

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, October 20, 1960.

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

QUESTION.**MILK FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN.**

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER—I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER—As honourable members know, since 1950, when the States Grant (Milk for School Children) Act was passed, all children under the age of 13 years attending public or private primary schools have been eligible to receive free milk. The object of the Act was to improve the diet of school children by the addition of a small quantity of milk daily. The cost of the milk, plus half the capital or incidental costs (including the administrative expenses of the scheme) is reimbursed by the Commonwealth to the States. There are in this State a small number of institutions—I believe about half a dozen—which, by charity, are caring for infants who are destitute or orphans under school-going age. In view of the Government's splendid health schemes and its interest in the welfare of our young children, I ask the Chief Secretary if he will examine the possibility of having the free milk scheme extended to include the cases to which I refer. There are not a great number of children involved. I can give the Minister a list of the institutions I have in mind, which will cover most cases in this State. I know that this would be greatly appreciated by the various organizations which are sometimes short of money and battling to develop these less fortunate children into good healthy Australians.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—If the honourable member will give me a list of the institutions to which she refers I will have the matter examined. If these necessitous cases are pre-school they may be already receiving some consideration through the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department. Without information concerning specific cases I am unable to answer the question, but if the honourable member will give me the particulars I will look into the matter.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following final reports by the Parliamentary

Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:—

Gepps Cross and Hendon (Kidman Park) Girls Technical High Schools.
Heathfield High School.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS.

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

That it be an order of this Council that all papers and other documents ordered by the Council during the session and not returned prior to the prorogation, and such other official reports and returns as are customarily laid before Parliament and printed, be forwarded to the President in print as soon as completed, and if received within two months after such prorogation, that the Clerk of the Council cause such papers and documents to be distributed amongst members and bound with the Minutes of Proceedings; and as regards those not received within such time, that they be laid upon the table on the first day of next session.

Motion carried.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

BIRTHS AND DEATHS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

ART GALLERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

PORT PIRIE RACECOURSE LAND REVESTMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL TREATMENT OF CHILDREN BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The main object of this Bill is to enable medical practitioners to perform life-saving operations upon children whose parents refuse to give their consent to such operations or cannot be found. It is regrettable that it has become necessary to introduce a measure of this nature. Members are no doubt aware that for the most part objections by parents to the performance of certain operations on their children—I refer in particular to operations of the nature of blood transfusions—are based on religious grounds. While the Government

respects the religious views of all sections of the community, and is reluctant to interfere with those views or with the right of an adult person to decide for himself whether he should submit to the performance of an operation to save his own life, the Government feels that the lives and health of children are largely a State responsibility. The Bill should therefore be regarded as one designed for the purpose not of denying parents their right to control the religious upbringing of their children, but of withdrawing from some persons the power of life or death over others.

The operation of blood transfusion is an accepted medical treatment throughout the civilized world as a means of saving life in certain critical cases and it is felt that there is no justification, whether on religious or other grounds, for denying a child in a critical condition the chance of survival, if such a chance exists through the performance of any life-saving operation. Every human being has the right to protect and safeguard his own life, and no parent should be vested with a power to condemn any child of his who is in urgent need of such medical attention to die because that parent holds certain religious convictions. I submit that the foregoing reasons alone are sufficient to justify the passing of the legislation. Similar legislation has recently been passed in Queensland and New South Wales.

This Bill provides that a medical practitioner may perform an operation on a child without parental or other legal consent if—

- (a) such consent has been refused or the person entitled to give the consent cannot be found;
 - (b) the practitioner has had previous experience in performing such operation;
 - (c) the practitioner has obtained a second medical opinion confirming the condition from which the child is suffering, that the operation is reasonable and proper for that condition and is essential to save the life of the child; and
 - (d) in the case of every operation of blood transfusion, the practitioner assures himself before commencing the operation that the blood to be transfused is compatible with that of the child.
- Members will observe the safeguards that have been written into the Bill. If a parent or other person entitled to consent to the operation is available, his consent must first be sought. This would enable the parent or

other person to ascertain whether a second opinion on the child's condition has been obtained and, if not, to seek one. The right of seeking a second opinion is not taken away from the parent although it is appreciated that in a town where there is only one practitioner, a second opinion is not always obtainable; but to deprive a parent of this right could have the effect of denying the child the best medical treatment that a responsible parent is able and willing to provide.

The Bill also places certain responsibilities on the medical practitioner in cases where parental consent is not obtained. He must have had previous experience in performing the operation and a second opinion must not only confirm his diagnosis, but also confirm that the operation is reasonable and proper and essential to save the child's life, and, in the case of every blood transfusion, the practitioner must ensure that the blood is compatible with that of the child. These safeguards are essential where a parent's wishes are to be overridden.

I invite members' attention to subclause (2) of clause 3, which provides in effect that an operation performed pursuant to and in accordance with subclause (1) of that clause shall be deemed to have been performed with the necessary consent. This places practitioners performing operations in those circumstances in the same position in law as they would be if the necessary consent had been obtained, without relieving them from liability for negligence. Subclause (3) of this clause clarifies the intention that the powers conferred on practitioners by the Bill are additional to existing powers vested in practitioners in relation to the performing of any operation.

I submit that this Bill gives effect to a principle that should find favour with all members and commend it for favourable consideration.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 1411.)

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—I congratulate the Treasurer on presenting this year his 22nd Budget. That is a wonderful achievement, of which all South Australians can be proud. Although the Government budgeted for a deficit of £791,000 last year

the actual deficit was only £311,000. In recent years South Australia has had tremendous industrial expansion, and the Treasurer himself has been largely responsible for encouraging industries to come here. For years South Australia has been regarded as a primary producing State, but even with the great influx of manufacturing industries there is room for many more. Since the advent of these industries we have been inclined to forget the responsibilities that have developed upon our primary producers, who help to provide a living for the people of South Australia and also earn most of our export income. I am more particularly concerned with living standards than with wage standards. It is much more important to have a good living than a high wage. Some people feel that it is more important to have a pocket full of money to spend, with which they cannot buy very much anyhow, than have a high standard of living. Our standard of living is high and I hope it will be maintained. I shall always advocate the highest living standard for all sections of the community, but it must be commensurate with our economic development and national security.

South Australia has just passed through the driest year on record. The State has had some very dry years, but the impact of this driest year was not so great on our primary production as it might have been. Probably that was due to greater diversification of farming, better farming methods, and the building up of fodder stocks. Although the impact was not as serious as it might have been, there was a considerable reduction in returns, and almost all primary producers completely depleted their fodder reserves, had stock losses, and absorbed any capital that they may have accumulated in the form of financial reserves. Therefore, primary producers are faced with the problem of carrying on without much financial help. The Budget provides for a surplus, despite wage increases and marginal adjustments costing £1,500,000 on the Government payroll for the year. A Budget surplus is a happy prospect for the State. I look with some regret upon the increased costs resulting from wage increases. The impact of those increases has had a tremendous effect, particularly on primary industry, where prices have declined and where it is impossible to pass the increases on. Soldier settlers and others who have recently bought land at present-day high prices are passing through a serious economic period and I hope that the chickens of this indiscretion do not come home to roost.

We are fortunate that we have experienced an early break in the year and reports indicate that we may have a good season. If that is so primary producers may be able to overcome the setback of last year. I hope that the settlers who have particularly suffered may, at least partly, rehabilitate themselves in the present year, which promises an abundant harvest. The general standard of living in the State has been high and it is to be hoped that it can be maintained. The Commonwealth has asked that an effort be made to increase exports by £250,000,000 in the next five years. We should consider the source of our exports and where they are likely to come from in the future. I think that South Australia has been particularly singled out in this connection following last year's dry season because the other States generally had fairly good rains. The export of primary production from Australia represents over 80 per cent of the total export production of the Commonwealth, and when we consider the work force engaged in primary production—only about eight per cent of the total force—members will realize how important primary production has been and still is.

The United Kingdom is a notable exporting country of manufactured goods and in that country approximately the same proportion of the total employment as in Australia provides over 80 per cent of the export income. From that we may realize what can be done in Australia and what has been achieved by primary production. The part that primary production is called upon to play in the economy of Australia is great when we consider wage standards and increases. In the last eight years our export income has not improved, but our population has increased by 1,500,000, or about 17.5 per cent. I have an informative report contained in the *Monthly Summary of Australian Conditions* of the National Bank dated September 15, 1960. I believe all members are supplied with a copy of this review, which states under the heading of "National Income and Expenditure, 1959-60":—

National income is estimated at £A.5,489m., an increase of £420m., or 8.3 per cent, compared with 1958-59. A rise of £272m. to £3,311m. in wages and salaries provided the bulk of the increase in national income for the year. Company income rose by £43m. to £672m.; the income of unincorporated businesses (other than farms) increased by £36m. to £577m., and net rent and interest rose by £40m., to £367m.

The important part that I wish to draw the attention of the Council to is that farm incomes

increased by only £8,000,000 or by 1.7 per cent, in spite of the very large proportion of revenue provided by the farming community. The report continues:—

The main factor limiting farm incomes appears to have been higher costs as the gross value of rural production rose by £40m., of which costs and other payments absorbed £32m.

I have quoted from that report to show the position that is developing in primary production today. The reserves of primary producers in South Australia have been depleted both financially and otherwise and they are finding it particularly difficult to get further loan money with which to develop their properties. I have had several complaints from farmers who have been requested to reduce their overdrafts and for the information of the Council I shall refer to one case. This man, who shall remain nameless, had very good security but needed money to meet an account with a company with which he was associated on his property. He had valuable assets which formerly would have been accepted by banking institutions, but on this occasion he waited on most of the institutions in the city and each one told him that it was not interested in the proposition. He went to one bank and received a reply from the manager which was rather typical of other advice he received. He was told the bank could not advance him "two bob." However, the manager, who had known the applicant all his life, gave him a letter of introduction to a subsidiary of the bank and told him that he might be able to get the finance there.

He went to the hire-purchase section of the bank and was readily offered money at 12 per cent. Everybody knows that primary producers cannot possibly pay that rate of interest and remain solvent unless the money is borrowed for only a short period. This subsidiary company, after telling the primary producer it would lend him money at 12 per cent, informed him quite genially that if he liked to take anything over £100,000 it would consider a reduced interest rate. It seems that hire-purchase companies are not short of money. I am not criticising the banks for going into the hire-purchase business. We all appreciate that the Commonwealth Government, in its wisdom or desire to ensure some financial stability in the Commonwealth, has taken charge of certain funds of the banks and is paying an extremely low rate of interest for it. Consequently the banks have not as much money to lend now as they had because of the competition from hire-purchase companies,

which offer very high rates of interest, and because many people have subscribed to debentures in these companies at eight or nine per cent. These companies can and are charging a high rate of interest. The banks have been forced to go into the hire-purchase business so that they may reap the benefits from it, because very few people are prepared to invest money with the banks on fixed deposit at two or three per cent. I am not an expert on finance but I am putting the case, as I see it, on behalf of the primary producer. With the limited rate of interest they can charge under Commonwealth regulation and the tying up of their surplus funds, the banks have not had the best of times and have been forced into the hire-purchase business.

As a result of these moves the bulk of farm finance is now handled by stock agents. I was not only amazed but dismayed to find that one of our leading stock firms is now investing in hire-purchase, and perhaps within a short time all the stock firms will be forced to follow this example and maintain hire-purchase subsidiaries themselves. It is indeed a gloomy outlook for the primary producer who is trying to obtain money to carry on his farming operations at either an increased level, or indeed to maintain the level which he has already achieved. All honourable members should be concerned at these matters. We fully appreciate what the stock firms have done over the years and that they took over a great deal of the finance originally supplied by the banks to the primary industry, but they were selling the producers' wool, grain and produce and had good reason to do so. But the primary producer still has the problem of obtaining the necessary finance at a reasonable rate of interest in order to carry on and increase his production. I feel that the high standard reached in primary production in Australia generally, and in South Australia in particular, demonstrates how we have developed in the last 50 years.

In earlier days eight or nine bushels to the acre was a good crop, but now the farmer is disappointed if he does not get eight or nine bags, and this improvement is shown also in other sections of primary production. We know that, generally speaking, Australians are indeed having a very good time and that the total savings banks deposits of the Commonwealth are now £1,529,000,000 an increase of 10 per cent on last year. According to the South Australian Savings Bank report, deposits from the rural population were considerably

reduced because of the drought. At the end of June 1960, the balance in all the savings banks of the Commonwealth showed an increase of 10 per cent for the year, representing an increase in the average deposit per capita from £135 to £147. The increase on the average operative account was from £165 to £172 during the same period. The Savings Bank of South Australia has financed the building of homes. It provides finance for social services and district councils in the country and suchlike, but the amount it has provided for primary production has been only about one-sixth of the total amount that has been advanced. Perhaps it could increase assistance to the industry, but the State Bank of South Australia is the bank we shall have to look to if no other avenue becomes available. I appreciate that the obligation is on the Commonwealth to see that high interest rate companies are not given all sorts of privileges as against the normal banks and lending institutions. If some similar control is instituted to bring into line all institutions of that description so as to give the banks and the stock firms the opportunity to compete with them, this trouble may be overcome without any great effort. The State Bank has money to lend for primary producers, but it has not enough to satisfy all the applications that have been made this year by them for relief.

I understand the Government has certain powers under the State Bank Act for special advances to primary industries, and perhaps we have reached the stage when we should call upon the Government to take steps to use some of those powers. It would need only a temporary measure as it would not be similar to drought relief or gifts of money, as I feel that the primary industry generally has been able to cope pretty well with financial difficulties. There are a number of returned soldiers and others who bought into primary industry at very high rates at a time when there was a great fall in prices. I should like the Government to look into that aspect and see if it can make some recommendation to the Commonwealth Government to ameliorate the position so that they can get finance to enable them to carry on. I know that these people will carry on whatever happens. I have heard it said that many are carrying on, even those with a reasonable rainfall, with interest on their capital of only one or two per cent. If primary industries are to continue to develop and provide the great bulk of our export income, then they must be given a little better hold on the handle of the stick and be

able to get financial accommodation to tide them through the difficulties and stresses from which they are now suffering. I support the Bill.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2)— I did not come prepared to say anything this afternoon, but I was intrigued with some of the Hon. Mr. Densley's remarks. I feel that he has struck a note which I struck on another occasion, namely, a warning of the serious position that we are getting into with bank finance for primary production, and indeed for any production that is allied to the use of capital goods. I should like to join with the honourable member in congratulating the Treasurer on the very fine job he has done in the preparation of this year's Budget. The fact that he has budgeted for a modest surplus is in line with the best economic advice that can be given in these days, and in line with the financial advice and policy which this year has been explored and utilized by the Commonwealth Government. The fact that this State has seen fit to follow the same line of economic thought is excellent. That the State has been able to do this following upon the experience of our worst drought on record and without any special proposals for increases in taxes and charges is a remarkable tribute to the Treasurer and his advisers.

Mr. Densley said that at the moment bank finance was very tight and he mentioned the experience of one of his constituents who could not get any money for his requirements from the bank with which he had dealt for a number of years. The bank manager, who had known all about his financial situation, then referred him to a financial company which, it was alleged, was a subsidiary of that bank. I looked into this matter some time ago and I do not think that the facts and statistics bear out any suggestion that the banks today are investing their funds entirely through financial companies that are subsidiaries. In fact, figures show that the amount of money invested by banks, either as capital or as loans, has in fact lately decreased. Practically the only finance the banks today have in these finance companies is of a capital nature where they have taken up certain groups of shares. That, of course, represents only a drop in the bucket as regards the finance available to these particular companies, which are raising much of their money from the public at high rates of interest; and often this money is going out into hire-purchase transactions on consumer goods.

I gave some figures on this matter in the Address in Reply debate and there is no question about their accuracy. Only five per cent of the money made available through finance companies is going into capital equipment for future production. Of course, primary producers' expenditure is in the nature of capital equipment in the form of machinery, grain and superphosphate. It is not in any way for consumable goods. It is a fact that today banks are not increasing their advances, and have been ordered by the Commonwealth Bank not to do so. Their deposits in the Central Bank have been increased by a directive from that bank.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—The Central Bank is sitting on the money?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER—Yes, and paying the trading banks a nominal rate of interest of only one per cent. This has resulted in the trading banks not having sufficient money to continue to progress. It is a law in the financial world that once a business comes to a full stop, it tends to stagnate. Once a bank has got to the position that all its available funds are out on overdraft, and it has been told by the Central Bank that it must not increase its lending, then it has reached a condition of financial stagnation. Therefore, the only thing the bank can do if it wants to keep alive and perform its accepted function, is to have a whip round amongst its customers and say, "I am sorry, but you will have to reduce your overdraft a little. We now want you to start paying a bit back."

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—That is a negative policy. What dictates that?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER—If a bank has 500 overdraft customers and says to each of them "I am sorry, but you will have to find £100 to reduce your overdraft," it means it will have another £50,000 to keep itself going. It is not permitted to increase its advances in the normal way.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—The value of assets does not come into it then?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER—That is so.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—That is unusual in these prosperous times.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER—It is a result of the banking policy, which I do not question. The banks, as it were, are putting a mild squeeze upon their customers to reduce their overdrafts in order to keep up their liquidity so that there will not be stagnation; and on

the other hand we have these finance companies lending money at high rates of interest, mainly for consumable goods, with no controls on them by the Commonwealth Government. I am suggesting that if the money that is being circulated through finance companies was circulated through the banking system, a different state of affairs would exist and primary producers and others would not be in their present situation. In the past the banks have always followed the traditional method of using their funds and have never, according to my knowledge, gone out on this great splurge on consumable goods. The amount of money invested by the banks in finance companies has diminished greatly. I think that some five or six years ago about £16,000,000 was invested in these companies and that figure has now been reduced to under £6,000,000. That will show the reduction of the banks' interests in finance companies. We must look to the Commonwealth Government to solve this problem. It is outside the realm of State Parliaments to do anything about it. At the moment there are certain constitutional problems for the Commonwealth Government to face up to. I think the time is not far distant when we shall find something will have to be done about it.

In going through the Estimates my attention was called to two or three items, on which I should like to comment. Firstly, I congratulate the Government and the Libraries Board on the great effort they are making, particularly in the establishment of suburban libraries. There has been a tremendous demand for good books from the general public. Some time ago when the introduction of a free lending service in the metropolitan area was mooted it was said that people would not want to read the types of books that would be available, because they would prefer Westerns and thrillers to be read at leisure. However, the present position is quite the reverse. With the advent of television the demand for detective stories, wild west novels and lighter love romances has been met. That type of entertainment can be obtained from television *ad nauseum*. The prognostication of the Libraries Board has proved to be correct. People do want good books on scientific and educational subjects. The libraries in the metropolitan area, particularly the one at Marion where the success has been remarkable, have proved that the demand for good books is colossal. The demand for the lighter fiction has fallen away. The board is to be congratulated on establishing these lending libraries. I hope that in the

future we shall have more of them. The scheme has my commendation.

I am pleased that this year the Government has increased the grant to the Law Society for the administration of the poor persons' legal relief scheme. The additional £5,000 will be used to good purpose. The legal profession must be congratulated on the way in which it has co-operated in the management and working of this legal relief scheme. Legal help has been denied to practically no-one really needing it. Even hardened criminals with long records have been provided with this legal assistance. Much of the work has fallen on the shoulders of the young practitioners, but the senior men are always available when called on. The legal profession is really the Cinderella profession as far as remuneration is concerned. No benefit scheme is available to the legal profession, as there is available to medical practitioners. Those employed in the legal profession work long hours for comparatively small reward. This applies particularly to members of the profession who are asked to assist under the poor persons' legal relief scheme. They spend long hours in the preparation of briefs, in attending court hearings, and in hanging around waiting for their cases to come on, for which they get no remuneration. This additional money from the Government will enable something to be paid in deserving cases. The disposal of the money is to be in the hands of the committee. I congratulate the Government on tackling the problem and I hope it will give favourable consideration to further extensions of the scheme.

I suggest to the Government that there might be a review of the fees charged to litigants and practitioners in the Supreme Court. A scale of charges is laid down under the Supreme Court Act. We call them court fees. They are the fees that are payable for documents handed in and I think there is a need for streamlining the schedule. There would be a saving of much time for practitioners and the matter of the charges would be simplified. In my experience it is difficult to explain to clients, and indeed to myself, how the schedule was evolved. It is amazing to find that for one document a fee of 2s. 6d. is paid, and for another 5s. If a document is filed in connection with an undefended divorce case the fee is £1 5s., for a defended divorce case it is £2, for the issue of a writ £1 and for the issue of a summons 10s. I think there could be an upgrading of the schedule generally. After all, litigants get away with a small

charge for the use of the services of the court. I do not suggest a large increase, but it must be remembered that there is now a tremendous list of fees ranging from 1s. to slightly over £2. Unless a man has a legal training he has no idea what is payable on the various documents.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—It costs a lot more to fill them in.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER—Yes, but I am talking about the charges for handing documents over the counter. There is a case for the standardization of the fees, and it might be that practitioners pay only 5s., 10s. or £1, according to the document, instead of the present multifarious scale. I support the second reading.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES (Southern)—I, too, support the second reading and join with other members in congratulating the Treasurer on the magnificent financial position that exists, at least on paper, in South Australia at present. In the congratulations I include Cabinet Ministers and the heads of departments who have had anything to do with the compilation of the Estimates. I join with the Hons. Mr. Densley and Mr. Potter in their well-thought out summary of the financial affairs of the State, particularly as to loans to people who work on the land. There is no doubt that Mr. Potter hit the nail on the head when he spoke of the money that could go into circulation through the banking system instead of its being channelled into other directions. This is an important matter and it needs to be watched if primary production is to go ahead as we hope it will do. Of course, the banks' attitude to the problem must be considered, I believe they maintain that funds that go into subsidiary companies are private investors' funds and have nothing to do with the overall sum handled by the institutions.

I want to refer particularly to stock agent companies and the recently publicized tendency for this type of company to go into the hire-purchase field. It is a serious matter, and, as a man with something on his hands in the developmental programme in the south-eastern portion of the State, I know that much money is owing to stock agent companies. I hope the day will not come, looking at the matter personally, when the money I owe on developmental affairs will be referred to hire-purchase companies that are subsidiary to banks or stock agent companies. This sort of thing would be much to the disadvantage of the

many people who are trying to do an honest job in opening up more land for primary production. The Treasurer said that the population of Adelaide would double within 20 years but it will be impossible to double the area of land capable of producing food for all those people. Much has been said on this point during certain debates in the last few weeks. When the population has doubled, probably export losses now resulting from the sale of butter, wheat and other primary products will have been overcome and primary producers will have established themselves on a more realistic footing by dealing with their best market, the home market. Knowing, as we do, that new production areas cannot keep pace with the growing population we must ensure that primary production methods advance in step with methods adopted by other sections of the community.

I congratulate the Government on the magnificent way in which it enabled the State to survive the previous dry 12 months. South Australia has more people who are able to turn on the tap, proportionately speaking, than any other State, and that reflects great credit on the far-sightedness of the Government's planning of water supplies to overcome difficulties associated with dry years such as the last one.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Hasn't Parliament anything to do with that?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—Where a lively Opposition operates, yes. However, I look further into the future of water supplies in country areas because they must progress as rapidly as the rest of the State. We have before us the prospect of the Myponga reservoir and the River Murray dam and I hope the Commonwealth Government continues to co-operate with the Treasurer in achieving this important end and ensuring adequate water supplies. The Murray Dam will ensure continued water supplies for a few more years. I say "a few more years" because we will soon have to start again. A report by L. S. Herbert and H. R. C. Pratt (members of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization) discloses that within a few years parts of Australia, not possessing large supplies of pure water, must look to the desalination of water for future supplies. The report by the two gentlemen I have mentioned deals primarily with that state of affairs. Obviously, in the most advanced countries water is taken for granted. Water for domestic, industrial and other purposes is obtained in catchment areas, rivers, dams, sub-surface

water-bearing areas and from many other sources. Generally speaking, the cost to supply water in this State is about 2s. a thousand gallons. That cost includes charges on all the capital works needed for the supplies of of water and it affects everyone in the State. Slowly but surely the cost of each thousand gallons of artificially-produced water, that is brackish water or sea-water turned into pure water for domestic purposes, and the cost of catchment water are coming closer together.

I quote from this report because the future of this State, perhaps more than any other State, must eventually lie in our ability to supply nuclear heat to operate desalination plants. Most honourable members recently returned from a visit to Leigh Creek coalfield and I am certain that those members who had not previously inspected the field appreciated what a remarkable area it is; but they must also have been impressed by the fact that our deposits of coal are limited, possibly more limited than the sources of power available in the other States. My point is that South Australia may hope to be the first to receive aid from the Commonwealth to install a nuclear reactor. Once a nuclear reactor is installed and operating, desalination of water comes nearer realization. The report, headed "Potential Application of Saline Water Conversion in Australia", lists the various alternatives available and commences:—

A brief survey is given of methods which have been proposed for the production of potable water from saline waters. It is concluded that vapour recompression distillation, electrodialysis and in some cases solar distillation, represent the most suitable process for domestic units capable of outputs of about 50-500 gal./day.

We may ignore that angle except in cases well away from Adelaide. The report continues:—

For large-scale plants, suitable for supplying large communities, distillation methods appear most suitable on the basis of existing technology, although electrodialysis would be applicable to brackish waters with salt contents below about 5,000 p.p.m. Freezing methods also show considerable promise, although a final assessment must await the results of pilot plant studies at present in progress. Preliminary design and cost studies are given for multi-stage flash evaporation plants employing nuclear reactors as the heat source, both without and with concurrent power generation by means of back-pressure turbines. It is shown that plants based on the 150 and 275 MW(e) gas-cooled reactors currently being installed in Britain would produce respectively 44 and 80 million gallons per day of water together with 30 and 63 MW of surplus power; the larger of these plants would be capable

of providing a city of 500,000 population, *e.g.*, Adelaide, with the whole of its water and about 25 per cent of its installed power capacity.

I think the report may be slightly out-of-date because Adelaide's population is now more than 500,000. The report proceeds:—

Cost data for such plants is difficult to translate into Australian conditions, but it is probable that the capital costs would be about £A54,000,000 for the smaller and £A88,000,000 for the larger. Operating costs would then be about 8.9 and 7.9 shillings per 1,000 gallons respectively, allowing a power credit of 0.80d. per kWh., assuming a load factor of 80 per cent and total capital charges of eight per cent.

That contains interesting possibilities but what should interest us is that it would cost that much to produce each thousand gallons. That cost of 7s. 9d. compares with the approximate figure of 2s. a thousand gallons to produce water for industrial and domestic purposes under existing conditions. Members will observe that the difference is still large but it is decreasing as the years pass and there is no doubt that this is a side associated with future life in Australia that will become a real possibility with a consequent impact on our country.

Imagine the possibility of being able to produce water in the quantities I have just quoted, up to 44,000,000 gallons a day in one plant. Imagine a series of such plants running from Port Augusta to the north of the State. What a fantastic difference that would make to the country there! I believe that I shall live to see something like that although it is an amazing prospect at present. As the standard of living in our country improves and secondary production increases, water consumption will increase correspondingly. The increased demand for water will have a great impact on the State and, although members may consider all this too far in the future to worry about, we should be acquainted of it and study future trends.

In the schedule to the Bill there is a line "Minister of Agriculture, Miscellaneous—£372,897", and included in that line is an amount provided for the construction near Northfield of a semen-collecting centre. The Council will hear more of this matter in the future but it may be a good idea if I deal with it in a general way now. The building of this semen-collecting centre is important for many reasons, and should be done fairly rapidly. In South Australia the Department of Agriculture, because of the opinions of two Ministers who have held the portfolio

of Agriculture, has in the last few years sponsored four pilot trials in this field. These trials have not been carried out in such an obvious place as the Murray swamps, because that has a dense cow population, can be covered readily, and the distance and economic factors of such a trial in such an area would be of little value to the Department of Agriculture.

The pilot trials were undertaken at more distant pastures, as it were, at Eight Mile Creek, Inman Valley, Woodside and near Oakbank in the Adelaide hills, where, on a very limited basis, dairymen volunteered their herds for these trials. This work has been going on for some years, although it is obvious that the extra demand for such services is more than can be coped with by the department. Figures from those trials show the possibility of setting up an overall economic system in this field in South Australia, and the selected areas are not necessarily the easiest to cover economically. The report gives a basis for planning for the future in this field. It is obvious that over the next few years in South Australia artificial breeding will expand for many reasons. Co-operative companies, milk companies and all sorts of people are interested in using artificial insemination as a commercial enterprise. One of the problems to be solved is whether such companies should be allowed to enter this field with the main idea of serving the dense cattle areas and receiving a percentage of profit, or whether such services, by some means or other, should be made available on a more general basis. It is a problem that the Parliament of this State will have to consider because it is so easy to serve dense cattle areas but so difficult to provide a service for farmers situated in more outlying areas.

Behind that problem again is the ever-present danger of allowing private companies to enter a field that must of necessity depend so much on the health measures adopted before the article—in this case, semen—is produced. It is interesting that artificial insemination is used in many countries in Europe today as a measure to defeat diseases such as vibriosis and trichinomyeosis.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What about myxomatosis?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—They are types of venereal disease, which is different from myxomatosis and that is why artificial insemination is important in that field. On the other hand, the very substance that we are discussing is

one of the worst disease carriers if the production of semen is not policed and controlled. Semen must be produced under very strict supervision indeed, under conditions of very great cleanliness, and under conditions that will ensure a clean sample for the dairy herds of this State. This matter interests me probably more than it does other honourable members of this Council, but it is one that is important for the future of the dairying industry of South Australia.

I draw attention to the magnificent job done by the South Australian Government regarding education. In this important field there are always comments both favourable and unfavourable, and I do not envy the job of any Minister of Education one iota. He must expect to get fired at, as it were, quite apart from the fact that schools get fired every now and then. There exists in the country today, as well as in the city, a demand for technical knowledge. On the one hand it is a demand for agricultural science knowledge, though I do not mean agricultural science in the full sense of the word, but farming and agricultural subjects generally. There is a real demand for that type of education in country areas. On the other hand, in the city there is a great demand for technical skill and the subjects required for a specialized technical education. I congratulate the Government on the number of area schools it has provided in the country, but ask that consideration be given to building more of them. Although there are many aspects of education that are important to our way of life today and the future of this country, I ask that, despite the mad scramble for technical knowledge, the wants of the simple farming community are not overlooked.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You wouldn't say the farming community were simple?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—Compared with some honourable members I am afraid we are. I support the second reading.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2)—I propose to address myself only to one aspect of this Bill, and in introducing what I propose to say I wish to read two extracts from *Hansard* of speeches I made in this Council in the past two years. They will at least show that I have been thinking of this matter for a considerable time, as have others. There is nothing new about the generality of what I shall say, although there may be something new about the particularity of what I

shall say. On the debate on the Public Purposes Loan Bill on September 24, 1958, I said this:—

I do not think the Government is paying sufficient attention to cultural matters. Cultural progress is part of our life, whatever materialists may say to the contrary. I think they have been well catered for in South Australia over the past years. We only have to look at the beautiful buildings on the north side of North Terrace to appreciate that they have been constructed at great expense by our forebears, and I fail to see what we in our generation have done to match them. I feel that for a comparatively small expenditure we could do something for the cultural side of the State's life. Perhaps later I shall contribute some more direct and constructive suggestions in that regard. That is the only note of criticism I raise.

I praise the Government's handling of all its practical and material portfolios, because I have always felt it has got value for its money and has spent its money very well, with this one exception. I then went on to say in my speech:—

We are not devoting the widow's mite, so to speak, to that side of things that would go a long way toward satisfying the people's requirements.

The following year I spoke in much the same vein. In my Address in Reply speech on July 28, 1959, I said:—

Finally, I would like to congratulate the Government on its outstanding record of progress, to which I have referred before, in relation to its new-found freedom from the Grants Commission. I believe that its money has been exceptionally well spent; the Government has put essential things first. We cannot have everything, but I hope that one day the Government will have money to spare for all these other odd things I have mentioned, bearing in mind, as an inspiration, our magnificent row of buildings along North Terrace.

I should like to say that the Public Library and the Museum, etc., were all built by the Governments of the day out of public moneys. They were not subscribed to by the public except, to my knowledge, with one exception, and it was one of your illustrious relatives, Mr. Acting President (Hon. A. J. Melrose), who made a magnificent gift to the State for the erection of the Art Gallery, which has survived to this day, and I am glad to see that the Government is aiding it a little this year. That is one of the few exceptions of the type I have mentioned that has happened in my generation. I was returning by air from Sydney the other day and happened to look at one of the air route maps and it referred to the reputation of Adelaide for its great public buildings. We

are still living on the reputation of our forebears, because we have done little to add to their efforts.

I quoted those *Hansard* remarks deliberately to show that it was no new view on my part. For a long time I have held the opinion that surely the Government could spare out of its annual expenditure of £116,250,000 a few hundred thousand pounds a year for the cultural side of life. It is all very well for the materialists to talk about the things that really count. It is a lot of rubbish. Life is far greater than that; and this does not apply to any particular class of the community. Culture comes from every section and sometimes one finds it in the most unexpected places. In every class of the community there is a love of culture of some sort. Life is not just living the "daily bread" sort of existence. It includes cultural and artistic matters, such as reading books, looking at pictures, admiring the works of art, beautiful buildings, trees and so on. They are all part of our existence and I venture to say, and this is a world-wide view, that with the increasing leisure that people are enjoying through shorter working hours, which is a wonderful thing to the human being, the cultural side of life is becoming increasingly important.

I am a member of the Board of Governors (a rather high falutin term) of the Adelaide Festival of Arts, which I believe was a great success, and I am a member of the board for 1962. The board met great difficulties and inhibitions in the 1960 festival in finding places in which to present its performances, which enthused every section of the community. For instance, it was only by the grace of the proprietors of the Regent Theatre that the board was able to present wonderful orchestral concerts by the Melbourne and Sydney Symphony Orchestras. It was purely due to the generosity of the private owners of the building who, at great financial sacrifice, placed it at our disposal. That also applied to the University of Adelaide in relation to the Bonython Hall, where the great classic *Murder in the Cathedral* was presented to many people. One does not have to be highbrow to enjoy such concerts. The University was most gracious about the matter and indeed broke down a principle whereby the board was able to charge for admission in order to defray some of the costs of these entertainments.

The Festival of Arts did two things. I think it put Adelaide on the map again as the

cultural city of Australia and as a place suited to that kind of thing; and it really put Australia on the map as a place that leads in culture. It also showed clearly and conclusively that Adelaide almost completely lacks the facilities to put on that kind of entertainment, except, as I say, by the co-operation and sacrifice of private interests. Adelaide has, in fact, established itself as the art festival city of Australia and I hope that it will continue. The Board of Governors felt that it was their duty to the people of the State to take the matter a little further and offer a certain suggestion to the Government, which would be for the benefit not only of future festivals, but for the everyday benefit of all sections of the community of South Australia and would clinch Adelaide's position as the festival city of Australia. A letter was sent to the Treasurer from the Adelaide Festival of Arts and it was followed by a deputation I introduced. The letter read as follows:—

The Board of Governors of the Adelaide Festival of Arts respectfully suggests to the Government of South Australia that a multi-purpose festival hall should be built in Adelaide for the people of South Australia.

1. The suggestion is that the project should be financed from public money. There is complete precedent for this. Most of the world's most beautiful opera houses were built by the countries concerned.

I believe that the London Festival Hall, built in comparatively recent years, is a magnificent place and that it was built by the London County Council, a semi-governmental body. The letter continues:—

Indeed, here in Adelaide, the beautiful North Terrace public buildings, the Public Library, the Museum, the Art Gallery, were all originally built by the Governments of the day. Adoption of the practice which has recently sprung up in Australia that the Government should subsidize private subscription for purposes such as this would, in our opinion, condemn Adelaide to its present hopelessly inadequate facilities for generations. We consider that it would be quite impossible, particularly in this era of high taxation, to raise even a fraction of the amount required, and that it would be unfair to ask the few who regularly subscribe to appeals to finance a proposal such as this, which is for all the people.

2. It is many years since any very large sum of money was spent from the public purse for the cultural benefit of the public. It is respectfully suggested that the present time of prosperity and expansion is the right one for the adoption of this venture, and that, if considered necessary, a sum of say £250,000 could be set aside under the Budgets of each of the next four or five years for the purpose. This amount would only be fractional in the total annual expenditure of the State.

3. It is hardly necessary to mention that the present facilities for music, drama and opera are hopelessly inadequate. The Theatre Royal, although a gem of its kind, is now too small for a city of the size which Adelaide has reached, has been purchased by a departmental store, and its days have been strictly numbered by an order of a Government department. The beautiful Town Hall, acoustically perfect, is also far too small for celebrity concerts, and the Wayville Centennial Hall, although large, was built for other purposes and is quite unsuitable—indeed it was not, despite its size, used for the 1960 festival. That festival could not have been a success had it not been for the generous co-operation of the University with the Bonython Hall, and of Hoyts Theatres in providing the Regent Theatre at considerable financial sacrifice.

4. Our considered opinion is that what is needed, and what should be most practical and practicable, is a multi-purpose hall, with two auditoria of differing sizes to cater for both concerts and theatre. Its cost would depend on its size and facilities and it could be planned to fit the sum available.

5. The festival governors would be prepared to promote a trust to be responsible for the conduct and maintenance of the festival hall. If so desired we will present, at a later date, full details of how this would be financed. It is in this aspect that we consider the people of South Australia could and should be asked to join.

6. We feel that, unless something of the nature suggested is done, Adelaide could well be without a major theatre at all in the predictable future.

7. Adelaide is known world wide as the Festival City of Australia. A festival hall would confirm this status and be of lasting benefit to the people of the State, for everyday use as well as for future festivals.

I think that is a fairly convincing case. It is not a luxury expenditure that is suggested; it is certainly not an expenditure just for festivals, for a hall that will be used only every two years. It is a suggestion that a concert hall, theatre and so on shall be built all in one for everyday use in Adelaide, for visiting artists. Thanks largely to the Australian Broadcasting Commission and other *entrepreneurs* we get wonderful topline world artists coming here regularly. We have orchestras, music, drama, theatres and so on, in many ways better than before, although the theatre has not been as popular since the cinema came in, but that is our suggestion that I have put before the Council.

We took it along to the Treasurer, who gave us a most courteous and interested hearing. We emphasized the fact that surely £250,000 a year could be found out of a Budget of over £116,000,000. I think the Treasurer was inclined to agree that that should be possible. The position is that after, say, two years'

allocation of that amount, the scheme could go straight on because a hall of this nature would take six months or a year to plan, the arrangement of a contract would possibly take another six months, and then the hall would probably take another two years to build.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What about the land?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I will come to that in a moment. After a couple of years, the project could be started. The Honourable Mr. Condon has brightly interjected, "What about the land?". We deliberately avoided suggesting possible sites for this place because we did not want to divert the argument. We have had some experience of this sort of thing. Unfortunately, the enthusiasts get in among the scheme and, in their enthusiasm for it, want their own pet ideas incorporated. Finally, there are so many ideas put forward and the thing gets so complicated that by their very enthusiasm they frustrate the whole scheme. Therefore, the governors deliberately refrained from suggesting any site, although I am prepared to suggest a number of sites, since Mr. Condon has referred to the land.

An obvious place is the Municipal Tramways Trust building in Victoria Square. This is only one of many. Sites are available for a small expenditure—or possibly to the Government for nothing. The Tramways Trust's building would be a magnificent site for a festival hall or opera house. We would have all the excitement and glitter of the lights and the beautiful building with a lovely perspective of it from all over the square, and, indeed, from other parts of the city. I do not want to tread on the toes of people by putting forward other suggestions for a site, because I know I am now on dangerous ground. I merely mention this, not for the purpose of recommending any site but to show that sites would be freely available.

There has been much discussion recently in the Adelaide City Council on the future of Victoria Square. Nothing came out of that discussion, because the council realized that nothing irreparable was being done by some delay and hoped that one day in the future some better plan might be thought of for Victoria Square than was now available. But there was one thing on which the members of the council were totally agreed—that Victoria Square needed some central feature to enhance its appearance from King William Street, and from Grote Street and Wakefield Street. Whether it was a matter of making more

importance of Queen Victoria's statue, or whatever it might be, that would be greatly advantageous to the City of Adelaide, because the only street that I can think of with a fine view at the end of it is Pulteney Street, with the view to Bonython Hall. Most other cities have beautiful streets. For instance, Paris has its Opera House at the end of *Avenue de l'Opera*: one looks straight down the street at that magnificent building. I mention this almost with bated breath but I am not advocating it; I am merely giving an idea of what is possible. The "Hands off the park lands" people always cite Colonel Light's utterances and plans when they want to stop any progress in the park lands. They do not like to draw attention to the fact that the whole of the southern half of Victoria Square in Colonel Light's original plan was allocated for Adelaide's cathedral—and that is a fact. One has only to look at the original plan to see the cathedral in the southern half of Victoria Square. Colonel Light saw that it would be an advantage to the main street to have something of beauty at the end of it.

That is another possible site, although I am not necessarily advocating it; I merely mention that as a possibility. In fact, there are dozens of sites. We have over 1,700 acres of park lands in this city to about 1,500 acres of building blocks. That is a pretty vast proportion of park lands. I am not one of those who want to see many permanent buildings go up on the park lands, but I think certain improvements in recent years have shown us that suitable buildings can enhance the beauty of land, and can enhance rather than detract from its value. The Adelaide Bowling Club's building is one example. That building was removed, in fact, from park lands to park lands. There is no great departure in doing that. Where it was in Victoria Drive was originally park lands. The club got a new site in exchange for that land, which is now a valuable extension to Kintore Avenue.

In my opinion—some people think otherwise, though I have not heard much criticism since it has been up—the Adelaide Bowling Club in its new site enhances that part of the park lands. Of course, I should not like to see buildings all round the park lands, but anyone who has been to the Cinnamon Gardens in Ceylon knows that a few buildings of beauty and character make a place. There are dozens of places in the park lands where a beautiful festival hall could be erected that would not detract from the park lands, for only a small area would be used. The building would be a

thing of beauty to enhance the appearance of the city. In addition, there is the more important aspect today that large areas would be available for car parking; also, we could get somewhere near public transport or, if we wanted to seclude the building and not take up some of the people's park lands, we could put it away somewhere that is not used now and never will be used. So much for the site. I do not want to advocate any particular site because so many are available. I told honourable members that the Treasurer gave us a very interested and courteous hearing, but, unfortunately, I think honourable members will guess—

The Hon. A. J. Shard—The usual answer—a lemon!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—The following letter was received from the Treasurer, dated October 11, 1960:—

Cabinet has considered the request of the Board of Governors of the Adelaide Festival of Arts that the Government should, during the next four or five years, appropriate funds for the construction of a multi-purpose festival hall. In view of other requirements and commitments for the next few years Cabinet has decided that it cannot at the present time agree to the request.

There is the sad story! Our Loan Estimates provided for the expenditure of £30,772,000. The sum of £9,000,000 was to be spent on waterworks and sewers, £7,700,000 on Government buildings and land, £2,000,000 on loan to the Electricity Trust, and so on, but apparently there was no room in those Estimates for the expenditure of £250,000 over a period of four or five years which would have been of immense value to everyone in South Australia who is interested in this matter. Everyone is interested in some form of art, the dramatic theatre, music, etc. It would have been something for everyday use, something that would have really put Adelaide on the map as a cultured city.

Although we are spending £116,000,000 this year we cannot find £250,000 for four or five years for culture of this nature that would be to the advantage of everyone. Why? Is it because it is a cultural matter, or is it because it will not win votes? I do not know. We are told we cannot find the money for this purpose. We have done our best in this matter. I do not think it will rest at that because other things will be said. I think it is a great pity that something of this nature cannot be achieved in these times of transcendent prosperity. If we cannot do it now, will we ever be able to do it? Are

our lives to become so mundane that we cannot get ordinary entertainment? Are we to watch our theatres being bought because the sites are more valuable for other purposes? Are we to watch arts going on in the eastern States and have none here because we have nowhere to put them? I leave it to honourable members. We have made the suggestion but we have got nowhere with it. I feel that this will not be the last word on the matter.

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

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

The House of Assembly intimated that it had appointed Mr. F. H. Walsh to fill the place on the committee rendered vacant by the death of Mr. M. R. O'Halloran.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS.

The House of Assembly intimated that it had appointed Mr. F. H. Walsh to fill the place on the Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills rendered vacant by the death of Mr. M. R. O'Halloran.

EXCHANGE OF LAND: HUNDRED OF SKURRAY.

The House of Assembly transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council:—

That the proposed exchange of land in the Hundred of Skurray, as shown on the plan and in the statement laid before Parliament on August 25, 1959, be approved.

TRAVELLING STOCK ROUTES: HUNDREDS OF DAVENPORT, WOOLUNDUNGA, GREGORY AND WILLOWIE.

The House of Assembly transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council:—

That the travelling stock routes, containing 4,468 acres, in the hundreds of Davenport, Woolundunga, Gregory and Willowie, extending south-easterly from Stirling North to Wilmington, and easterly from Wilmington to Willowie, as shown on the plan laid before Parliament on August 11, 1959, be resumed in terms of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1959, for the purpose of being dealt with as Crown lands under the provisions of the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1957.

MONEY-LENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

ROAD TRAFFIC BOARD BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 1407.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2)—I support the Bill. The Government is to be commended for its plan to set up a unifying authority in road traffic matters. I feel that the only ground for criticism is the way in which this authority is to be constituted. We have already heard three thoughtful and constructive speeches from honourable members in support of the Bill, and I would merely add one or two points to what has already been said.

In the Bill provision is made for the appointment of members of the Road Traffic Board, but there seems to be no provision for their removal from office or even for the limitation of the period of their service, beyond the general over-riding authority of the Executive Council or Governor in these matters of public appointment. Although three different authorities may make the nominations for the initial three members of the board, they would appear to have no authority to terminate the appointments should the members so appointed cease to act in the best interests of all concerned. For example, the Police Commissioner can nominate one of his officers, but he would not appear to have any right of sponsoring a change in later years should he subsequently have a more experienced and more desirable person available to occupy the position.

We have all had experience of members of boards becoming more autocratic as years go on and it seems reasonable to me that appointments of members to public boards should be subjected to periodic review, or at least that the term of each appointment should be limited to a few years. Again, this Bill virtually introduces Government by bureau instead of by Parliament. It is, indeed, another big step in the establishment of autocracy and the dissociation of power from Parliament and its Ministers. The board, nominated by various authorities, would have no responsibility to the people. In fact, I believe that a bad principle of law-making is involved in this: namely, that by concurring with this manner of appointing the board we are setting up members of a board who will not be subject to control by the people for whom the laws are being made. Surely the essence of democracy is that the people should have the right of electing or dispensing with the services of their

legislators. I draw members' attention to new section 43c (3) which states:—

Every prescribed zone and the speed limit for that zone shall be indicated by signs on the road at or near the beginning and end of the zone.

What is the use of having signs at the beginning or end of each stretch of road in a prescribed zone and no indication at the points where side-roads enter? A most confusing position could arise in the case of travellers not knowing the district and entering a prescribed zone. They would not know that they were infringing the law until they heard the ominous sound of the approach of the law or until, by some good fortune, they got to the end of the zone and discovered that they had been travelling in a prescribed zone. I shall, therefore, move an amendment to meet this situation. Briefly, then, I consider a unified traffic authority most desirable, but I believe that its actions should be the responsibility of and under the control of the Minister and Parliament. I will support any amendments that rectify these faults in the Bill.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Roads).—It is desirable to answer briefly one or two points that have been raised. I do not know whether the second reading speech clarified the situation about which the Hon. Mr. Bevan seemed somewhat worried. He queried why what should be amendments of the Road Traffic Act should be included in this Bill. Members will recall that I requested them to consider this Bill rapidly because it was desirable to introduce a Bill to consolidate the Road Traffic Act before the end of this session. What will happen is that this legislation will be incorporated in the consolidation of the Road Traffic Act. In other words, this is a short-time Bill.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Don't bring down the Road Traffic Bill on the last night of the session.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—The sooner members accept this Bill the sooner we can deal with the other.

The Hon. A. J. Shard—When the Road Traffic Act is consolidated will this legislation be repealed?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I am not sure of the technicalities involved, but I have no doubt it will be dealt with properly. The Hon. Mrs. Cooper made rather a good and practical point regarding the placing of signs at entrance roads to zoned areas. However, I have no doubt that the board will make practicable

recommendations on this matter. I point out that where side-roads enter main roads at present the number sign appears within a few chains thereof. I will draw the board's attention to this, but I doubt whether it is necessary to include it in this legislation. I am sure the board will recognize the necessity of making some provision. Members have argued that the board should be responsible to Parliament and in the same way that I listened with sympathy and appreciation to the Hon. Mr. Shard's contention yesterday, I listened sympathetically to this contention.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—We do not want sympathy: we want action!

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—The amendments on the files to be moved by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill regarding the responsibility of the board generally to the Minister and the power to appeal to the Minister through the board are acceptable to the Government.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Hear hear! That is a major forward step.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—With regard to whom should be appointed to the board I point out that two of the members are clearly defined. It is desirable in this modern age to look ahead and to live with the future, which, after all, is what we must do as we will be spending the remainder of our lives in the future and not in the past. The third member is to be selected by the Minister. Obviously, the Minister should have the fullest possible choice from the few suitable persons available to appoint to this position and any restriction placed on the choice must necessarily further limit the number of persons available. It may be desirable for the selected person to have special qualifications. If we choose someone from local government we may get a person who has city interests as against country interests.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—You have to choose a city man or a country man: you cannot get away from that.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—The whole point is that if we say that he must be a representative of local government we will naturally expect to find the elected representatives of local government virtually demanding that they appoint the man, or that they select a man not necessarily acceptable to the Government. If they do that, along come the various associations, the Roads Federation and the Automobile Association, all of which have capable and possibly suitable men. Then along

comes someone else who says that we should have one of the highway workers on the board.

The clause that gives the Governor power to define the terms and conditions upon which the members of the board shall be appointed makes it clear that they can be appointed for a short period, three years or so, and then be changed if necessary. No-one is keener than the Government to see that we have a good board. Why should the Government want dead-heads on the board if it is to continue for 30 or 40 years? This is the Government's duty. I have not often heard members get up and say that it is time that someone should be taken off a board but, if they think a member of a board is not doing his job, it is their duty to say that. As I am the Minister in charge, this can be reported to me so that I can take action. I feel that no other points require answering. I thank members for the keen way they have entered into the debate and I trust that when the Bill goes into Committee the Government will have the support that is desirable.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Constitution of Road Traffic Board".

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I move—

After "person" in subclause (2) (c) to insert "representative of local government interests".

Contrary to what the Minister just said, under the amendment there is no fetter whatever on his power to appoint this person except that he should be representative of local government interests. The amendment does not provide that he has to be a member of local government, and I deliberately cast it in that way. I have confidence that the Minister will choose the best person and I think this restricts his choice very little more than does the clause as it stands. However, as the clause stands the person appointed is representative of no-one. The Minister seemed concerned that his choice of this person might be fettered. I interjected that he had no choice regarding the other two and asked why he should have such an extremely unfettered choice of the third member of the board of three, as the other two could out-vote the third in any case.

This clause provides that one member of the board shall be the Traffic Engineer of the Highways and Local Government Department.

The Minister has no choice in that member's appointment. He might have some say in his appointment as Traffic Engineer, but not in his appointment to the board. The second member of the board is to be a member of the Police Force holding a rank not lower than that of Inspector and nominated by the Commissioner of Police. Again, the Minister has no choice. So there are two members of the board who, between them, have the total say and neither of whom the Minister has the right to nominate. Because of this, why is he so concerned that he should have a completely unfettered choice of the third member? In this specifically designed Bill, which the Minister has explained involves great technicalities, why should he be given the right to choose any person he wants to choose? I have confidence in the Minister and I am sure his choice would be a good one. I do not mind his having unfettered power in that respect, but why should any person at large be capable of being chosen to this technical and specific board that is going to give technical advice to the Minister? Why should it not be a person representative of the other interests dealt with by this Bill?

In this Bill three main parties are involved—the Highways Department, which has a representative, the Police Department (which is extensively involved, and rightly so) which also has a representative, and local government. Local government is involved throughout the Bill and, with a couple of comparatively minor exceptions, it is the only other interested party. Also interested, but only in a minor way, is the Railways Commissioner; he is interested only in one sense, however—regarding railway crossings. The Municipal Tramways Trust is also interested, as it relies on local government for the use of roads to the cost of which it makes no contribution. There are three parties involved.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—The trust makes a contribution.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—It does not make a contribution to the Adelaide City Council, and I do not know to what council it does make a contribution. In fact, years ago it was threatened that the City Council should make a contribution to it. The Minister has yet to convince me that the trust makes a contribution to the City Council. In this Bill three major parties are involved—the Highways Department, the Police Department and local government. A couple of subsidiary parties are also involved. The first two parties have representation on the board

but the third, which I venture to say has as much interest as the others, has no representation. Has not the Minister of Roads and Local Government any confidence in local government? Does he think local government cannot provide a man to stand up to the other two? If he thinks that, I can suggest several names to him. The Adelaide City Council has a terrifically good administrator named Veale who is one of the hardest workers and best administrators I know and is also an engineer of high standard. We have a brilliant young engineer named Bubb who was dealing with traffic lights long before the Highways Department knew anything about them in Adelaide, and the Minister cannot deny that. That man can still teach some of the Highways Department's officers something. We have men such as Mr. Frank Lewis, from Glenelg, who is a most capable and conscientious officer, and we have other fine local government officers, but the three I have named are the ones I am particularly interested in. I have no doubt that there are other men who are as capable as them. The Minister was worried whether or not he would become involved between country and city men, but unless the man chosen is imported from another State, the Minister must choose a city man or a country man. Even people with places in both the country and the city are one thing or the other. I see no real objection to the amendment because it does not refer to a man nominated by local government. The man chosen by the Minister may not even be from local government, but he would represent local government. That is all I am asking for.

The Hon. A. J. Shard—Would the council concerned make the chosen person available from local government?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—Most councils are interested in the general weal of South Australia, and I have no doubt the person chosen would be made freely available by any council. He does not even have to be a member of a council or of its administration. He may be anyone, provided he represents the third party principally concerned with this Bill. There are many directions to be given to local government and more are to be given to local government under the Bill than to anyone else. Traffic lights, road signs and this, that and the other thing are to be controlled and the councils are bodies that have to pay for these things. They are going to be told what to do with things they pay for but do not provide for them-

selves but for the welfare of the people generally. What could be more reasonable than to let those people have, in the first place before the board, some say on what they are to be told to do, and let them have some chance of direct representation in the first instance, equally balanced with the other authorities on the board?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—I oppose the amendment. I am interested in clause 4 (2) (c) as a normal road user, and cannot see the logic of Sir Arthur Rymill's argument. He said that in paragraphs (a) and (b) there is no choice, and that therefore the same should apply to paragraph (c). As long as the Minister is tied to a traffic engineer under paragraph (a) and to a member of the police force under paragraph (b), the wider the choice he has under paragraph (c) the better it will be for the board. I do not discredit highly respected people such as Mr. Veale, but would prefer, as an ordinary road user, to have a person who more actively represents the people driving on the road. I hope the Minister sees fit to appoint a prominent man, possibly from the Royal Automobile Association, who could also represent local government under paragraph (c).

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—I support the amendment. Two members are nominated from definite authorities, and therefore the third authority in control should have an equal say. We are taking much from the councils and we should make sure that we are working with them whilst we are taking something from them. Local government men don't claim to be the best in the world, but they wholeheartedly give their services for nothing.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Does the City Engineer give his services for nothing?

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—I am glad the Minister of Roads will have the necessary authority under this Bill but if we are to take authority from local government, surely we can appoint someone to the board who has the interests of councils at heart.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Sir Arthur Rymill digressed on one point, but I wish to clear it up. Last year the M.T.T. paid about £44,000 for the use of the roads on its various bus routes into the Highways Fund and this money was disbursed to the various metropolitan councils. I listened to the Hon. Mr. Giles and the Hon. Sir Frank Perry with interest, but my thoughts about the board do not exclude a person from local government. The most desirable person may be somebody associated

with local government, but if that man cannot accept further duties and declines the position, and the next best man is not in local government and not directly connected with it, then we have to take him instead. That is how I feel about it. The point is whether we are to have the widest possible choice or not.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER—I support the amendment. Some confusion has arisen particularly in regard to what the Minister just said. The person to be chosen by the Minister under the clause as drafted may not be a person or representative from local government. He must be a representative of local government under the amendment, and that is a different thing. In other words, what Sir Arthur has foreshadowed is that the person nominated has to consult local government and be its mouthpiece and put the views of local government to the board. He does not have to come from a council and he does not have to be an employee of a council. He may be anybody as long as he represents the interests of local government bodies. This Bill is designed so that the decisions of the board will primarily affect local government bodies. As Sir Arthur Rymill has said, the board's decisions will impose conditions on local government bodies concerning the expenditure of ratepayers' money. The important thing, so far as I can see, is that if this board is to have some sort of status and if it is to get the necessary co-operation of local government authorities, there should be somebody on the board who can put their case. This amendment merely provides that somebody shall be there as

an advocate for the interests of local government.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Somebody they can go to?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER—Yes, and somebody whose duty it will be to consult local government bodies to get their views. It is not "a representative from" but "a representative of", and that makes all the difference. If this board is to function successfully and have standing, and if its decisions are not continually to be the subject matter of complaints by local government bodies, then I think we have to have the widest possible co-operation. I support the amendment.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—When I spoke on a previous Bill I mentioned the important work local government had done and expressed concern regarding the scant consideration it had been given. I feel it is highly desirable in this Bill to give local government the consideration to which it is entitled. The scope of the amendment is wide. The more closely the person selected is associated with local government the more pleased I shall be. It is open to the Minister to select anybody he desires to represent local government. I strongly support the amendment because it means that local government authorities will appreciate that at least they have been considered in these important measures before the House.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.59 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 25, at 2.15 p.m.