

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Wednesday, October 28, 1959.

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

**QUESTIONS.****LEVEL CROSSING ACCIDENTS.**

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Many accidents have occurred at level crossings on the Henley Beach railway line, particularly in the Albert Park section, and yesterday two persons were killed and five injured there. The Woodville Council has requested that mechanical warning devices be installed at these crossings. Will the Minister of Railways take up the question with the Railways Commissioner with a view to the provision of suitable warning devices for the protection of human life?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Yes.

**ABATTOIRS GLUT.**

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—Last week there was a record yarding of sheep at the Metropolitan Abattoirs, and I have received several letters on this subject in relation to the confusion that existed as regards both yarding and unloading of stock. Although the Government obviously cannot anticipate seasons such as this and the resulting glut, nor would we imagine that it should expend vast sums of the taxpayers' money in providing uneconomic conditions for the handling of stock, nevertheless I ask the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Agriculture, whether he can produce any figures on a comparative basis as regards the ability of the abattoirs to handle stock this year, as compared with previous years.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I shall be happy to refer the question to the Minister concerned. I can only say from observation that this year the figures are almost double those of any previous year, both as to the number of stock killed and the number dealt with. Last week it was not possible to auction all the stock in one day, so it was not a matter of facilities unless we are to duplicate the selling system.

**EARLY CLOSING ACT.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I notice in this morning's paper a report of a deputation to the Minister of Industry as regards the

policing of the Early Closing Act. Does the Government intend to appoint more officers in the Department of Industry in order that the Act may be properly policed?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—A deputation representing all sections of the industry in question waited upon me yesterday and stated that they were concerned about the number of people trading in hours outside those allowed by the Early Closing Act. They asked whether action could be taken to enforce the law. We have nine inspectors and an additional one was appointed recently, but I have spoken to the secretary of my department and we are endeavouring to make arrangements to ensure that more satisfactory inspections are carried out, because it is felt that the trader who does obey the law should not be penalized as against the trader who does not.

**BIRTHS AND DEATHS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Births and Deaths Registration Act, 1936-1947. Read a first time.

**LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Courts Act, 1926-1956. Read a first time.

**SUPPLY BILL (No. 3).**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 27. Page 1203.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—This is the third Supply Bill we have had this session, and it is for an amount of £4,000,000. Clause 3 states:—

No payments for any establishment or service shall be made out of the said moneys in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments or services on the Estimates for the financial year ended on the thirtieth day of June, nineteen hundred and fifty-nine, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the public service, or by any regulation, or by any award, order, or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

After a month's discussion in another place on the Budget, this Bill was introduced here yesterday afternoon. Much to my surprise, the Chief Secretary, after taking a whole minute to introduce it, objected to the adjournment! I take exception to that attitude because I do

not want this place to be made a farce. Judging by what has happened here this afternoon, we shall not be sitting tomorrow. It is about time that the Ministers dropped their discourtesy to honourable members of this House. At least honourable members should be taken into their confidence and told what they intend to do.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—Is the honourable member suggesting that he has not been advised?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I have never been told anything at all. It was only a short time ago that the Ministers adjourned this place for 10 days and did not have the courtesy to say what they were doing. We are entitled to consideration because we are all part and parcel of this place. A little more courtesy towards honourable members would be welcome, at least as far as we on this side are concerned.

Referring to the Bill, £4,000,000 is a fair amount of money to spend. We are told that this is a House of review. Very often we do not get that consideration that we are justly entitled to. After all, we are supposed to watch over the affairs of State. I should now like to deal with one or two matters, not that any notice will be taken of what I say. The estimated cost for the first part of the South-Western suburbs drainage scheme is over £2,000,000. The Public Works Committee went into great detail, took much evidence, and examined experts on the matter. Finally, a recommendation was made to spend over £2,000,000. The Government was supposed to find half the amount—I think, £1,287,000. When the committee's report was published certain councils lodged objections. At the same time the Woodville corporation complained that it was called upon to pay for its drainage scheme, which cost a lot of money, and it could not see why the people concerned in the South-Western suburbs drainage scheme were complaining because the Government was going to pay half the cost. I support that scheme, but does the Government propose to go ahead with it? If these people do not want it, why force it on them? The people chiefly concerned say that they object to the Government paying half the cost. If they do not want the scheme, do not let them have it. I favour it myself, for it will be a great thing for the State if proceeded with but, if people are going to object to it, let them do so.

During the course of this debate I should like the Minister to explain what the Govern-

ment intends to do about this scheme. The people are not asked to pay a penny piece, in 53 years, until the Government has spent £1,000,000, and they are only asked to repay any amount following the financial year in which the Government says it is going to spend the money. I advise those people to go steadily and quietly, encourage the Government to proceed with this work, and offer no objection.

Another important matter is that in 1950 the Public Works Committee recommended for Port Pirie a scheme for a new hospital block of three floors with accommodation for 70 patients. It was considered to be the most modern hospital in South Australian country centres. For a 20 years' plan it was proposed that a 400-bed hospital be erected but not completed before a population of 37,000 was reached within Port Pirie. Port Pirie has not passed that figure today, so the committee was looking a long time ahead. Although this hospital building was recommended at a cost of about £126,000 or £127,000 in the first place, it was opened last Monday but cost £250,000. I want the Government to explain why these costs are so high.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—The honourable member thought he had an explanation.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—My honourable friend's mind is on increased wages, but he cannot blame everything on that. There have been several unnecessary delays. Have the contractors been kept up to scratch? In many cases there has been unexpended money at the end of the financial year. Government departments have been allocated certain moneys that have not been spent, and I should like an explanation on that. Port Pirie is entitled to that hospital. As previously, I support the action of the Government in erecting this hospital, but this is only part of the cost because much more work has to be done. Is there a close enough watch on this expenditure? I contend there is not, because from the time the recommendation is made until the time the work is completed, the costs rise steeply.

I have no hesitation in saying that the fruit fly eradication programme is a racket. I am not suggesting that this work should not be done, but the cost is too high.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—You had better tell us what the racket is.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Take my own case. I have only two trees, only one of which is bearing. Is it necessary that those engaged in the spraying programme should have to visit

my place seven times? One generally sees almost a cricket team marching about. A number of people in the district have complained to me about their actions. Since operations were begun this activity has cost the State £1,846,000, and therefore we must take some notice of it. Last year it cost £164,375. For the year ended June, 1958, there were 32,055 claims, 869 of which were disallowed, and for the following year there were 5,884 claims, and 145 were disallowed. Compensation paid up to the present time totals £474,000. It cannot be disputed that the Government should do all it can to protect the fruit industry. I fully support that policy, but I think that there should be better supervision of those engaged in the work. I hope that on this occasion the Government will take some notice of what I have said. The Bill provides for £4,000,000 to meet Government expenses and increased wages, which the trade union movement has been so successful in getting for South Australia. When the Australian Council of Trade Unions, the Trades and Labour Council and other Labor organizations go to the courts to get increased wages for employees, other workers also get the benefit of those efforts. Those who have been responsible for such increases should get some little credit. I support the second reading.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—I also support the second reading. This Bill is necessary to keep the wheels of the Government going by enabling the Public Service to carry on. Today is the 31st anniversary of Mr. Condon's entrance into this Chamber. Anyone who can retain the confidence of his electors for such a period is to be commended. It indicates that he has served them well. During that time he must have faced at least five elections, and he won each of them. It can be said that during most of those 31 years he has given most admirable service to the Chamber and has gained the respect of members and officers. I congratulate him on the services he has rendered and the work he does as Leader of his Party in this Chamber. I sat on the bench behind the honourable member for some years and have some appreciation of the time he must spend in the preparation of his speeches, and the thorough manner in which he deals with various subjects. He is to be congratulated on the way he places the views of his Party before the House. We had an example of that this afternoon when he referred to many subjects, some of which do not relate to his own district.

He mentioned a drainage scheme in a district he does not represent, which shows his interest in the affairs of the State, and also had something to say about the fruit fly eradication campaign. I should say his district possibly has fewer fruit trees than most districts. The honourable member's interests have extended further than his own district and because of that his comments on matters that come before this House are well worthy of consideration. I congratulate the honourable member on a period of 31 years in this Chamber and service in another place, which represents a life-time of public effort.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

#### EXCHANGE OF LAND (HUNDRED OF NOARLUNGA) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 27. Page 1203.)

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES (Southern)—I support the second reading of this Bill and take this opportunity to congratulate the honourable Mr. Condon on his 31 years as a member of the Legislative Council. This House has heard from the honourable Sir Frank Perry on this subject but I would like, particularly on behalf of the four new members of the Council, to offer our congratulations on this great achievement and also to thank him for the help he has given us as new members. So far any advice he has given us has reacted well, so I must say that the honourable member is obviously sincere in his attempts to help new members.

As a representative of the Southern District I am glad to associate myself with the Government in supporting the second reading of this Bill. The Chief Secretary has already explained that it refers to an exchange of approximately 20 acres of land in section 616A, hundred of Noarlunga which is owned under glebe grant by the Catholic Endowment Society. At a future date 20 acres will be allocated from the Housing Trust's land and this exchange will have the effect of making available to the trust, land which is at present bounded on the north side by the O'Sullivan Beach Road, so that the trust may complete its future policy of building houses for employees of the oil refinery in this area. A Select Committee was appointed to inquire into this matter; five witnesses gave evidence, and the finding of the committee was distinctly in favour of the proposition.

I congratulate the Government on its practical approach to this problem, which has been disposed of smoothly to the mutual benefit of both sides. I also congratulate the Government on its continued recognition of religion in all areas and on the importance it places on the allocation of space for this purpose in new areas. This policy reflects credit on the Government.

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

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

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

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move—

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

For the year 1959-60 the Government is budgeting for a deficit on Consolidated Revenue Account of £791,000. Proposed payments total £80,323,000, while receipts are estimated to amount to £79,532,000. The figure of £80,323,000 for proposed payments includes:—

	£
Moneys which are required annually and the appropriation of which is contained in existing legislation . . . . .	21,058,000
The amount to be appropriated by this Bill . . . . .	59,265,000
	<hr/>
	£80,323,000

The fact that the Government is budgeting for a deficit this year is due entirely to the adverse season, particularly through its effect in increasing the cost of pumping water and in reducing rail and harbour revenues, and to a smaller extent through the indirect effect on other Government revenues. Because of the record dry winter it was necessary to commence full-scale pumping through the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline early in July and the present expectation is that pumping will continue at full-scale at least until the end of April next. The cost of supplementing country storages will also be much higher than in a normal year. The Railways Department and Harbors Board have maintained a normal rate of carriage and shipment of grain this financial year by shifting last year's carry-over, but a slowing down of grain transport is certain to occur in the latter part of 1959-60. The poor season has already caused some reduction in business activity in country areas and

this has had the effect of reducing the amount of general merchandise carried by the railways.

For the year 1958-59 the actual deficit amounted to £1,027,000 as compared with the original estimated deficit of £966,000. Actual receipts at £72,680,000 were £233,000 above the estimate while payments at £73,707,000 exceeded the estimate by £294,000. The main variations from the estimates were for Education and Railways Departments. Actual payments for Education Department exceeded the estimate by £677,000, the major part of this excess being for salaries. The Teachers' Salaries Board granted salary increases in a new award which operated from September, 1958. The Railways Department payments were £609,000 less than estimated and receipts £212,000 below the estimate. The reduction in revenues was due largely to the loss of general merchandise traffic which resulted from the poor seasonal outlook. The reduction in payments was due mainly to further economies achieved by efficient administration and operation.

Before I pass on to the provisions of the Bill itself I propose to follow the procedure of previous years and give honourable members some information about the larger items of receipts which, as I have already indicated, are estimated to total £79,532,000. This figure is made up of—

Taxation, £10,452,000, an increase of £235,000 over actual receipts last year.
Public works and services and other receipts, £38,689,000, an increase of £1,724,000.
Territorial, £586,000, an increase of £27,000.
Commonwealth, £29,805,000, an increase of £4,866,000.

The increase of £235,000 for taxation is expected to arise entirely from the normal annual increase in business and the main sources are estimated as—

	£
Stamp duties . . . . .	36,000
Motor vehicle registration and licence fees . . . . .	210,000

The estimated increase in motor vehicle registration and licence fees has no impact on the estimated Budget result as such receipts are automatically appropriated for the construction and maintenance of roads. No appreciable increases are expected this year from land tax and succession duties. For betting tax there has been a marked decline in receipts in recent years and a further decline of £32,000 is estimated.

The principal items which make up the estimated increase of £1,724,000 for Public Works and Services and Other Receipts are:—

	Anticipated Increase. £
Education.—Due to increased reimbursements from the Commonwealth under the scheme for assistance to Universities . . .	235,000
Railways.—Due to an increase in suburban and country passenger fares, and to higher revenues from the carriage of ores and concentrates . . . . .	224,000
Waterworks and Sewers.—Due to the anticipated increase in the number of consumers, to revaluations of vacant lands, and revaluations in the City of Adelaide . . . . .	445,000
Hospitals.—Due to the increasing number of patients, particularly at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and to increased recoups from the Commonwealth in respect of tuberculosis services . . . . .	317,000
Recoveries of Interest and Sinking Fund.—Due to increased loan moneys made available to semi-governmental undertakings . . . . .	792,000

The increase of £27,000 for Territorial is estimated to arise from increased revenues from mining activities partly offset by a decline in land sales. Mining revenues this year will be increased by some £40,000 by a royalty of one shilling per ton imposed on Leigh Creek coal. Commonwealth Grants to be received in 1959-60 will be £4,866,000 greater than such grants received last year, and I shall give honourable members a brief review of the new arrangements under which these grants will be received. Following applications from Victoria and Queensland for special grants to assist their Budgets in 1958-59 the Commonwealth decided that the existing arrangements for Taxation Reimbursement and Special Grants were likely to become unworkable. At a conference held in Canberra in June, 1959, the Commonwealth put forward new proposals which were designed to overcome some of the special problems of Victoria and Queensland, to allow some increase in financial assistance generally, and to give South Australia such a grant as would enable it to function in future as a "non-claimant" State. The new arrangements were to apply for a period of six years and it was proposed that grants should increase each year at a rate a little greater than the rate of increase of population and average wages.

The grant suggested for 1959-60, the base year of the six-year period, was not acceptable to South Australia, as it was considered inadequate compared with the proposals for other

States and less than what this State might reasonably have expected to receive under a continuation of the old arrangements. The Commonwealth considered the objections raised by South Australia, agreed that they were justified, and increased the proposed grant to South Australia for 1959-60 by £1,000,000 to £27,675,000. South Australia also pointed out to the Commonwealth that the accounts for 1957-58 and 1958-59, with their outstanding deficits of £399,000 and £1,027,000, should be subject to review and recommendation by the Commonwealth Grants Commission to close the old arrangements even if South Australia agreed to become a "non-claimant" State under the new proposals from 1959-60. The Commonwealth agreed to this submission also, and as a consequence the Estimates of Revenue for 1959-60 include the following two grants—

	£
Taxation Reimbursement Grant	27,675,000
Grant pursuant to Section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution	1,426,000

Payments.—In addition to the amount to be appropriated by this Bill an estimated £21,058,000 will be spent this year on purposes for which appropriation is contained in existing legislation. The major commitments included in this amount are—

	£
Interest and Sinking Fund in respect of the Public Debt of the State . . . . .	16,505,000
Transfer to the Highways Fund of the net proceeds of motor taxation . . . . .	3,276,000
Contribution by the Government to the South Australian Superannuation Fund . . . .	993,000

Appropriation of £59,265,000 sought by this Bill is to meet the normal requirements of the various departments detailed in clause 3. I shall now give honourable members explanations of the main lines included therein.

Police Department, £2,302,981.—This is an increase of £245,000, or almost 12 per cent, over actual payments for 1958-59. The majority of the additional funds required are for salaries and wages for which the proposed provision exceeds last year's payments by £217,000. This increase is to cover the full year's cost of a new Police Award operative from March last, and to enable the strength of the Force to be increased by 100 men from 1,525 to 1,625. Provision has been made for additions and replacements to the motor vehicle fleet so that the department may continue the policy of replacing vehicles at a "safe" mileage. The purchase of additional radio equipment, on which £60,000 had been

spent up to the end of June, 1959, has also been provided for.

Sheriff and Gaols and Prisons Department, £450,222.—This provision exceeds actual payments for last year by £58,000, and £27,000 of this increase arises from the provision for approximately seven months' operation of a new prison establishment at Cadell. At this new training centre fruit growing, dairying, pig raising and other aspects of farming will be taught. Construction of buildings and services is well advanced, the initial staff and the first group of prisoners will move in during December, and by the end of this financial year 60 selected trusted prisoners from Yatala Labour Prison will have been transferred. A second stage in the project will be the construction of a cell block capable of holding up to 60 short term prisoners from the Murray Lands areas. This stage will commence operation late in 1960-61.

Hospitals Department, £5,231,651.—Increased expenditure of £685,000, or 15 per cent, over actual payments for 1958-59 is proposed. The major item responsible for this increase is the progressive operation of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, for which £792,000 is required this year, an increase of £348,000 over last year. The maternity section of the hospital has now been operating since 1953-54, as a temporary measure in the nurses' quarters until May, 1957, and since then in the new maternity block. The present capacity of 105 beds is in practically full use. In the general block 64 beds became available and the first patient was admitted on March 3, 1959. At present 229 beds are available, by the end of December the number will be 263 and by the end of February next the hospital will be operating at its planned capacity of 385 beds. The Outpatients' Department opened on May 11, 1959, and six clinics are now functioning. In addition funds are provided for the adequate staffing and operation of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and other hospitals under the control of the Government. The first steps have now been taken in the programme to rebuild sections of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and the Government will make loan funds available each year to enable the building programme to be continued so that the older buildings may be gradually replaced.

Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department, £750,797.—This amount is required to cover the salaries and wages, purchase of provisions and other running costs of the training homes, schools, hostels and other institutions conducted by the Department, and

to provide relief at approved scales to widows and deserted wives with children; pensioners with children, and families seriously affected by sickness or unemployment. This is £33,000 greater than expenditure incurred in 1958-59.

Department of Public Health, £224,268.—This is an increase of £25,000 over actual payments for 1958-59. In addition to normal health inspection services the Department is providing school health services, both medical and dental, an x-ray survey to detect and combat tuberculosis, and is continuing a vigorous and successful campaign against poliomyelitis by supplying free vaccinations. There has been a most gratifying response from the public of South Australia in taking advantage of the poliomyelitis vaccination service which has been provided from specially equipped caravans moving from one locality to another throughout the State. During the three years for which the service has been operating 430,000 people have received injections. The very low number of cases notified over this period is indicative of the success of the campaign.

Chief Secretary (Miscellaneous), £2,283,237.—This is an increase of £323,000 over last year's expenditure. The requirement for medical and health services is estimated at £1,921,000, which exceeds payments made in 1958-59 by £186,000. This reflects the new policy which doubles the Government's capital subsidy from £ for £ to £2 for each £1 raised by the local people for hospital building purposes. The following are some of the principal grants and subsidies to hospitals and institutions under this heading:—

Adelaide Children's Hospital, £607,800.—This grant includes £85,000 towards the addition of a fourth floor to the Gilbert Wing which will provide accommodation for an additional 36 patients. Of the estimated total cost of £160,000 the Government will have contributed £115,000. It is anticipated that the additions will be ready for occupation later this year. A sum of £13,000 is included to cover final payments on the completed services block consisting of quarters for medical officers, staff dining rooms, kitchens, and store accommodation, £5,000 for final payments for new buildings at Estcourt House, £10,000 for initial payments on a new multi-storeyed outpatients' block to be commenced this financial year, £10,000 for a central sterile supply department to cost £15,000, and £2,800 for new equipment and alterations to existing equipment in the hospital laundry.

Home for Incurables, £89,171.—Included in this grant is £44,171 as a further contribution towards the completion of a programme comprising a new 25-bed women's wing, nurses' home, cafeteria, kitchen, domestic block, and miscellaneous services.

Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, £178,750.

Mothers' and Babies' Health Association, £81,800.

Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital, £176,000.

—The sum of £25,000 of this grant is a further contribution towards the purchase of land and a new obstetric block and other additions estimated to cost in all £800,000.

South Australian Blood Transfusion Service, £48,000.—This is the State and Commonwealth Governments' share of the costs of operating the Blood Transfusion Service; £16,000 will be recouped from the Commonwealth.

Tailem Bend Hospital, £10,000.—This amount is provided as an initial contribution towards a new 24-bed hospital with nurses' quarters which is estimated to cost some £85,000.

Ashford Community Hospital, £10,000.—Expansion of the hospital is planned and this grant is to assist in the acquisition of adjacent properties.

Tanunda War Memorial Hospital, £15,000.

—Additions planned, which are estimated to cost some £22,000, will increase bed capacity from 14 to 21. The grant provided is to cover two-thirds of the total cost.

Proposed subsidies to institutions for 1959-60 total £256,242, which includes the following major proposals:—

	£
District and Bush Nursing .. ..	20,000
Kalyra Sanatorium .. .. .	54,000
Private (non-profit) hospitals—	
Calvary Hospital .. .. .	76,712
St. Andrew's Presbyterian	
Hospital .. .. .	90,000

The provision for Calvary Hospital is in respect of a new northern wing to provide 18 additional beds. At St. Andrew's Hospital the first stage of a building programme to increase bed capacity from 20 to 73 is under way. Estimated total cost of this stage of the work, including staff accommodation, operating theatres and auxiliary services, is £390,000. In subsequent stages of the building programme it is planned to increase the number of beds to 155. A sum of £158,570 is provided for conditional subsidies to hospitals, which exceeds the total of last year's payments

under this heading by £8,460. These subsidies are paid towards the running expenses of hospitals.

Special subsidies to hospitals for additions, alterations and equipment, etc., will this year require £163,686, an increase of £97,113 over last year's payments of £66,573. Included in this group are the following proposals:—

Angaston Hospital, £15,000, towards building additions which will enable a further 10 patients to be accommodated.

Berri Hospital, £60,000, as a further payment towards a new hospital which will provide 32 beds and is estimated to cost £120,000 to complete.

Booleroo Centre Hospital, £8,893, towards nurses' quarters and modernization of the hospital.

Murray Bridge Hospital, £9,094, being the final payment towards additional staff quarters and miscellaneous improvements.

Naracoorte Hospital, £15,700, being the proposed contribution by the Government this year towards a new hospital which is estimated to cost £105,000.

South Coast District Hospital at Victor Harbour, £10,000, being two-thirds of the estimated cost of a new maternity block.

Waikerie Hospital, £9,490, towards the new nurses' quarters.

Also included in the provision of £1,921,000 for medical and health services is £40,000 for ambulance services in metropolitan and country areas. Other special payments provided for under the heading of "Chief Secretary—Miscellaneous" include the following:—

	£
Royal Institution for the Blind ..	32,000
S.A. Institution for the Blind, Deaf and Dumb .. .. .	10,000
Transport concessions to incapacitated and certain other ex-servicemen .. .. .	89,000
Other transport concessions mainly to pensioners and blind persons	95,000

The last two items include £42,000 to meet the cost of concession tram and bus fares previously included in the general grant to the Municipal Tramways Trust under "Treasurer—Miscellaneous." The major part of the last item is the expenditure occasioned by the new concession fares scheme for pensioners for travel within the metropolitan area.

Publicity and Tourist Bureau and Immigration, £311,179.—This is an increase of £39,000 over actual payments for last year. The

principal items included within this provision are:—

	£
Grant to the Glenelg Corporation towards the construction of a boat haven on the Patawalonga	92,000
Subsidies to municipal authorities for the development of tourist resorts . . . . .	17,000
Subsidies towards the construction of swimming pools . . . . .	11,000

Treasurer—Miscellaneous, £7,299,390.—This provision exceeds payments made during 1958-59 by £761,000. The increase is mainly caused by variations in transfer items which do not affect the Consolidated Revenue Account balance. The first of these items is the contribution to the Commonwealth of principal and interest in respect of moneys borrowed under the terms of the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Acts. The proposed payment of £957,000 for principal and interest, which is £168,000 greater than last year's payment, will be fully recouped to Revenue by the South Australian Housing Trust. The transfer of the special Commonwealth grant to offset deficits outstanding in past years' accounts is £1,378,000 greater this year than in 1958-59. The transfer to the Railways Department is £450,000 less this year than last. The purpose of this transfer is to reduce the prospective deficit in the Railways Account to a figure which could possibly be eliminated by further achievements in reducing expenditure or attracting revenue.

There is a further significant decrease in this year's proposed Government contribution towards the working expenses of the Municipal Tramways Trust. Including the cost of concession fares previously covered in the general grant but now shown under "Chief Secretary—Miscellaneous," last year's grant of £440,000 is reduced to £161,000. In addition the Government will recoup to the trust the cost of the newly commenced pensioners' concession fares scheme which I have already mentioned.

Engineering and Water Supply Department, £3,650,233.—This represents an increase of £557,000 compared with last year. The major part of this increase is to meet the cost of pumping water from the River Murray. Full-scale pumping has been carried out continuously since early July, and with the present seasonal outlook there is little prospect of it ceasing before the end of April next. The capacity of the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline is being lifted from 52,000,000 to 55,000,000 gallons a day by installing additional pumping

plant. Because of the record dry winter 42 bores in the Adelaide water district were re-opened and are now supplying almost 9,000,000 gallons a day.

Public Works, £1,215,800.—This is an increase of £44,000 over last year. The provision covers the cost of repairs to and maintenance of Government buildings, furnishings, and also the cost of replacement furniture. The main requirements this year are:—

	£
School buildings . . . . .	459,000
Hospital buildings . . . . .	381,000
Police and Courthouse buildings . .	71,000
Other Government buildings . . . .	276,000

Education Department, £10,330,050.—This is an increase of £1,459,000 over last year, of which £1,288,000 is for salaries and wages and £171,000 for contingency lines. The provision made for salaries will not only cover the full year's cost of a new award for teachers operative from September 1958 but permit the present teaching force to be increased by 350 to 6,050, and the number of teacher trainees to be increased by over 500 to approximately 3,000. These increases indicate the growing emphasis on education to meet the rising demand.

Minister of Education—Miscellaneous, £2,084,905.—This is an increase of £288,000 over last year. This appropriation includes the following grants:—

	£
University of Adelaide—additional to the £44,000 to be paid under the authority of special legislation . . . . .	1,581,000
School of Mines and Industries of South Australia . . . . .	295,000
Kindergarten Union of South Australia . . . . .	145,000
Institutes Association . . . . .	24,000
Townsend House School for deaf and blind children . . . . .	16,000

The grant proposed for the University of Adelaide is £241,000 more than actually paid in 1958-59, and the grant proposed for the School of Mines is £35,000 greater.

Department of Agriculture, £793,470.—This appropriation is £37,000 more than was actually spent by the department in 1958-59. Provision is made for expenditure in the control and destruction of fruit fly, for the purchase of equipment and livestock for research centres, and for continuance of all the services provided by the department.

Minister of Agriculture—Miscellaneous, £428,130.—This is an increase of £43,000 over last year. The principal item under this appropriation is the proposed grant of



£284,000 to the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, which forms part of the State's contribution to the University of Adelaide. An amount of £50,000 is provided for fruit fly compensation, and £26,000 for expenditure by the Bush Fire Research Committee on investigations into the prevention and control of bush fires.

Mines Department, £685,499.—This is an increase of £34,000 over last year's expenditure. This will enable the department to continue its main function of investigating and testing the mineral resources of the State. An item worthy of note is the provision of £23,000 for underground water investigations, an increase of £16,000 over expenditure in 1958-59.

Harbors Board, £1,380,765.—This provision exceeds actual payments made in 1958-59 by £37,000. Operation and maintenance costs of all harbor facilities, including the costs of operation of bulk loading installations, are met from this appropriation.

Railways Department, £14,365,000.—This is an increase of £240,000 over last year's payments. Increased wage and salary rates will cost the department an additional £425,000 this year, but savings in fuel costs arising from the conversion to diesel operation, and other economies achieved by efficient administration, will offset some of the unavoidable increase.

Clause 2 provides for the further issue of £37,265,000, being the difference between the total of the three Supply Bills passed—£22,000,000—and the total of the appropriation required in this Bill. Clause 3 sets out the amount to be appropriated and the details of the appropriations to the various departments and functions. This clause also provides that increases of salaries or wages which become payable pursuant to any return made by a properly constituted authority may be paid, and that the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased by the amount necessary to pay the increases. Clause 4 authorizes the Treasurer to pay moneys from time to time authorized by warrants issued by the Governor and provides that the receipts obtained from the payees shall be the discharge to the Treasurer for the moneys paid.

Clause 5 authorises the use of loan funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Commonwealth and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorised by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect

of a period prior to the first day of July, 1959, or at a rate in excess of the rate in force under any return made by the Public Service Board or any regulation of the South Australian Railways Commissioner. Clause 7 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

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

#### NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1054.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I support the second reading and in doing so join with Sir Frank Perry and Mr. Giles in extending felicitations to Mr. Condon for his 31 years in this Chamber. His Parliamentary career started in the House of Assembly, in which I understand he served for 3½ years, thus bringing his total Parliamentary service to 34½ years. I do not need to extol his fine characteristics as they are well known to us all. He has had the honour of leading his Party in this Chamber for many years and we have all become fully acquainted with his sterling qualities. This seems to be a gala day for the Australian Labor Party, because Mr. O'Halloran today celebrates the 10th anniversary of his appointment as Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly. We offer our congratulations to these two gentlemen, who play such a prominent part in maintaining the high standards and traditions of the South Australian Parliamentary institution.

I pay a compliment to the noble band of women who undertake the vocation of nursing. I think I express the opinion of all honourable members when I say it is one of the most noble professions and one of the hardest, because they are called upon to deal with all phases of sickness. Their responsibilities are great. I am reminded of an old adage in making a comparison between the medical profession and the nurses. It is said that the sun shines on medicos' successes, but that six feet covers their failures. I consider there would be many medical failures but for the nurses. It has been one of the aims of the Minister of Health to provide for the recognition of nurse aides. In 1956 a conference was called in Victoria to amend the various State Nursing

Registration Acts so that nurse aides and nurse attendants would be given some status in the nursing field. However, the conference failed. The only two States not enjoying this legislation are Queensland and South Australia. Therefore, I compliment the Minister on having introduced the Bill.

It is true that our hospitals are not only over-crowded with patients, but that there is a shortage of labour, as regards both nursing staff and domestic staff. Many years ago those who chose this noble profession were provided with poor living accommodation. However, those dark days have gone and in every major hospital today, both private and Government, the nursing staff and those associated with the conduct of the hospital are treated as an integral part of the institution. The position has now arisen where hospitals are finding it difficult to attend to the patients committed to their care. I might mention that in South Australia we have 5,122 registered nurses. As in every other profession where women are engaged, many nurses leave to get married or perhaps undertake other employment. The last edition of the *Statesman's Pocket Year Book* shows that there were 478 new nurses that year, and that 382 resigned. No doubt some had reached the retiring age or were suffering from sickness and were not prepared to continue their professional duties. The number of nurses at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is 864, and the State total is 2,126. Attendants and others at the Royal Adelaide Hospital number 748, and for the whole State 1,897.

There is need to amend the Act to give the Nurses Registration Board power to register nurse aides and nurse assistants. Similar legislation was passed in Western Australia recently in which conditions are prescribed for the training of nurse aides and nurse attendants. I am not now criticizing the Government or the Minister, but I suggest that it would have been well had the Bill contained directions to the board of the major principles upon which this new legislation will be carried out. In Western Australia before an institution is approved as a training school it must fulfil the following conditions: the matron must be an experienced registered general nurse, the building, equipment and other facilities available must be adequate for training purposes, and the daily average number of beds occupied by patients must be at least 20. Further, the board must consider the proportion of registered nurses to trainees and the number of registered nurses must be suffi-

cient to ensure adequate supervision of the trainees' duties. The trainees must receive practical experience. Valuable assistance would have been given to the Nurses Board if the Bill had contained a schedule giving some indication of the Government's intention and particularly what the Minister of Health had in mind about the training of nurse aides and nurse attendants. The Minister of Health will, I have no doubt, take that into consideration and will make suggestions to the Nurses Board. I note that those provisions are to be dealt with by regulation and not by proclamation, so whatever is proposed to extend the activities of the Nurses Registration Board will be brought before Parliament and members will have an opportunity of discussing the various regulations.

I have no other comments to make and I wholeheartedly support the Bill knowing that it is necessary and that it will provide status for those who have not the required educational standard to become fully qualified nurses.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—I have had some limited experience in hospital administration and would not like this Bill to pass without my expressing wholehearted support for it. Anything that improves the field of recruitment for hospital staff must have a beneficial effect because there has been a continuing scarcity of people in this profession. The Bill contains an innovation so far as hospital staffs are concerned because a class of employee will be introduced of an age just a little below that of the probationer. A probationer is engaged for a definite period under definite conditions, but the new group to be recruited will not be subjected to similar terms of employment. The older recruits will be general handy people around the place who can assist in the domestic requirements of the hospital and give some minor nursing attention to people requiring it, especially if the attention required is not of a standard warranting the service of a qualified nurse. An acute shortage of hospital staff seems to exist throughout the State and I know of hospitals that have had to depend on nurses for the performance of the most menial work. Nurses have been called upon to perform any task from kitchen work to operating theatre work and this has been done even by double and triple certificated nurses. Many nurses are required to prepare the meals for the patients under their care. Such conditions are undesirable from every point of view.

Obviously the skilled nurse should be required to give her skilled attention to the patient and should not be called upon to perform menial services in the institution. If this Bill did nothing more than correct that position it would be worthwhile.

There does seem to be a class of people, particularly younger people, who need some encouragement to take up nursing and this measure will recruit that class. The fact that they will become associated with nursing, even if only of a minor class, may interest them enough to advance from aides to the higher orders of nursing.

I was impressed by the suggestion made by the Minister that consideration should be given to allowing nurses to live away. If that suggestion is adopted, instead of the Government having to provide nursing quarters and other buildings and equipment which require much money, nurses and other hospital staff will be encouraged to live away from the hospital and its surroundings. That would have two beneficial effects; it would obviate the necessity to provide accommodation at the hospitals and it would create that home interest among the nurses engaged in hospitals. I have always contended that if nurses could be taken away from the hospital environment during their off periods it would prove beneficial to them. It is said that a change is as good as a spell, and I think that applies to the nursing staff. One often hears expressions of appreciation by the nurses when new quarters are opened for them. They maintain that nurses' quarters do, in a limited way, provide some break from their duties for them. Sometimes the nurses must be in the hospital building itself but separated from the patients only by a passage between their quarters and the wards. That is a most undesirable situation but, fortunately, it does not often arise.

I join with Mr. Bardolph in his eulogistic comments on the nursing profession. As I said previously, I have had some experience in hospital administration and I have always held the highest regard for nurses and the nursing profession. It has been said that poets are born and not made, and that applies equally to hospital nurses. They have to be endowed with certain personal characteristics; they have to be models of tact and patience; and, above all, they have to be ready and willing to help everybody, whether a person of high estate or a person brought in from the street. Anything the department or the State can do to improve the status of the nursing profession and help in the recruitment

of staff and make the work easier and more attractive is worthy of the highest commendation. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Enactment of Part IIIB of principal Act."

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health)—There is nothing in the Bill to provide for people who are already engaged as nurse attendants and who have been serving for a period. It may be necessary to insert an appropriate clause because when a Bill of this nature is brought before Parliament, it is usual to provide for people already working in a profession.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### UNDERGROUND WATERS PRESERVATION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 27. Page 1214.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2)—Yesterday we received a good deal of instruction about underground waters in general and, one might say, almost exhaustive detail. The handbook issued to members recently on underground waters was paraphrased and re-paraphrased as if we had not all read it time after time from cover to cover, for we were all enthralled with its wisdom. I want, therefore, to deal with the salient features of the Bill only, which in my opinion are contained in clauses 9 and 11. The rest of the Bill is, as it were, ancillary to those clauses and merely goes to create the machinery necessary to put them into operation. I thought that my best approach to this Bill might be to compare it with two other branches of our law which really define what I would regard as the external and internal limits of this matter. The first is the Mining (Petroleum) Act of 1940 as one limit, and the other is common law riparian rights, on the other side.

Members may recall that the Mining (Petroleum) Act of 1940 declared all petroleum to be the property of the Crown. It made certain reservations for existing agreements and on existing permits for a period but its function—which I think is now completed in that manner—ensured that rights to petroleum and, I think, helium also, whether already vested in the individual owner of land or not, should be expropriated to the Crown. That

I regard as the external limit. Members yesterday referred to some similar sort of situation in Queensland whereby the Government of Queensland has expropriated the ownership of underground waters. I would not tolerate that for one moment in this State, and I do not think other members would either. Of course, that is not what this Bill sets out to do. There is quite a difference, as I see it, in the taking over by the Crown of something that is thought to exist but no-one knows whether it does or not, such as oil, and something like underground waters which everyone knows to exist and, indeed, exists under nearly everyone's property. Expropriation of that, of course, would be an entirely different matter.

The Mining (Petroleum) Act of 1940 took away from the people their rights to oil when they did not know whether or not any oil existed and which would cost a tremendous amount of money to find out. Most people could not afford to spend much money, nor would they have any inclination to do so, to find it, and that Act, of course, has considerably encouraged the search for oil for the general weal of the State at large, including those people who lost any rights they might have had for oil—and thus it is in a very different category from this. I regard it as the external limit of what could be done.

The other side of the question is the British common law on riparian rights. That law guarantees to owners of property abutting on streams certain rights, not to the whole of the water of the stream but to their proper share of it; it guarantees to the individual a proportion of the water running through his property and those rights are protected and belong to the owner. They are well defined by the law itself. This Bill does not do that either because no rights are guaranteed to anyone under this Bill. It sets out to regulate underground waters. It does not assure any underground waters to anybody, nor does it expropriate them. It sets out, within certain limits, to regulate the whole question of underground waters, including who can take them, how much they can take, and the conditions on which it can be taken. The important words in clause 9 are "contamination" and "deterioration," and we have already heard quite a lot about them. The meaning of contamination is, as I see it, quite clear and does not need any further interpretation. The question of deterioration is a little more difficult because it applies to quantity of water as well as quality. In other words,

it could be said that underground water supplies will be deteriorated if one takes even one drop, and thus it is a very wide word indeed and one to which honourable members should give a good deal of attention.

Clause 11 mentions the conditions that can be imposed on the seeking of underground water and on the taking of it. It includes the words "including terms and conditions as to the depth of a well and terms and conditions restricting the amount of underground water that may be taken from a well," but those words are not in any way definitive of the general words in the terms or conditions which the Minister may impose. As I read the clause, the Minister may impose conditions of any sort, subject, of course, to other limitations as to right of appeal and so forth but that—as my honourable friend, Mr. Bardolph, is fond of saying—I will deal with later.

A similar Bill was presented in another place two years ago and at that time there was a good deal of talk in the lobbies about some power of making one share underground waters with a neighbour. I have had a look at that Bill and cannot find any precise clause giving that power; it may be even in this question of conditions, but I believe, according to the lobby talk, that that was the reason why that Bill was stood over. The Bill before us, however, although it is considerably different, still contains a number of clauses which were in the former Bill, and it is still a fact that any conditions can be imposed on the taking of underground waters; there is no limit and no guarantee that anyone having underground waters on his property can take any of them once this Bill is passed. As Mr. Story said, this is a very important Bill as its effect could be to restrict—and indeed take away—the rights of ownership—very fundamental rights, because water is one of the necessities of life. It is unlike oil in that we cannot get along without it. It is something which everyone needs, whether for household and domestic purposes or purely to survive by way of drinking, or for running an agricultural property.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—You do not seriously believe that it would be taken away?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I did not say that. If the Minister thought I said that, either I did not say what I thought I was saying or he misunderstood me—and I incline to the latter. What I said was that water was a necessity for everybody and, indeed, I propose to have something to say on

the lines which, no doubt, are running through the Chief Secretary's mind. These things I have pointed out are the dangers inherent in this Bill that must be considered by members. The worst aspect of it that I can see—and I am looking at the bad side now—is that, unlike the law relating to riparian rights which is a law relating to overground waters, which guarantees a certain proportion of them, one could be, under this Bill, excluded from any rights to underground waters.

On the other hand, there are certain attractive features of the Bill. Firstly, it is expressed to apply only to certain parts of the State, although it could be made to apply to the whole. There is to be an advisory committee of experts who will, according to their lights, no doubt advise the Minister of what should be done, and above all there is to be an appeals board to see that the rights of the individual are protected. There is also an inherent protection of the needs of the countryside and the country as a whole. I rate these things very high in consideration of the Bill because it is only a matter of common sense—and this really deals with what the Chief Secretary said a few moments ago—that Governments do and must encourage the development of our natural resources of water. For instance, the Commonwealth Government gives certain very valuable taxation advantages to people obtaining underground waters or preserving surface waters; they get a direct write-off from their income tax on money expended on these important matters. There would be no sense, in my view, in any Government going too far in preserving underground waters; it would not be of any benefit to anybody if the Government said, for instance, "No-one can use underground waters in this area," because that would deprive the community at large, and indeed the Government itself, of sources of revenue. Therefore, I feel that the difficulty is not in the generality of the Bill, but rather in its particularity. For instance, if I want to put down a bore and my neighbour has one nearby he immediately becomes afraid that his supply of water may be impaired, and this would tempt him to make representations to the controlling authority not to allow me to put down a bore on my property. I have had some personal experience of this. I was proposing to put down a bore on a little property but my neighbour, who is a very good and wholesome neighbour, became afraid at once that his supply might be depleted, and he told me so. I think his fears were illusory but being, I

hope, a good neighbour, I constructed a dam instead, and it has been empty ever since.

To sum up, I think the difficulties in this Bill will probably lie in its administration. No-one can be all-knowledgeable. The matters dealt with are intangibles—whether underground waters exist or not is in general known, but not in particular known: that is, it is often known that an area has underground waters, but where they are is very difficult to ascertain. Certain guides are available but are by no means complete; thus the whole thing will be a matter largely for the discretion of these people who will be administering the Act.

The usual argument whether the areas to come under the Bill should be ordained by proclamation or regulation has already reared its head. Personally, I, as most members do, favour regulation because this House has some right of review of regulations and not of proclamation, in general terms. However, I think proclamation is a convenient and necessary method on occasions, especially where there is urgency, but I cannot see any in this measure. If the people who are going to administer these difficult matters are competent to administer them, they ought easily and readily to be able to anticipate any further area that might need regulation. Thus my present tendency is to support the proposed amendment to alter "proclamation" to "regulation" unless, of course, I can be convinced in the meantime that there is any real reason for proclamation to be used.

One matter of detail about which there has been some apparent confusion up to date is the question of permits. There has been some debate on whether one needs a permit only to sink a well or whether one needs a permit to retain a well. The permit provision is in clause 10, which says that a permit shall be available for two years. The actuating clause in this regulation is clause 7, which says that a person is guilty of an offence, if he has not a permit, if he sinks a well, if he repairs or alters the casing of a well, if he deepens a well or if he uses—and I emphasize the word "uses"—a well for drainage purposes. The only place in which the word "uses" is used is in relation to a well for drainage purposes. Thus, on my reading, a permit is not needed to carry on the use of a well for obtaining water, but is needed for the purpose of carrying on using a drainage well. That sounds logical because surely it would be illogical to issue someone with a permit to put down an

expensive bore and then afterwards, two years later, have the power to say, "You cannot use it any more although you have spent all that money on it."

On the other hand, it sounds sensible and logical that renewable permits should be necessary to use a well for drainage purposes because, first of all, drainage although most desirable is not completely essential to life, as it were, in a direct sense; and, secondly, it could have a varying effect from time to time on poisoning an underground system. If my reading of it is correct, I think the provision is probably satisfactory in that sense. However, as there seems to be some confusion, I would advocate that the verbiage receive further attention by the draftsman because, if there is confusion in this House as to interpretation, no doubt there would later be legal confusion. Thus, I do suggest that the intention with regard to permits should be further clarified.

In general, I recognize some control of underground waters is necessary in some areas, which of course may well not be static: that is, with an increasing population and increasing development, it may be that new areas from time to time will need to be brought under control. I think I should point out once again that there is no such thing as absolute freedom. People often misinterpret the phrase "freedom of the individual." The freedom of the individual must be confined within boundaries that do not trespass on the freedom of other individuals. In other words, freedom of the individual must be exercised in relation to the rights of others. I think that a real attempt has been made by those promoting this Bill and the draftsman to protect individual rights—as it were, to sort out individual rights to see that everyone has a fair share, in so far as they could guarantee it, of underground waters; and to see that other people's rights are not trespassed on by doing

anything to pollute or interfere with the quantity or quality of the water in general. Thus, I am prepared to give my general support to this measure.

I think the detailed consideration of the Bill will be very important in the Committee stages, and that in some instances the powers granted by it may go beyond what I personally should like to see. Thus, I propose, in common with the honourable Mr. Story and, I think, the honourable Mr. Potter, to consider the detail of the Bill very carefully. It is a Bill that is made up of detail; it is not an easy one in any sense. As I have said before, it is a Bill that does take away rights from people, or at least threatens them with the possibility of rights being taken away. The main difficulty about the Bill is that we are dealing with matters that are not, and cannot be, completely defined, and that it will have to be largely a matter of individual opinion as to what should be done in each case that comes forward. Those sorts of matters must always be very carefully scrutinized because, to the use the old platitude, "to err is human," and there is no-one on earth who cannot fall into error, however expert he is.

I think a real attempt has been made to ensure that individual rights are protected. Whether anything more can be done in that regard we must consider in the Committee stages but, in the meantime, as I have indicated, I give general support to the measure as being something designed to protect the general weal of the landowners and residents of the State. I hope I may be able to contribute something further in the Committee stage.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.20 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, November 3, at 2.15 p.m.