

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, September 1, 1960.

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

QUESTIONS.**KIMBA WATER DISTRICT.**

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—Has the Attorney-General any further information regarding the question I asked on Tuesday about Kimba water supply?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—The honourable member's previous question was taken as referring to the dams and tanks supplying Kimba township and the information that was given was on that basis. However, he has now indicated that he intended his question to cover the tanks and dams in the Kimba district, and he now desires to know the quantity stored in the various supplies in the county of Buxton. I have a detailed schedule of supplies in all the various tanks and reservoirs in county Buxton, and I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Quantity Stored at 30/7/60.

Name of Supply.	In		Total. Gallons.
	Tank. Gallons.	Reservoir. Gallons.	
Moongi	971,000	2,430,000	3,401,000
Bascombe's Rock	64,000	—	64,000
Pinkawillinie	850,000	200,000	1,050,000
Cunyarie	1,000,000	1,738,000	2,738,000
Pilepudla	1,000,000	3,245,000	4,245,000
Malgra	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
Curtinye	799,000	65,000	864,000
Atora	1,170,000	—	1,170,000
Tola	1,162,000	—	1,162,000
Caralue	150,000	—	150,000
Laeroma	346,000	—	346,000
Mootra	944,000	—	944,000
Cortlinye	345,000	—	345,000
Wilka	693,000	—	693,000
Barna	78,000	—	78,000
Yalanda	1,000,000	586,000	1,586,000

TOWN PLANNING.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—In this morning's press is a report of a statement made by Mr. Lock of London criticizing the style of the houses that are being built at Elizabeth, and also offering some comments on town planning. I understand that this lecture or statement was delivered at a town planning meeting held in the Adelaide Town Hall. In order to do justice to Mr. Lock I ask the Minister has his attention been drawn

to the statement, and if not, will the Minister obtain a full copy of the statement so that the Housing Trust may be able to supply any refutation of the adverse criticism that has been made?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I have seen the statement referred to and shall be pleased to ascertain what further information I can get about it, not only with a view to doing justice to Mr. Lock, but with a view to doing justice to the Housing Trust.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—That is the point I make.

FAR NORTH ROADS.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—Much publicity has been given to the need for the provision and better maintenance of roads on what is known as the Marree-Birdsville stock route in the north-east portion of the State. I heartily agree with all that has been said, but I point out that similar conditions prevail in the north-west portion of our pastoral country in the districts around the Oodnadatta railway terminus. Both districts I have mentioned have, unfortunately, had a very dry period over the last two years and conditions are such that it is impossible for stockowners to get their stock to the railhead at Oodnadatta or Marree on the hoof, and the only means by which they can get them in is by motor transport, which is available in those areas.

I am informed, and I think reliably informed, that there are a number of cattle in store condition for which there is a ready market at present at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. Many people desire such stock for the purpose of fattening them on the more luxurious pastures in the better rainfall areas. I ask the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Works, if he will endeavour to have money set aside in the present financial year to enable work to be done on the roads that converge on Oodnadatta in the northern pastoral country. Those areas, which are outside district council areas, are under the control of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and I appreciate the work done there, but there is still something that can be done to make creeks trafficable and to take some of the bends out of the roads which are at present difficult for motor transport to negotiate. Will the Attorney-General make inquiries to see if something can be done to relieve the position in that area?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I shall be pleased to refer the matter to my colleague and I shall ask him if he will see what can be done on the lines of the honourable member's question.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I ask leave to make a statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—From time to time I have asked certain questions of the Minister of Roads and Railways about railway crossings. I now ask another question of a much more generalized nature. Since I have been asking these questions I have noticed that repairs have been done on one or two of the railway crossings but, with the heavy traffic on those roads, the bitumen that has been put around them is soon humped up again and forms bumps in a very short time. As I have said before, traffic conditions have changed considerably in recent years. Thousands of motor cars go over most railway crossings for every one train that goes over them, and I feel that motorists should be properly catered for in the changed circumstances. It occurs to me that it would be very easy for the Railways Department to design some form of standard crossing in, say, reinforced concrete that would not be very expensive but that could be used at all railway crossings on main roads. I emphasize "main roads", where heavy traffic is involved. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Roads and/or Railways look into the question and see if something of that nature cannot be done for the benefit of all road users?

The Hon. Sir LYELL MCEWIN—I will refer the question to the Minister concerned.

AMUSEMENTS DUTY (FURTHER SUSPENSION) BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 31. Page 848.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2)—It is refreshing to see such a splendid presentation by the Government of proposals for new and continuing development of this State in such a wide range of activity. I thank the Chief Secretary for his clear exposition of the various sections of this Bill. For many years the Government has been planning for and increasing the development of this State and it is interesting to note this year what a high proportion of the Estimates concerns completely new work as distinct from what we might call current functioning. For instance, we see that nearly £3,000,000 is for advances for houses, £134,000 for settlers, £560,000 for South-East drainage, £240,000 for irrigation and reclamation of swamp lands, more than £1,000,000 for afforestation and timber milling, £9,000,000 for waterworks and sewers, £2,000,000 for hospitals, nearly £5,000,000 for schools, and £2,000,000 for loan to the Electricity Trust for expansion and extended services and similarly £1,000,000 for the Leigh Creek coalfield. It is a most exciting story. It is natural that in a project such as running the State and distributing its financial resources to so many multifarious activities that every one of us will have items which we consider should receive a priority higher than they are receiving.

There are two fields of activity I should like to discuss, the first being our prisons. I see that we still cater for that large criminal element in the South-East. Last year we agreed to an amount of £5,000 for alterations to the Mount Gambier gaol and we were told at that stage it was for the commencement of building a new £15,000 block of 10 cells. This year we are allowing for an amount of £12,000 which is £2,000 more than at first mooted, raising the cost of each cell from £1,500 to £1,700. I expect some small luxury for the male prisoners was missed at first.

All honourable members who inspected the Cadell Training Centre earlier this year were extremely impressed by the efficient working of this most modern prison-without-bars. Congratulations were rightly bestowed upon the Minister and the Department for this tremendous step forward. Now it seems that a cell block is to be built at the cost of £75,000, and that this project is now to become a prison-almost-without-bars. I understood that the success of this experiment depended largely

upon the confidence established in each trainee and that if that confidence were betrayed, then that trainee would be returned to Yatala. I should like to have this point clarified.

Some weeks after visiting Cadell, I inspected the Women's Prison which is situated in the Adelaide Gaol. After the magnificent buildings and general air of efficiency and contentment at Cadell, it came as a definite shock to me to find in what conditions women were imprisoned in this State. It amazed me that any degree of efficiency or discipline, or indeed peace, could be maintained in such an antiquated place. The fact that all three were maintained was only made possible by the fact that the members of the staff were women of high principles, determined to perform their duties with sympathy and firmness in the face of any difficulty. Whereas the men in the Adelaide Gaol are there usually only for a short time, either on remand or serving short sentences, the Adelaide Gaol is the only prison for women in this State other than, I believe, a couple of cells at Port Augusta. At present, there are several women serving very long sentences.

The staff of the Women's Prison is very small, and yet the prison is most efficiently run; it is spotlessly clean, and the food is excellently cooked, and there is an atmosphere of sympathetic discipline. I met the day staff only. These two fine women were coping very well indeed with the onerous task of looking after 20 prisoners in two separate yards. If one of them were called to the telephone or to answer the gate, then one yard was virtually without supervision for that time. The cells were wretchedly cold, and the prisoners were huddled over fuel stoves doing various small tasks. There were no facilities for spare-time training or rehabilitation. When one considers the excellent dormitory system at Cadell with its modern ablutions block, and the facilities for men prisoners to take up any training they desire to fit them for future useful citizenship, then it is very disappointing to find that these women are living in antiquated, uncomfortable conditions with the most primitive of toilet arrangements and that their only training for the future consists of voluntary groups who come and teach them such things as making bread flowers and patch-work quilts. Since then I believe that another voluntary group is going to teach them pottery under the misconception that what these women need is self-expression. Actually, of course, these women have expressed themselves too freely as it is—once too often as it were—and what they really need is to be re-educated by some

sort of training to think sanely and to live sensibly. Again, in contrast with the modern laundries at Cadell, here in the Women's Prison are enormous fuel coppers, so high that I could not see into them, but from them clouds of steam were rising. These women had to lift weighty clothes, dripping with water, out of these coppers. It could be done only with a stick. It was, therefore, no surprise to me to learn that there is a high percentage of gynaecological surgical cases among the women prisoners. Whereas one might have suspected that these women use their time in gaol to have these operations done at public expense, one also must realize that if they have no trouble of this kind when they go in as prisoners they stand a fair chance of developing it while doing laundry work under these conditions.

I realize that women prisoners in this State rarely number more than 20 but I cannot see that they should be punished in these extra ways just because they belong to a sex which is either much better than the male sex, or much brighter, *i.e.*, not caught so often. I ask that the Government give serious consideration to the building in the near future of a small, modern prison for women. I ask honourable members to give the matter their earnest consideration.

My second point refers to the Harbors Board, which is to receive £1,275,000 for many purposes, including the maintenance of certain jetties, presumably for those being used for cargo handling, such as Kingscote and Port Lincoln. The sum of £75,000 is to be spent on the Port Adelaide scheme for sundry works, and £70,000 on outports for sundry works. I would like to see a little more money allocated for the maintenance of some of the jetties that are at present being neglected. I view with distress what is apparently the policy of our Harbors Board with respect to the jetties that are not being used currently as part of our cargo arrangements. Throughout the world jetties and piers seem to have a fascination for local people and tourists alike as units of those national pleasure ground facilities of which we have been hearing so much lately, especially in regard to our tourist drive. The South Australian coast was in years past rather plentifully supplied with jetties and piers, and although I realize that in recent years many of them have played no part in the economy of the State they have quite evidently given pleasure to thousands of people on holiday bent. It is therefore with dismay that I have noticed in recent years that jetties not in

current use are receiving no maintenance whatsoever. Their bolts are allowed to rust, spikes and iron fittings to deteriorate, timber and decking to work loose until a storm inevitably does the rest. Immediately I recall jetties at Glenelg, half of Cape Jervis, and two-thirds of Kingston, one of the most magnificent jetties we have had in the State. It is used by the crayfish industry. Undoubtedly many more will be known to honourable members. I am not a lone voice in protesting against this policy. I have heard it referred to by many people who are not unconscious of the economics involved.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What has Glenelg done to deserve another jetty?

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER—It deserves a little help in connection with its tourist trade. It is all very well to outlay some thousands of pounds for various works under the Greater Port Adelaide Plan, the provision of national playgrounds in the rather dim future, and other things. This will be small comfort to the present generation who see such neglect of existing facilities for pleasure and recreation. I hope that the Government in the future will be able to spend a few thousand pounds a year on the maintenance of what would today cost many millions of pounds to replace.

In supporting this Bill it gives me great pleasure to congratulate the Government upon drawing up a plan to use the State's money so wisely and so well. It is a plan with a two-fold aim. The first is to provide the people of South Australia with the necessary facilities for efficient working and production, and the other is to provide the necessary basis of utilities to support the anticipated and inevitable considerable increase in population in the future.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

CELLULOSE AUSTRALIA LTD. (GOVERNMENT SHARES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 31. Page 851.)

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—This is a matter of great interest to people in the South-East, where the industry has been set up. It has created a use for timber from our forests and provided much employment, in addition to making Millicent into a fair-sized town. The Government has given it valuable and commendable aid. It has encouraged the setting up and expansion of industries all over the State. There has been

a great industrial expansion, particularly regarding the use of Government forest products. No doubt the support the Government gave to the cellulose industry was desirable. For many years we have seen timber lying about in our forests. The biggest part of the trees have been cut away and the rest has been left to rot. It seemed to be a waste and it was suggested that something should be done with the wood. Therefore, the setting up of the cellulose industry to use some of this timber was desirable.

All members know that the birth of the industry was difficult and the Government came to the rescue by providing capital. It purchased £22,273 worth of ordinary shares in 1928. Considerable difficulties arose later in connection with obtaining machinery actually ordered overseas at the outbreak of war. Consequently, there was a lag in the early stages of production. Because of the difficulties the Industries Development Committee, through the Government, was called upon in 1941 to bolster up the industry to the extent of about £100,000. By 1957 the Government had increased its holding to 69,342 fully paid up £1 shares. In 1960 the share capital of Cellulose Australia Limited was £696,875, and it had reserves amounting to £872,470, with tangible assets quoted at £2 8s. 9d. a share. It can be readily seen that the cellulose industry has developed into a going concern. Its ordinary £1 shares have been quoted up to £7 5s., and the company is showing a profit of 33.4 per cent on ordinary capital. What that means I would not attempt to tell the financiers of this House, but it is a very good position to be in. As a private enterprise advocate I believe the Government has fulfilled its function in supporting this valuable industry. It has helped to build it up until it has reached the stage today which I have just quoted. It could hardly be held that the industry requires any further infusion of Government support. Under the Industries Development Act the practice is to limit a guarantee to the minimum period that it is expected to be necessary for an undertaking to be able to carry on without Government support. The position regarding the Cellulose Company is different from some other industries. The Government provided some capital through the purchase of shares in the early stages, and somewhat similar circumstances apply to the Nairne pyrites works.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—The Government is only taking up its rights under this Bill.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—In the Nairne pyrites works the Government holds shares as well as having made a guarantee under the Industries Development Act. The best interests of the State can be served by the Government providing public facilities. There is no evidence that the Cellulose Company needs further assistance, as it is now a profit-making venture on a very sound footing. Many other profitable sources of investment would be available to the Government, because many commercial undertakings would be glad to have Government finance and the happy association which could be enjoyed if the Government were a shareholder. It is desirable that at an early stage the Government should get out of this undertaking and this sort of investment.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Why don't you advocate that with the Electricity Trust and buy the bondholders out?

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—There are many avenues in which Government funds could be used for State development. The Government should dispose of its holdings in the Cellulose Company at a suitable time and price and the very high prices that are offered today indicate that this is the time. I feel that when the market value of shares was low and while the company was struggling, it was a very laudable function of the Government to assist the company, but if the Government sold its interest in Cellulose it could use those funds to bolster development in other directions. A tremendous field for profitable expansion exists in primary industries, particularly in the South-East, where a policy of adequate road construction would bring about a broader diversification of production on smaller holdings, and a building up of country population to an undreamt of extent. I am sure the ultimate return to the Government both in profitable employment and growth of the State would be greater than if it maintained its interest in the Cellulose Company.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—We were not too well received on that policy in the South-East.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—I have not heard of anyone in the South-East who would not welcome with open arms any expenditure by the Government on roads in that area, and that is the point I wish to make. We are always faced with a road programme impossible to fulfil because of the lack of funds, and I suggest this as one alternative in developing the State. I realize it would not

be desirable, or perhaps wise and proper, for the Government to sell its investment at less than the highest possible price. The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill made that point quite clear in 1957 when we were debating whether the Government should take up further shares at that time. I believe it is not necessary now to continue to take a financial interest in industries that are properly and effectively constituted. They can carry on without the assistance of the Government, and I hope the Government will examine this point when considering the further purchase of shares in the Cellulose Company. Of course, if there is not a market for the rights within the period before which taking up the shares becomes necessary, the Government should not throw away its investment, but it is desirable to leave this field of investment to the public as soon as possible.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Do you think your ideas are shared by your electors?

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—I think so. Although I support the Bill, I believe the Government should quit this field in the interests of the State.

The Hon. A. C. HOOKINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

COUNTRY HOUSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 31. Page 849.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I support the second reading of this Bill, under which £100,000 is being granted to the South Australian Housing Trust out of moneys at present in the Home Purchase Guarantee Fund. I know I am expressing the opinion of all honourable members when I pay a compliment to the South Australian Housing Trust. In a comparison of various building authorities throughout the Commonwealth, the South Australian Housing Trust stands pre-eminent in efficiency, cheapness in cost of construction, and the co-operation of the staff from the executive down to those working on the housing schemes. Amongst all the housing authorities in the Commonwealth, the South Australian Housing Trust has the least amount of accrued rent owing to it. In New South Wales thousands of pounds is owed as rent by those occupying houses there, and the same applies, perhaps to a lesser degree, to Victoria. During the 12 months ended June 30, 1960, the trust completed

3,174 houses under all schemes including flats, and during the year ended June 30, 1959, 3,142 houses were completed. In all, 40,003 houses and flats have been completed by the trust since it commenced building operations in 1937. I do not intend tracing the history of the trust back to 1937, but most honourable members know that the trust was mainly established to provide houses for people on the basic wage. Since the war the Housing Trust has launched out as the principal building authority. Under the trust's house-sales scheme initiated in 1946 a total of 17,329 houses have been completed and sold in the metropolitan area and in the country. That figure does not include houses previously let. On July 1, 1960, a total of 2,503 houses were under construction and the total amount of rent receivable by the trust from all its houses during the year ended June 30, 1960, was £2,791,427.

That gives a comprehensive account of the activities of the Housing Trust in its efforts to catch up with the demand for houses, and those efforts were made notwithstanding the activities of various other authorities, such as the Savings Bank, the State Bank and the operation of the Homes Act. At this stage I ask the Minister to indicate why the Homes Act has not been used more for house building, for that was the intention when it was passed. The preamble to that Act states:—

In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, or some other meaning is clearly intended—

“dwelling-house” includes the land on which a dwelling-house is erected and all appurtenances of the dwelling-house, outbuildings, fences and permanent provision for lighting, water supply, drainage and sewerage;

“guarantee” means guarantee given by the Treasurer under this Act;

All the authorities mentioned, namely, the Co-operative Building Society of South Australia, the Hindmarsh Loan Land and Building Investment Society on the Permanent Principle Incorporated, the Permanent Economic Loan Land Building and Investment Society Incorporated, the Imperial Permanent Building and Investment Society Incorporated, the Savings Bank of South Australia, and the South Australian Superannuation Fund Board in addition to the Independent Order of Odd-fellows Manchester Unity Friendly Society in South Australia, and a number of lodges including the Australian Natives' Association and the Hibernian Australasian Catholic Benefit Society, Adelaide District, No. 7, have the right under the provisions of the Act to seek a guarantee.

The institutions to which money has been lent are required, in the section which the House is now asked to amend, to pay a quarter of the amount guaranteed into the fund and that fund now, according to the second reading speech of the Minister, contains £99,000. The amendment proposes that an amount of £100,000 shall be handed over to the South Australian Housing Trust to enable it to build houses in the country for war widows, deserted wives, old-age and invalid pensioners and those in indigent circumstances. In February, 1958, the Government allotted £368,000 to the trust from the Federal grant under the Housing Agreement for the purpose of building homes.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Free of interest?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No, there is nothing free of interest from the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Are you sure?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes. Since I have been in Parliament I have never known the Commonwealth Government to hand over anything free. It is not the policy of the Commonwealth Government to apportion back to the State the amount of taxation it has garnered in this State. Much of the amount that the Commonwealth lends through the Loan Council is money we have paid as taxation to the Commonwealth. The same comments apply to the reserve fund and the money taken from the private banks and private institutions. They have to borrow it back at six per cent, which is the amount charged by the Reserve Bank. There is not much left from the Commonwealth Government to those desiring some small recompense.

The Hon. C. R. Story—You should adopt the Liberal policy.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No, I have always told my honourable friend he has much to learn. If he keeps close to Labor policy he will have something to give to the electors. The Government now, through the efficiency of the Housing Trust, is basking in the reflected glory of the trust and of the good work performed and, like Bill Adams who won the battle of Waterloo, it steps in front and takes the glory. The Housing Trust not only builds houses, but it is capable of handling its own finances. If it were not for the outstanding ability of its two senior executive officers I do not think it would be in quite such a prosperous position. I give full credit to the Housing Trust board and its officers. All this measure does is to make provision for £100,000 now lying in the Home

Purchase Guarantee Fund to be given to the Housing Trust for the purpose of carrying out house building in the country. Houses are needed in the country and the trust will provide them at an economic rental for those able to pay.

Before I conclude I desire to mention that the trust has built 582 cottage flats. Honourable members will remember that I advocated a scheme to build cottage flats in 1948-49 and the trust, in its wisdom, saw fit to look after the aged and the infirm of the State. It has charged only nominal rents for the cottage flats. It has been suggested that until then the old-age people were a forgotten legion in the community.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—Are you trying to take the credit away from the trust?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No. I usually ooze with humility but in 1948-49 I did advocate that scheme and prepared it. Now the Minister is charging me with taking the credit. I do not desire any credit and I wish to give it all to the Housing Trust. I merely say that I evolved such a scheme and the Housing Trust, very laudably, acted on it. Honourable members will remember that I went to the trouble of collecting all the information that was available at that time on various schemes in operation in Great Britain and South Africa particularly.

I am one who gives the Housing Trust full credit. I do not wish to take credit from the trust. I further compliment the Housing Trust on its cottage flats, but I ask the Minister whether some scheme could not be devised whereby the trust, instead of having to find the full amount for the construction of cottage homes for which it does not collect an economic rent, could be allocated money from the Commonwealth Government on a £2 for £1 subsidy basis to build homes for aged people. If a scheme of that type could be devised the trust could accelerate its building efforts to the satisfaction of all concerned.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—Commonwealth policy is adverse to subsidizing homes for the aged.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—If that were done and the trust were subsidized the building of homes would be accelerated and the money now used to build cottage homes could be used for other purposes. I have the utmost regard for the Housing Trust despite some adverse criticism that may be engendered against it. I admire its efficient and courteous methods and the way in which its officers have,

by planning ahead, made the trust the premier building authority in Australia.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 31. Page 850.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—Every time the trade union movement spends a considerable amount of money fighting for improvements in the Commonwealth Arbitration Court and is successful a Bill of this signal nature appears in this Council. The Bill provides for an increase in the salaries of certain public officers whose remuneration is fixed by Act of Parliament. Early this year the Public Service Board prescribed a scale of general increases for public servants ranging from £54 to £260 a year. The rates prescribed were paid from March 7, 1960. I draw attention to the fact that when it suits the Government and its supporters the Government will always make retrospective payment, but when it comes to a question of doing something for those on a lower standard of wages there is always a fight against retrospective payment. The salaries affected by this Bill are those of the Agent General, the Auditor-General, the Commissioner of Police, the Public Service Commissioner, and the President and Deputy President of the Industrial Court. The Bill also contains a provision concerning the South Australian Railways Commissioner, the Commissioner of Highways, and the Deputy Commissioner of Police. Increased payment to all these officers is made retrospective to March 7. I support this legislation and I do not intend mentioning the amounts that will be paid to these gentlemen, but I suggest that they are probably twice as much as a member of Parliament receives.

I hope that the officers who will receive the increases will not lose sight of the fact that the trade union movement fought for an increased basic wage and marginal increases, and all their increases are based on union efforts. Might I mention that the Government, which does not believe in retrospectivity, is providing in this Bill for back payments. The officers concerned are entitled to the same consideration that other public servants have received. I therefore support the second reading.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—I support the Bill. The Hon. Mr. Condon

mentioned that the Trades and Labour Council had fought for increased payments. I consider that the word "fought" is wrongly used. The duty of the Arbitration Court is to consider the case of both sides and then make an award. It is not a question of fighting, but the amount awarded is decided according to the prosperity of the country. The Trades and Labour Council represents a large section of the community, and were it not for some organized body of employees probably the case would not be heard by the court and its requests would have to be considered in some other way. Trade unions claim that they are responsible for all wage increases, but I do not think they can say that because of their fight all those increases have been granted. As the result of awards there have been increased wages and salaries throughout the community. Because the salaries of the officers mentioned in the Bill are governed by Statute law, the increased salaries suggested must be agreed to by Parliament.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—They get more than Ministers of the Crown.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—Not necessarily. The Ministers feel that these gentlemen are entitled to the proposed salary increases, and I am prepared to accept their views.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Do you think that a public servant is worth more than a Minister of the Crown?

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—It all depends. Ministers of the Crown come and go. It is not a career, as with civil servants, and often a Minister has some other income. I cannot see any reason why the gentlemen concerned should not receive the increases, as these increases conform to the general increases already given to other public servants. I consider that the rates prescribed for these officers are not too high and I therefore support the Bill.

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

MILE END OVERWAY BRIDGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 31. Page 852.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—To appreciate the extent of the proposed amendments one should have to delve into history. In 1925 the Mile End Overway Bridge Act was passed. Under it that portion of

Hindley Street that passed through the West park lands was closed and became portion of the park lands. A new roadway was constructed extending from the Currie Street intersection with West Terrace through the park lands and eventually linking up with Henley Beach Road. The Act provided for authority for the construction and maintenance of the bridge. Provision was also made for a public roadway underneath the bridge and certain railway lines had to be removed. At the time the Metropolitan Tramways Trust was made responsible for the upkeep of the roadway under the bridge and the approaches to it. The Bill is introduced as a result of a request of the trust, which wishes to relinquish this responsibility because of the discontinuance of electric traction and the use of buses.

It provides that this land shall cease to be vested in the trust and shall be vested in and under the care, control and management of the Thebarton Corporation as portion of a public street. The roadway under the bridge is divided by a bridge support, resulting in effect in a two-way thoroughfare running north and south. The amendment should go further than it does, because another strip of land must be considered, and I want more information about it. On the south-western side of the bridge there is a narrow strip of land under the jurisdiction of the Tramways Trust, and it has been so ever since the bridge was constructed. That land has been used by the trust for storage purposes. Many sleepers have been stacked there for years to be used as replacements. I inquired from the trust whether the Bill covered this strip of land or whether it would still be retained by the trust. I was told that the trust intended to let it go along with its other responsibilities mentioned in the Bill. I can find no reference in this measure to the land and I wonder whether it will revert to the Highways Commissioner or become a no-man's land and later a rubbish dump. The Thebarton Corporation can see no mention of the land reverting to its jurisdiction, but if that is the intention I am sure the corporation will be glad to have it. I do not know whether the Government wants the land to revert to the Commissioner of Highways. It has never been under his jurisdiction, because it is in the Thebarton Corporation area. Perhaps this matter has been overlooked.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Who do you think should get it?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—As the land will be useless to the Commissioner of Highways I

suggest that the Minister might further consider the matter with a view to its being placed under the control of the Thebarton Corporation. If that were done it would not become an uncontrolled rubbish dump. It is not large enough for a house, but it would be useful to the corporation. We should clear up the position in respect of this strip of land.

Clause 4 amends section 4 (1) of the principal Act by deleting the words "Municipal Tramways Trust at all times" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "The Commissioner of Highways as a charge against the moneys in the Highways Fund." This means that in future the upkeep of the bridge and road approaches will be in the hands of the Commissioner of Highways. Clause 4 also deletes subsection (2), and this has relation to the control of the bridge and approaches by the Commissioner of Highways. I support the Bill, but would like the Minister to explain the position regarding the narrow strip of land I mentioned.

The Hon. A. C. HOOKINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 31. Page 851.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Central No. 1)—This is not a controversial Bill and makes only two amendments to the principal Act. The Opposition does not oppose the measure, but regrets the necessity for its introduction, because it does not think the Commonwealth Bank acts in the best interests of the people. The amendment to our Act is consequential upon alterations to Commonwealth legislation. The first amendment in the Bill deletes from section 7 (1) the words "Commonwealth Bank of Australia" and inserts in lieu thereof the words "Reserve Bank of Australia." The second amendment deals with trust funds and the financial procedure to be adopted under the Act. I support the Bill.

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

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of House of Assembly amendments.

(Continued from August 31. Page 852.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—Yesterday I moved that amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—The amendments are not on the file.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I am sorry to hear that, and, in consequence, I think progress should be reported so that they can be put on members' files.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I raised this question yesterday because I thought it might have something to do with the question I raised on May 10 last. I am satisfied the amendment is all right. It was intended to make clear that a plea of guilty can be signed before a justice of the peace and other officers. This is an amendment of the 1957 Act and I thought it might have something to do with the question I raised concerning people who were not permitted to plead guilty on arrest. I am quite satisfied to support the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 2.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I move that amendment No. 2 be agreed to. Since the Bill was introduced in this Chamber the Government has considered representations made by the Metropolitan County Board proposing a further extension of the procedure prescribed by section 57a of the principal Act to cases initiated by officers or employees of county boards and local boards of health. The constitution and function of these boards are similar to municipal and district councils and the extension of the procedure to those cases can be justified for that reason and the amendment will give effect to the proposal by widening the definition of "Public Officer" to include officers of county boards and local boards. I recommend the amendment. What is being attempted is to provide facilities whereby a defendant can enter a plea of guilty in the court by an endorsement on the back of the summons and sending it back to the court instead of attending the court to enter a plea of guilty. When an endorsed summons is returned to the court it saves the court the time and trouble of calling police officers and other witnesses. Last year's amendment allowed this procedure in prosecutions by the police, and this year we are extending it to cover prosecutions by certain public boards. That amendment extended the procedure to prosecutions by the Commonwealth or an instrumentality of the Commonwealth, or the State or an instrumentality of the State, or by municipal or district councils. The Bill extends it to prosecutions by a county board. They are all public boards and the amendment is justified.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I hope the Attorney-General will consider the points I have raised when another Bill is introduced. This Bill certainly improves the position but it does not go far enough. Take the case of a person who, arrested on a charge of driving under the influence of liquor is brought before the court and his name is mentioned in the press. I know of cases where people are found not guilty but their names have been published everywhere showing they appeared before the court, but it is not published that they pleaded not guilty and that the charge was dismissed. Take the case of a man down from Woomera who meets a few friends on a Saturday and finds himself arrested for drunkenness. He may be bailed out at 11 o'clock at night or the next morning. Why should he not be able to appear before a justice of the peace, plead guilty, and pay his fine? Why should he have to remain down here all Sunday and Monday because he cannot return by train to Woomera before Tuesday and perhaps get into trouble on his return and lose time? Why should not some Act provide that consideration could be given to a man who is allowed to be bailed out? Once arrested a person must appear before the court and I think this is a matter which the Government should consider.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—I take it that these extensions apply only to minor offences and not for the offence of driving under the influence of alcohol. It is in quite a different category when a man is arrested. I support the Bill as it stands. It provides that the person charged need not appear in court, but I was intrigued by the Attorney-General saying that no police officer or witness need be called, because I think the court must have some information upon which to fix the penalty. I accept the Attorney-General's statement as regards these amendments, but not if it goes any further.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—The matter raised by the Hon. Mr. Condon is something different from what is proposed in this Bill. I will look at his suggestions and give them consideration. Regarding the matter raised by the Hon. Sir Frank Perry, the provisions which this legislation seeks to implement only come into force after the defendant has written and entered a plea of guilty to the charge, which presumably means he admits the truth of the facts alleged against him in the complaint. The prosecutor informs the court of the facts and on those

facts the court imposes the penalty. If the defendant feels he should put aspects of the case to the court he should be there. The effect of this legislation is to save time, expense and delay to our courts and the police force. I recommend that the Committee accepts the amendment.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—When this type of amendment was first introduced only a few years ago, we were told if I remember rightly it was by way of experimentation, and if successful it would be extended to other arenas. It has been eminently successful as I thought it would be at that time. I had been engaged in a number of cases contemplated by this Act, and I am happy to see this further extension. I have been engaged in cases for the Metropolitan County Board as prosecutor and I know how much time the Court and prosecutor wastes when cases have to be proved in the absence of the defendant. It is a great boon to the defendant to be able to use a cheap and simple procedure to enter a plea of guilty. I do not know whether anything else could be covered by the Bill, such as the Hon. Mr. Condon has suggested, and the Attorney-General has agreed to look into that. I agree with the Attorney-General that it is something that would need careful consideration, because as the Hon. Sir Frank Perry pointed out, the legislation is only intended to apply to the most minor of offences. I am happy to see this further amendment and I am sure it will save much time and expense to many people.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I said I supported this amendment, but I referred also to minor offences. Under this provision serious offences could be met by sending in a written submission to the court or through a solicitor. Why shouldn't a man charged with a minor offence be able to plead guilty through his solicitor? That cannot be done because he must attend, and that is the point I raise.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—I understand the honourable member's point.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—He could send a letter either direct or through his solicitor to the prosecutor indicating that he wished to plead guilty and leave the matter in the hands of the court. That is all I am asking.

Amendment agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.53 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, September 6, at 2.15 p.m.