total of £1,631,000 has been spent to June 30 this year on protection. A sum of £695,000 has been spent on rehabilitation, and £824,000 on relief of hardship.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Is that all from revenue?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—From consolidated revenue. We have to look to the future; that we shall, in the first place, be able to take all the water we are entitled to and, secondly, if not, are we getting what we are justly entitled to? I do not think anybody knows much about the position because it depends upon the development of South Australia.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Exactly; we want the right.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—We have it. We all want the right and support the action that has been taken to get that right. The Commonwealth Government contributed £752,000 of that expenditure and the State Government £879,000; this does not include the salaries and wages of permanent employees of Government departments. The rehabilitation work is still proceeding, and nobody knows what the ultimate cost of that will be. During the Murray River flood the public of South Australia contributed generously to the Lord Mayor's Relief Fund, and £351,000 was raised. The Commonwealth Government and the State Government each made a grant of £50,000, which added another £100,000 to the fund.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Has that fund been used up?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—No, not entirely. Altogether, there were 938 applicants for assistance. Under the agreement entered into under the Murray River Waters Act, 1935-54, the Commonwealth and the States of New

South Wales, Victoria and South Australia in the River Murray Commission were vested with the administration of the construction, operation, maintenance and control of the River Murray works. The agreement also established the method of contribution to the costs and expenses of those works. The Loan capital invested by this State as its quota at June 30, 1958, was just under £5,000,000, the increase during the past year being £554,000. From the inception of the scheme until June 30, 1958, the sum of £4,284,000 has been contributed from the consolidated revenue of the State to meet operating deficits including debt charges. The deficit met by South Australia for 1957-58 was £244,000, which was £34,000 higher than the previous year due to a higher interest rate and an increase in the Loan capital employed.

In supporting the second reading of this Bill I congratulate all concerned. It appeared at the outset that we may have missed the bus. I think we were a little late in realizing the exact position because of the action of the Federal Government in refusing to submit a copy of the agreement to this State. I am sure I can say that members were unanimous in supporting the Government to see that the State received its just entitlement.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN (Southern)—In rising to support the Bill I would at the outset mention its very great importance to the future welfare, progress and population of this State. We have recently heard certain legislation referred to as being of great importance and, although I agree that matters concerning the establishment of oil refineries and steel works are of very great importance, I point out that the further supply of water for the future of this State is of paramount importance. Water is the lifeblood of every country. If we care to refer for a brief moment to the history of the world over some centuries we find that the large centres have been established and the great accumulations of population have taken place along the major valleys of the greatest rivers. This stresses the fact that those people of the olden days appreciated the vast importance of having adequate supplies of water nearby.

I congratulate the Government, and more particularly the Premier, on the stand the Government has taken in this matter. I believe it has not missed any point, and over the past three years or so it has taken a very active interest in discussing this matter with the Prime Minister and the leaders in other States to see that South Australia was not

overlooked, as seemed to be the tendency, in the further allocation of water from the Snowy Mountains hydro-electric scheme. This matter became very involved. Most of the tributaries of the Murrumbidgee, Snowy and Murray Rivers have been diverted into various storage areas, and the Snowy River itself, which has always been looked upon as a fast-flowing, turbulent and destructive stream, has been or will be turned back into the Jindabyne Dam. From there it will gravitate through certain channels and, after passing through at least six generating stations, it will eventually find its way into the Murray. The bone of contention relates to the disposition of that water once it has reached the Murray River above Albury. The other States claimed that it was still Snowy water, and therefore they were entitled to divide it between themselves and ignore the interests of South Australia; eminent legal authorities backed up those States in that regard.

We are very fortunate indeed to have reached this stage where we are to ratify another agreement assuring South Australia that it will receive in the future sufficient water to enable it to use exactly twice as much as we are now using in a year of restriction or drought. That is, of course, the period when water is hardest to get and when there is less to go around to the various States that participate in its use. That, indeed, is a very good arrangement for this State. Not only are we to receive that much water but we are also to receive a separate allowance on account of the wastage of water that takes place through such things as evaporation, percolation, and leakages from Albury to Lake Victoria and from Lake Victoria to the Murray mouth. However, that arrangement will not cover any evaporation from Lakes Alexandrina and Albert.

Evaporation is very important, because over Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert, the total area of which is 288 square miles, the evaporation amounts to three feet nine inches a year. That represents a considerable wastage which the other States will not recognize, and we have to make that up ourselves from the water allocated to us for irrigation or reticulation. I claim that the time will rapidly come when it will not be possible to afford that wastage. It will be a difficult problem but it can be tackled in various ways. Even the Snowy Mountains authority is tackling the problem of evaporation on the storage areas with the assistance of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, which has

already proved that evaporation can be arrested by placing a chemical film on the surface of the water.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Can you give us the average depth of those two lakes?

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—It would not be more than six to eight feet, and as a result that area becomes warm in summer and the evaporation is very great. To give honourable members some idea of the amount of evaporation that takes place, I have gone to some trouble to ascertain it as correctly as possible. The evaporation over those two lakes in 12 months would fill the South Para Reservoir 19 times in that period. It is a matter of real concern, and the other States are not prepared to provide for the water we lose through evaporation on those two lakes.

In the debates on this matter in another place and in the Federal Parliament certain members have tended to belittle the efforts of our Government and our Premier regarding South Australia's interests.

The PRESIDENT—Order! I am afraid I cannot allow the honourable member to discuss what happens in another place.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—On account of your ruling, Sir, I will confine my remarks to the Federal Parliament. Reference was made there on a number of occasions to the poor deal that South Australia has, even now, received under this Agreement, and it was claimed that we would not receive much more than a little extra water in periods of restriction. That is not only misleading but incorrect. The formula remains the same as that arrived at in the 1915 agreement, which is five, five and three for the various States or, in other words, as it is referred to in the Schedule to the present Bill, New South Wales will be rated at 1,000,000, Victoria 1,000,000 and South Australia 603,000. That ratio still remains the same, and that is why some people have claimed that we have not achieved anything regarding this legislation now before us. However, they overlook the fact that although the ratio remains the same the amount of water involved has increased considerably, therefore our ratio of three as compared with the other States' five and five means that we shall receive a considerably larger amount of water than we have received in the past.

I claim that South Australia would be a poor State if it were not for the Murray, as only 10 per cent of the area enjoys an assured rainfall. Because the Murray waters have

been efficiently used by the Government, Adelaide has been the only capital city in Australia that has not suffered water restrictions in recent years in some shape or form. The progress, prosperity, development and population of the State largely depend upon the future development and progress of the Murray Valley. As the years go by I believe there will be a much bigger population in the Murray Valley as a result of the extensive use of water for irrigation. The land along both banks must eventually be utilized for irrigation, and by reticulating water from the Murray the drier parts of the State will be greatly benefited. I stress the vital importance of the Bill to South Australia. Although it relates to something that is not as spectacular as the establishment of steelworks, I believe that eventually it will prove of greater advantage than any of the projected industrial developments in that it will ensure an adequate supply of water for the State.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY (Central No. 2) —The Leader of the Opposition said that the less said about the Agreement the better. It is no use saying that, as an agreement has been actually arrived at. Some years before the Murray Waters Agreement was entered into we were concerned about the tremendous waste of water from the Murray. Most of the water flowed to waste and a well-known cleric once said that Australia should pray less and dam more. We began to dam much more and the Murray Waters Agreement was part of the damming process. A commission clothed with considerable powers was set up, and it has done an excellent job. It was regrettable that the Commonwealth Government could not have been a little more co-operative when the question of the disposal of Snowy River waters was under discussion, resulting in the South Australian Government issuing a writ. Because of the action taken, our Premier carried the day. The original agreement was arrived at after considerable negotiation. In the event of our experiencing drought periods, the additional supply of water from the Murray will be of unquestionable value. We all heartily support the agreement. Water conditions the prosperity and progress of South Australia. Nothing could be more important, therefore I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. I share with my honourable friend his remarks about the excellent provision for water supplies in this State. I believe I am right in saying

that there is greater provision for water supplies in South Australia than in any other State, therefore we should pay a tribute to our engineers who made it possible and also to all those who worked on the various water projects.

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE (Southern)—The utilization of the River Murray waters has always been of tremendous interest to the people of South Australia. Even back in 1880 the Legislative Council gave much attention to the question. A person who was closely associated with me told me, when I was a youth, that he used to travel to Melbourne, not through Murray Bridge and Bordertown, but by proceeding along the Murray to Mildura and following the open channels where much evaporation took place before the water reached its destination. In 1915 he attended a conference of the interested States and the Commonwealth and gave his opinion of what should be done concerning South Australia's share of the water under the agreement. I was interested to read in the schedule of the 1915 Act:—

Whereas at a conference between the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Premiers of the said States held on the 7th day of April, 1914, certain resolutions were agreed to with a view to the economical use of the waters of the River Murray and its tributaries for irrigation and navigation and to the reconciling of the interests of the Commonwealth and the riparian States.

Some of the States should take a little more interest in that than they are taking.

I want to be associated with my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, my colleague, Mr. Cowan, and Mr. Anthony, in their complimentary remarks regarding the action taken by our Premier and his Government to safeguard South Australia's interests under the Murray Waters Agreement. We should be very proud and thankful that we have people prepared to stand up for our rights. In view of the extract I read from the schedule of the 1915 Act I cannot understand how a responsible body of people should not have consulted the three States concerned and the Commonwealth Government before making any other arrangements concerning the use of the Murray waters. One has only to travel along the banks of the Murray to see what has been accomplished not only by departmental irrigation schemes, but also the part being played by private irrigationists and to know how they appreciate the value of this water in growing something to help feed our people. The quantity of vegetables grown along the banks of the Murray is astounding. A tremendous part will be played

in this direction in the area from Bow Hill northwards.

When the Public Works Committee considered the erection of another bridge over the Murray, it was definite in its opinion following the information it gained regarding the action of certain wineries in purchasing some apparently useless land situated in the low rainfall areas, which is now being planted with vines, following on the loss of certain vine areas in the Barossa Valley and other parts of the State. A private company is being established in the district of Waikerie and Ramco and it will develop a private irrigation settlement from its own resources. Ultimately, this will result in some approved returned soldier applicants for irrigation land being able to secure blocks. I hope the Government will do everything possible to encourage this venture. The project is of interest not only to local men, but to others living some distance away. I pay a tribute to those who are endeavouring to do something in the interests of fruit production.

Much has already been said about the establishment in South Australia of an oil refinery, steel works and other projects. It is very difficult to estimate the immense value of Murray River water in the establishment of our secondary industries. Only yesterday I had the pleasure of driving through part of the Southern District—as I have often done during the past three months—and there saw a huge line of 30in. pipes on the roadside. In bad times Murray water will be fed, firstly, into Mount Bold reservoir, then into Happy Valley, and finally through this main, some to the new oil refinery and some as far south as Willunga. This shows what our engineers have accomplished and the value of the River Murray to the people of South Australia. I have much pleasure in supporting the action of the Government in securing this satisfactory agreement which, one of the River Murray Waters Commissioners assures me, is on the same footing as the agreement of 1915.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Second reading debate adjourned on October 15. Page 1214.)

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

LIBRARIES (SUBSIDIES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 1215.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—I am not too happy about this Bill because it gives no consideration to institutes, and the attitude of the Libraries Board is of no assistance to institutes, which play an important part in the education of the people. Institutes depend on subscriptions for their maintenance, whereas in New Zealand half the cost is met by the Government and the other half by subscriptions, and our Government should consider introducing something of that nature. For many years the Customs Department has wanted to secure the Port Adelaide Institute and Museum building and finally arrangements have been made for its sale. The Institute Committee is spending £28,000 in erecting a new library without any assistance from the Government. If the city council were prepared to take it over some help could be given as this Bill provides, but few councils are prepared to spend the ratepayers' money in subscribing to libraries as they consider that the Government should assume the responsibility. Although the Government is prepared to assist libraries it will not give similar assistance to institutes.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Some institutes are under the control of councils.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Some are and some are not, but my information is that the Port Adelaide City Council is not prepared to saddle the ratepayers with the extra thousands of pounds involved as they are already heavily rated, and the responsibility thus falls back on the Institute Committee, which is doing a good job. I suggest that in future legislation the Government consider this point.

Contributions by the State from consolidated revenue to the Libraries Department for administrative purposes last year amount to £121,777 which is, admittedly, a fair amount. In addition the Government paid £24,000 for the purchase of books and materials and provided £2,262 for the purchase of books for subsidized libraries. After payments by the Government the excess of receipts over payments amounted to £3,685.

The administrative costs of the Institutes Association amounted to £8,251. Grants to institutes and Adelaide Circulating Library amounted to £10,379 and grants to institutes

upon local authority contributions were £1,289, making a total of £11,669. This compares with the £148,000 paid to the Libraries Board.

I do not think that institute committees are receiving fair treatment and it is not out of place to ask the Government to assist these people who are playing a wonderful part and have a great record in the interests of the community. With that slight criticism I support the second reading.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—I, too, support the Bill. Apropos of the criticism levelled by Mr. Condon in regard to the subsidizing of the Institutes Association, I bear in mind that the president and secretary of that association, some years ago, were stumping the country opposing any alteration of the Act controlling institutes. However, finance is becoming more difficult, and some country districts are finding it hard to maintain their libraries and institutes. I believe that some institutes have closed down their libraries simply because they could not get anyone to look after the book section. It seems to me that the local governing authority, with its permanent staff, is well equipped to do this work and I am

pleased that the Government has seen fit to recompense councils that are prepared to set up libraries and provide buildings for the purpose. The more we can extend the facilities for reading throughout the country the better for all concerned and I am therefore rather glad than otherwise that the Government has found it desirable to make money available for the purpose of recompensing councils for any expense they incur in the provision of furniture and buildings and the staffing of libraries. I hope, however, that it will not be understood that councils are going to take over every institute in the country. I am sure that will not be the case, but where institutes are having difficulty in carrying on the library work there will be an opportunity for residents to come in under this new scheme and have books placed at their disposal. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.15 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 22, at 2.15 p.m.