

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, August 27, 1963.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**NORTH EAST ROAD JUNCTION.**

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Has the Minister of Roads the report that he promised in answer to a question I asked last week concerning the corner we know as Hampstead Corner?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Yes. I was in touch with the Executive Officer of the Road Traffic Board, who reported to the Commissioner as follows:

Because of the complex layout of the junction, the undesirable manoeuvres created by Brooke Street being so close to the actual junction of Hampstead Road with the Main North East Road and the side activity generated by the shopping centre and the hotel, the design envisages the conversion of Brooke Street into a one-way street to facilitate the traffic flow and to make the complex manoeuvres inherently safer. This proposal has not been made without careful consideration, and there are of the order of 20 accidents a year occurring at this junction and Brooke Street traffic will not be too greatly inconvenienced by the one-way street, as there are alternative routes towards and away from Adelaide.

A letter has been sent to the Prospect Council seeking their co-operation in this matter, and as a result, a meeting has been arranged between the council and the Executive Engineer of the Road Traffic Board on Friday the 30th inst. to discuss the proposal. Traffic signals are not to be installed at this junction in the first instance, but the islands have been so designed that signals may be installed when considered necessary.

MURRAY VALLEY DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yesterday I was approached by Mr. Vernon Lawrence, Secretary of the Murray Valley Development League, who informed me that the organization had applied to the Treasurer for financial assistance to help its work in South Australia. Some years ago the Local Government Act was amended to enable councils bordering the River Murray in South Australia to levy or rate their ratepayers and make donations to assist the work of this organization. Those councils have been contributing for some years. The request by the league was that the South

Australian Government should make a similar contribution. Can the Minister representing the Treasurer say what has happened to the application and is the organization likely to receive some financial assistance this year?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I cannot give the honourable member the information he requires without reference to the Treasurer, but I will do that and endeavour to obtain a reply as soon as possible.

FISHERIES ACT.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Some weeks ago I asked a question concerning remarks made by Mr. Redman, S.M., in a court case dealing with the size and length of fish. The Attorney-General representing the Minister of Agriculture indicated that he would secure a report. Is that report now available?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I have a report from the Director of Fisheries and Game, which reads as follows:

From the point of view of administration of the Fisheries Act, 1917-1962, the definition of "weight" (*vide* section 4) raises no problem. Common usage is to speak of undersized fish and the definition is not contrary to this as "weight" includes size. The present definition dates back to 1904, and possibly even earlier. In those days it was the practice to have minimum weights in lieu of lengths (*e.g.*, schnapper 14 ozs.). If it was desired to amend this particular definition, the definition would still need to include criteria other than length as not all crustaceans or molluscs are measured on an overall length basis (*e.g.* carapace measurements, diameter of oyster shells, etc.). As indicated in the opening sentence, the department has received no complaints on this matter and it is departmental practice to speak of "undersized fish". When complaints are laid it is necessary to use the term "underweight" as "weight" is used in the various sections dealing with offences and penalties.

Following that report the matter was examined by the Minister of Agriculture and he indicated it could be considered when amendments to the Act are again before the Council.

SOUTH PARA RESERVIOR.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: During last weekend the River Gawler, in common with some of the other rivers, flooded its banks in certain areas and some of my constituents in low-lying areas, particularly those built upon by the Housing Trust, are very concerned about what may happen if a really big rain should occur soon. If some flooding occurred

during last week's moderate rain it follows that much more serious flooding will occur with really heavy rains. I understand from the Minister of Works that some flattening out of surplus waters is being done by releasing water from the South Para reservoir regularly. However, the reservoir is being kept nearly full and I believe more could be done by releasing further water. I ask the Minister representing the Minister of Works to ask his colleague, in view of what has happened in previous years with open river conditions on both Paras and in view of the completely saturated South Para reservoir catchment area about which I had first-hand reports over the weekend, whether he will consider lowering the level of the South Para reservoir—between rains—to 10,000,000,000 gallons, which is the level of the solid construction of the weir. It is likely that the reservoir would fill again even if this were done and it would greatly reduce the risk of serious flooding. I ask the Minister to give serious consideration to this matter.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Is the honourable member referring mainly to Gawler, or did he mention other areas?

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: In particular, Gawler, but there are other places too.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I will endeavour to obtain a report on the matter immediately.

ZEBRA CROSSINGS.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: A reference to illegal pedestrian crossings appeared in yesterday's *News*. It is as follows:

The rising death toll among pedestrians focuses attention on accident prevention measures, and in particular, on pedestrian crossings. The executive engineer of the Road Traffic Board, Mr. P. G. Pak-Poy, says the board now considers the zebra crossing with twin flashing amber lights to be the best safety haven for pedestrians. A number of so-called crossings exist in city and suburbs, notably in Rundle Street. There are yellow lines which encourage pedestrians to cross at the one point and bamboozle motorists. These crossings are, in fact, quite illegal. They should not be there at all. But the zebra crossing with flashing amber lights, enshrined by law, would be another proposition. They could clear up confusion, ensure safety, and save lives.

I have noticed this myself. There is one in Franklin Street where unsuspecting pedestrians have to jump quickly to miss motor cars when they do not stop. In other cases, motorists stop, not knowing it is an illegal crossing, and

this causes confusion. Does the Minister of Roads intend to replace these illegal pedestrian crossings with legalized zebra crossings?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The direct answer is "No", but I do not want the honourable member to take it that way. These pedestrian crossings are under the care and control of the local government authority involved, and although many of them carry no legal significance they are an attempt by the council to create some safety for pedestrians. Whereas a problem does arise for local government in that if a zebra crossing were put in it may be used for only a short period during the day, if the council is prepared to pay for the installation of flashing lights it has only to obtain the approval of the Road Traffic Board to do so.

MILE POSTS.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Over the last several weeks I have been asking questions of the Minister of Roads concerning mile posts. I do not want it to turn into a serial story. The last question I asked regarding the matter was whether or not there would be a saving of £28 by putting five-mile posts instead of one-mile posts, and whether the Minister would consider that matter. Has he a reply?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I remind the honourable member that many miles are involved in this matter and it could become a serial. The additional cost involved in erecting posts at one-mile intervals is considered to be fully justified owing to the benefits that will be gained by the department in respect of maintenance and compilation of records. In addition, the motoring public will have added service.

HUTS ON RAILWAY PROPERTY.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: On August 14 I directed a question to the Minister of Railways in connection with the huts on railway property at the corner of West Terrace and North Terrace and asked for their removal and whether it could be expedited. Has the Minister the reply he promised to get?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The Railways Commissioner has furnished me with the following report:

The former migrant hostel in the Adelaide station yard comprised 37 buildings in all. The large majority of these have been demolished to make room for new permanent installations or for re-use elsewhere. Nine vacant sleeping huts remain facing Port Road.

All are suitable for re-use and it is anticipated that three of these will be demolished and removed in the near future. The Chief Engineer advises that the remainder will be required in connection with projects scheduled to commence this year. While it would be practicable to demolish the remaining huts now, expenditure of public funds would be incurred unnecessarily in double handling and in making good deterioration of linings during storage.

FLOODED GAWLER RIVER.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: This morning I visited several garden properties that have been severely flooded by the Gawler River. They are on the lower reaches of the river. The floodwaters are able to leave the river at the railway bridge crossing and then travel north, parallel with the railway line, until they reach the road crossing the railway line. This crossing impedes the flow of the water, thereby causing the flooding of properties. It does appear that the lack of a culvert of sufficient size to take the floodwaters flowing along the railway embankment is the cause of the water forcing its way on to garden properties, and the owners have suffered considerable loss in garden produce. In fact, one person has had the floodwaters through his home. Will the Minister of Railways consider repairing the breach to the broken bank and investigate the possibility of providing a suitable culvert at the railway crossing?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The honourable member's question would indicate to me at first glance that at least three authorities may be involved—the Railways Commissioner, the local government authority, and possibly the owner concerned, who has suggested that we may repair the bank by his property or compensate him for the damage. I appreciate the point that the matter is urgent, particularly to the persons concerned in the locality, and I shall undertake to get the matter settled in as satisfactory a manner as possible.

FARM BLOCKS.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: In view of the lively interest in agricultural areas in connection with the Government's announced intention to aid young people to purchase blocks of land for themselves, can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to bring down legislation along these lines this session?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: There has been much publicity in regard to the matter, which, of course, concerns the department under the Minister of Lands. Instead of my making a firm statement on the matter now, I think it would be better to get a considered reply from the Minister, which I will do, and which I shall bring down probably tomorrow.

FLOODWATER DAMAGE RELIEF.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Attorney-General say whether there is any form of relief or assistance available to people who have suffered losses through the flooding of the Gawler River?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: As far as I am aware, at present there is no form of assistance which is normally provided in cases such as these. I shall be pleased to refer the honourable member's request to the Treasurer and ask him to consider it.

SCHOOL BUS SERVICE.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: A fortnight ago I asked the Minister representing the Minister of Education a question regarding the provision of a school bus in the Lewiston area, and whether or not it was Government policy to re-open small one-teacher schools in closely settled areas. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Before replying to the question I assure the honourable member that we all regret that he was not able to be here last week because of the passing of his mother. We take this opportunity to extend to him the sympathy of all members of the Council at her passing. The answer to the question is as follows:

A claim was lodged for a bus service to carry primary school children from Lewiston to Gawler River. This was considered by the Transport Contract Committee which ruled that the bus service should not be granted but that the primary school children should be carried on the Gawler High School bus and dropped at Gawler River. The transport officer has reported that this bus has a safety certificate for 45 secondary children and at present is carrying an average of 34 children to Gawler High School. The vehicle is not overloaded at present and there would be no problem in conveying children from Lewiston to Gawler River. Since the above decision by the Transport Contract Committee, the residents of Lewiston have not applied to the contractor for their children to use this transport. It is presumed that they are conveying their children by private vehicle. Referring to the second part of the honourable member's question inquiring whether or not it is Education Department policy to re-open small one-teacher schools in these fairly closely settled areas, I

have been informed that there is a distinct possibility, because of continued subdivision throughout the district, that the school population in this area may rise to as much as 50 in the next three or four years.

In general it is not the policy of the department to re-open small, one-teacher schools but because of likely development in the future, the possibility of establishing a school in the Lewiston area will be considered. Inquiries will be made to ascertain whether the future developments of this district are likely to warrant the establishment of a school between Gawler River and Two Wells other than at Lewiston.

PRINCES HIGHWAY ACCIDENTS.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to my question of August 21 last about the realigning of the Princes Highway four miles south of Millicent?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Yes. I have a report from the Commissioner of Highways, which is as follows:

Design plans for the realignment of the South-East Main Road No. 1 in the vicinity of Caines (Kains) Hill have been prepared. Land requirements have also been determined and negotiations will commence with the owners shortly. The realignment will involve approximately one mile of roadway and, provided that all land negotiations can be completed, commencement of the work will probably be made later this financial year.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Following on that answer, will the Minister consider imposing a speed limit on that section of the road until it is realigned?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Yes. I will refer the matter to the Road Traffic Board immediately.

HACKHAM CROSSING.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Subsequent to my recent question about the Hackham crossing, a man came up to me and congratulated me on the question. Will the Minister of Roads, when he is considering the destiny of this crossing, take into account this unusual display of public interest in the matter?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: When I do, I only hope that I shall be congratulated upon the answer.

DRIVING EYE-LEVEL.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I ask the Minister of Roads whether he noticed in the *News* of August 26 an article dealing with the lowering of eye-level in cars as it affects the

vision on highways. Amongst other things, the fact is mentioned that in Victoria the average height of eye-level for vision has, for many years, been 4ft. So the first part of my question is: does this figure of 4ft. of eye-level apply in terms of making highway vision satisfactory and safe? If I may refer further to this article, it points out that, with the six popular makes of cars, the Austin Freeway has 47in. eye-level, with a driver of average height, while the Holden has 47in., the Falcon 46in., and the Valiant 45in. With the Mini-Minors this gets down to under the 40in. mark. Does the Highways Department in this State take into account the lowering of eye-level as a safety measure in the construction of modern highways?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Matters relating to eye-level are always taken into consideration in designing roads. The honourable member has suggested that 4ft. has probably been used for many years as a desirable standard, from the motorist's point of view. He will appreciate that, when he looks at it from the point of view of his Mini-Minor, he has an advantage compared with a very small person, so it is impossible to lay down a firm set of rules in this regard. Generally speaking, the designer of a highway endeavours to reduce the variations in the vertical alignment as much as possible: in other words, he tries to get a dead flat level if he can.

EDUCATION COSTS.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (on notice): What is the present average cost per annum of educating each pupil in the South Australian Government schools up to and including the final year of secondary education?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The answer is £70 9s. 5d.

STATE BANK REPORT.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the annual report of the State Bank for the year ended June 30, 1963, together with balance sheets.

HAPPY VALLEY RESERVOIR.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the final report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on the Happy Valley Reservoir Inlet and Outlet Tunnels.

OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 591.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to support this Bill, which provides for a total expenditure of £32,914,000. The first thing I look for is some provisions for added or new works that may ameliorate the position of the unemployed, because we still have about 6,500 unemployed. (I believe there are about 1,000 males in the labouring class.) I look for undertakings that may provide work for that type of people. I find two—one headed "Railway Accommodation" under which £300,000 is provided to commence work on the construction of a new railway line from Ceduna to Kevin to replace the existing line between Wandana and Kevin. That could provide some work for these people, but I am not sure because I do not know whether the railways in that instance have their regular employees on this type of work or whether it would mean creating new employment altogether. Another project that will help in this matter in 1963-64 is the standardization of the railway line from Broken Hill to Port Pirie and rolling stock projects associated therewith, the funds for which are being provided by the Commonwealth Government. There is no indication of how this work will be done, when it will be commenced, whether new labour will be recruited or existing State railway employees will work on this project.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Isn't that the job in Peterborough that the Premier told us about six years ago that would employ 700 men?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but nobody believed it. This item provides for some work, but I am perturbed about labourers at Port Pirie who are unemployed. The unemployment position is becoming worse at Port Pirie; last month there were 36 extra people on unemployment relief. That is the real test of the unemployment position—when people are forced to draw social services. This item could create new work that would help these people.

The total amount proposed to be spent on water and sewer works is £12,380,000. Of this, £12,000,000 is to be provided from Loan Account—and this is the item to which I refer particularly—and the balance of £380,000 is to be met from the remainder of the special grant for employment-producing work which was made available by the Commonwealth Government at the February, 1963, meeting of the Loan Council. I followed questions relating

to this matter asked in another place and I spoke on the unemployment position in this State at length recently, but I have never yet heard from a Minister that any new work has been created through this money. If it is provided to create new work to ease the unemployment position, there should be some work for those who are unemployed, but if it is just to meet routine work and keep the present employees in work it is not achieving the purpose for which it was given to the State. I should like a reply from the Minister on this matter. The Commonwealth Government made an advance to this State of £380,000 to create employment for those unemployed. As a representative of the people I ask the question directly of the Minister concerned or any other Ministers: what new work has been created in the last six months within this State with a view to absorbing some of the unemployed? Unless the purpose of this loan is carried out, the object of the Commonwealth Government's aim will be nullified. If effect is given to this loan the unemployment position may be relieved.

I turn now to the amount allocated for roads and bridges. I am pleased to see that the total allocation is £670,000. The main item is £115,000 to complete the construction of the new steel and concrete bridge and approach roads at Blanchetown. From that I can assume that the bridge will be completed at least by the end of this financial year and possibly before. Would it be too optimistic to assume that it will be about December? From what I have seen it appears to be a good job.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I think we should have an official opening.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The orange-growing king of Renmark could do the honours. It will be another monument to the growth and development of the State and will be a great benefit to people along the river. There should be another bridge commenced almost immediately, but I have no idea where that bridge should be, and as I am not a resident of the river districts I do not want to come into that argument. I believe that the people there will see two new bridges over the river in the near future. For the benefit of fruit-growers, I hope there will not be any undue delay in transferring the two punts from Blanchetown, one each to Kingston and Berri. This will reduce travellers' waiting time by at least 50 per cent.

As honourable members know, I have been perturbed about the corner known as Hampstead Corner at the junction of Brooke Street,

Hampstead Road, North East Road and Lansdowne Terrace. It is one of the most difficult corners in the metropolitan area. I do not like criticizing work that has not been completed, but I know enough of the history of the troubles at this corner to have something to say. There was a transformer at this corner which was under the control of the Electricity Trust. I know that the Highways Department was anxious that the transformer be shifted to another area and thus give it more land and an opportunity to improve a nasty corner to the best advantage of all concerned. However, whether it was right or wrong from the trust's point of view, it decided that the transformer should not be shifted under any circumstances. The Highways Department then proceeded to alter the corner to the best of its ability with the area of land available. I believe that after the Highways Department had gone some way towards completing the work on the corner the Electricity Trust decided to shift the transformer.

I know that corner well and I am not surprised to hear that 20 accidents occur there each year. I want to know whether the Highways Department, notwithstanding the work already done at the corner, has considered the matter in view of the land formerly occupied by the Electricity Trust now becoming available. As the transformer has now been shifted, does the department think that the corner has been remodelled to the best advantage? I suggest that it would be far better to make further alterations now before the road is bituminized and sealed than to complete the job and then realize it is not as good as it might have been. In other words, it is better economics and a sounder proposition to cut losses at once than to complete the job and then decide it would have been better to use the land formerly occupied by the transformer.

I am at variance with the Highways Department and the Chief Engineer who want to make Brooke Street a one-way thoroughfare. I have lived in this area since coming to Adelaide in 1919. It is all very well to say there are alternative ways to and from Adelaide. That can be readily agreed, but the Hampstead corner, as it has become known, is a busy business centre. Many people living in the area back towards Collingrove and Galway Avenues go into Brooke Street and park their vehicles to do their shopping. If Brooke Street becomes a one-way street these people will be forced to travel around Collingrove

Avenue and park in Hampstead Road. I believe this would be undesirable because there is a bad corner there. Alternatively they could travel via Galway Avenue and park in North East Road. It would be more desirable for them to continue parking in Brooke Street.

I do not know the council's point of view. The Chief Engineer of the Highways Department is like the boy with the barrow: he has the job in front of him. He will find difficulty in convincing the council that it is necessary to use Brooke Street for one-way traffic. His argument is to make a left-hand turn from North East Road into Brooke Street. People living in the Galway Avenue and Collingrove Avenue district who wish to use Main North East Road and then park in Brooke Street will be put to a distinct inconvenience. I do not know whether the Minister or the Chief Engineer has realized that Brooke Street is the last link in the first road through from west to east from Nottage Terrace along Main North Road. People travelling north along Main North Road who wish to go east to Payneham or farther, and there are many of them, use California Street, then go through LeCornu Street to Hepburn Street and Brooke Street, and turn left into Main North East Road. If Brooke Street is restricted to one-way traffic at this section, which is no more than 200 yards long, all this traffic will be forced to travel through busier areas than it uses now. I will be surprised if the Prospect council agrees to this proposition. I do not believe it is necessary. The suggestion I heard about the project was to narrow Brooke Street. If that information is correct I wish to inform the Minister and the Chief Engineer that I believe our aim should be to widen and not narrow streets.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: If Rundle Street was made a one-way thoroughfare it would be narrowed because of the widening of the footpaths.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That may be true. I was at the Hampstead corner on Friday and Saturday evenings and a group of us stood where the new corner is being made. We saw that Brooke Street should not be narrowed but widened. Motorists making the corner swing out and finish on the right-hand side of the road because of a big sweep there. They turn the corner at high speeds.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: This is in conjunction with one-way traffic.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is the point. I am not talking about coming along Brooke

Street to Main North East Road, but travelling along Main North East Road and turning into Brooke Street. If the street is converted to one-way, without protection being provided for pedestrians, there will not be 20 accidents a year but 40 or 50. If the street is made one-way it will present an open invitation to motorists who drive without due care to make the corner at fast speeds. I do not know what advantage traffic islands will be.

I say sincerely that if ever a corner needed traffic lights it is this corner. It is quite as dangerous as that at the Buckingham Arms Hotel. I have often wondered how these lights were fixed, and I spoke to Mr. Johnke and told him that I did not think some corners where lights were needed would be controlled adequately by them. He said, and I accepted his word because I believe he has done remarkably well in his work, that any corner could be adapted to traffic lights in the interests of the travelling public. I hope that the islands are only on trial, and that soon we shall have traffic lights, because, with the widening and the remaking of the corner, we shall have trouble unless we do more in providing for the safety of pedestrians.

I now want to refer to the high tension poles on Hampstead Road. I first brought this matter under the notice of the Minister of Roads on July 25, 1962. I told him that I believed the poles were 4ft. 6in. or more out from the kerbing, and I asked whether they could be placed nearer. The Minister, in reply, said:

I am under the impression that the road work, which is usually the more difficult to get done, was ahead of the service facilities in this case. It will cost about £300 to move the poles, but I believe they will be removed in due course. I will let the honourable member have a detailed report.

On August 2 I again raised the matter and in his reply the Minister said:

I indicated in my reply that they would be removed. I now have a report that the high tension poles in Rakes Road and Hampstead Road were left in place after widening had been completed and it is expected that the Electricity Trust will, in the near future, remove them completely. It is considered, in the meantime, that as they are well marked with black and white paint and Scotch-lite they present no greater hazard than, for example, a parked car or a tree on the roadway.

Not one pole has been moved, despite the lapse of more than 12 months. I laugh every time I think of the statement that "they present no greater hazard than, for example, a parked car or a tree on the roadway."

I am sure that any driver of a motor vehicle would prefer to hit either a tree or another motor vehicle than a high tension pole, because usually when such a pole is hit there is a fatal accident. Repeatedly I have been told of near-misses. Both Hampstead Road and Rakes Road are good roads, but there seems to be a lack of appreciation of the need for safety by the removal of the poles. I do not know whether the Highways Department or the Electricity Trust is at fault. Are the poles to remain where they are until a fatal accident occurs? There was some agitation in connection with a position on the North East Road last winter. An unmade portion of it was as rough as it possibly could be and one night when going home from a youth gathering some children were hit by a motor car and several lost their lives. Within a month work was commenced to remake the road. Why couldn't it have been done before the fatal accidents occurred? I shudder every time I travel along this road. Sooner or later there must be a fatal accident. I would not like to be the person responsible for retaining the poles there. The road itself is almost perfect, but the poles remain in the wrong position. They should be moved back.

In 1958 I spoke about the installation of traffic lights in Adelaide and what I thought was best for King William Street. The Adelaide City Council has now come around partly to agreeing with what I suggested. It is said that it will cost £12,000 to modernize the traffic lights in King William Street, including the installation of pedestrian "Walk" and "Don't walk" signs. Their installation will be a step in the right direction. I think it was Councillor W. L. Bridgland, Chairman of the Traffic Committee of the Adelaide City Council, who supplied the information. He said that "Walk" and "Don't walk" signs had been added to several traffic light installations and that they were being extended by the council as providing maximum pedestrian safety. That is not so: it all helps, but other action is necessary. The lights indicate to pedestrians whether they can walk or not walk, and that is all right as far as it goes, but once they commence to walk the traffic making a left-hand turn still continues with the turn, thereby causing danger as it threads its way through the pedestrians. Also, drivers making the short right-hand turn continue to thread their way through the pedestrians. The only way they can get maximum protection, and I suggested it in 1958, is to do what is

done in Perth and Brisbane. In those cities the traffic going north and south and *vice versa*, and east and west and *vice versa*, stops, while the pedestrians cross. This means that the four lanes of traffic are stopped. I do not like the Barnes system of crossing intersections. In those two cities the pedestrians must cross at right angles. That is the maximum protection a pedestrian can get. The Adelaide City Council has done this so far in two stages: it has put the lights in for "Stop" and "Go"—admittedly an improvement. Then it proposes to put in "Walk" and "Don't walk" signs costing £12,000. It is leaving the third and vital step—that is, to halt all pedestrians at a given period, and in another given period all vehicular traffic. We would then cut out completely the vehicular traffic making the left-hand turn through the pedestrians and the motorist who makes the short right-hand turn through the pedestrians. I know the man who makes the short right-hand turn should not go through pedestrians, but he does. The only way to prevent that is to prohibit it altogether.

Another point concerning the City Council is my old friend (I have never stopped growling in this place about it) the pedestrian crossing in Victoria Square at Grote Street. I have never had a good word for it; it is totally wrong and does not function well. I am pleased that the City Council has at last decided to remove it and take the only course possible with that form of crossing. I do not like zebra crossings: the only good crossing is that with the red and green lights, because the only thing that Australian people understand is red for "Stop" and green for "Go".

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Doesn't the honourable member give them some credit for intelligence?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We want complete safety and that can be obtained only with red and green lights, such as those on North Terrace near the railway station. I do not know whether the Minister of Roads had anything to do with the lights there, but they are a good set and do not hold up the traffic to any appreciable extent; and, if they do hold it up, at least the pedestrian has every chance to cross the road with complete safety.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: Does the honourable member think that pedestrians should be prohibited from crossing anywhere except at intersections?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In the interests of safety I think so. I do not think zebra

crossings at intersections are as efficient as red and green light crossings.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Should we have these red and green lights built in?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know how many there are. It is all right as long as they are safe. We are looking for safety measures to prevent such large numbers of people being killed, whether motorists or pedestrians. We should endeavour to keep the number down to an absolute minimum. I believe this is the best way. Unless somebody can convince me otherwise, I shall not depart from that point of view. If anyone can convince me that some other type of crossing is better, I will admit that I am wrong, but so far nobody has proved it.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Does the honourable member think that we should judge other people's actions by our own?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We have to judge them by what they do, and that is the tragedy of it. If they would judge their actions by mine, they would not get into trouble, because I never cross anywhere other than at intersections. If people did that, they would be much better off. But, because people do cross at places other than intersections, they are entitled to the maximum protection while doing so. At the moment in King William Street people are not getting the maximum protection. Admittedly, the City Council is taking another step forward. I hope it will take the final step, and that I shall live to see it.

I touch on another matter while speaking of the City Council. I was pleased to read this morning of that huge project of transferring and transforming Morphett Street bridge and Victoria bridge. I hope nothing is placed in the way of the City Council proceeding with that work, which is necessary. I have had it in mind and spoken of it in years gone by, and have suggested that it be done. It will be a great advantage to the people who want to come from the north into the city and go from the city to the north and north-west. To my mind, it will assist public transport considerably. I have in mind the people who use the Kilburn and Ferryden Park buses which cross King William Road by St. Peter's Cathedral and then go down North Terrace and Kintore Avenue and back. They have to make a right-hand turn just on the city side of the bridge. I visualize when this work is completed that those buses from the north-west section, Ferryden Park and Kilburn areas, will utilize the Victoria bridge and Morphett Street bridge, turning from

Currie Street or Hindley Street (making a left-hand turn there), and then a left-hand turn into King William Street. It is the logical thing to be done and I hope it will be done. I wish the City Council every success in the matter and hope the alteration of those bridges will be proceeded with as soon as possible. It will put an end to any suggestion that the railway station should be shifted from where it is. I have a personal view on that: the station is as near as it can possibly be to the city, so please do not shift it or the railway losses will be greater than they are now.

I want to touch on another question affecting railway accommodation. We read, amongst other things, that £80,000 is provided for the construction of nine air-conditioned passenger cars for the Adelaide to Port Pirie service, and £256,000 to continue the programme of improvements and modifications to freight vehicles. I do not know whether nine cars would be sufficient to overcome the difficulties. If ever a service needed improving it is the one from Adelaide to Port Pirie, which connects with the East-West Express.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: It is reminiscent of the horse and buggy days.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes; and it is worse than that in the summer. It spoils a good trip. At the Western Australian end, whilst it is not as good as it could be, it is considerably better than at the Port Pirie to Adelaide end. All I can say is that I hope this work will be expedited. Possibly it is too much to expect it to be finished by the end of next January. Some of us may be making a journey to Western Australia then and it will be appreciated if these improvements are in operation. It will be a much better service and may entice people to use the train from Port Pirie to Adelaide much more than they do now.

I wonder how many more years will elapse before the Adelaide to Mount Gambier express is improved. (I am not talking about the daylight service; I understand the daylight train from Adelaide to Mount Gambier is comfortable, although I have not ridden in it.) Last December I had occasion to travel to Mount Gambier with other members and I was a little disappointed with, first of all, the sleeping accommodation. Let me say that whilst it is no pleasure to travel on that train (notwithstanding that I can use it free of charge) I shall not be using the sleepers under any circumstances in future unless they are

considerably improved, although I doubt whether I shall use the service again unless I can manage to travel on the daylight train. Those carriages do not encourage passengers to travel. The sleeping compartments are the oldest in South Australia. The Minister shakes his head but I have yet to find carriages on another line that are as old. They have nothing inside them except beds and a hand basin.

The Hon. C. R. Story: There are some lovely seats.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There is no space in which to put a case. I read the comments from another place and one member said they were rather comfortable. Well, it is not my idea of comfort. I am told that the carriages for first and second class passengers on that line are not air-conditioned. The day is past when people will travel from Adelaide to Mount Gambier in carriages that are not air-conditioned. With the money allocated to the railways, the standard of the carriages could be improved considerably. Even if nothing else is done I am told the first necessity is to have air-conditioning for first and second class passengers on that journey. If the Railways Department wishes to compete with the airways and road services it will have to give its passengers reasonable comfort or the losses will be even heavier than they are now as there is no possibility of increasing the number of passengers on a train that is not up to reasonable standards.

I refer now to the line for Government buildings and land, for which £9,000,000 is allocated. The first item is hospital buildings, £1,100,000; it deals mainly with the Royal Adelaide Hospital, to which I shall not refer as it is before the Public Works Committee. The hospital to which I particularly refer and for which I can find no amount is the Lyell McEwin Hospital at Elizabeth. I have taken some interest in hospitalization, a problem that is ever increasing. There are many hospitals of the community type in and around Adelaide catering more or less for general and maternity cases, but there has not been any increase in facilities in the northern districts—and I think this applies generally with the exception of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital—for the casualty types of cases that need immediate attention.

It is a problem that has been faced on a number of occasions by the hospital with which I am connected. This hospital has some 38 or 40 beds. Beds, staff and doctors must always be available to cope with casualties.

In Elizabeth there are now many people and much traffic; industry is growing and it must grow if Elizabeth is to be successful. Hence there is a likelihood of more accidents necessitating immediate treatment. Unfortunately the Lyell McEwin Hospital is similar to community hospitals and I have been approached by the trade union movement to suggest that the Government examine the need for further facilities for casualty cases, particularly at Elizabeth. I will cite a case illustrated in a letter from Mr. Husdell, Secretary of the Federated Ironworkers' Association of Australia addressed to the Secretary, the United Trades and Labour Council, dated March 21, 1963. It reads:

I am directed by resolution of the Adelaide Branch Committee of Management of this association to bring to the notice of your council the following state of affairs concerning lack of suitable hospitalization for acute casualty cases at Elizabeth. The ensuing report was submitted to the Adelaide Branch Committee of Management:

"An employee of Die Casters Ltd., Elizabeth, received an injury to a foot and the company conveyed her to the Casualty Department of the Lyell McEwin Hospital, but as no competent medical officer was available she was then transported to the surgery of one of the local doctors at Elizabeth Vale. At this surgery she had to stand for one and a half hours before she received medical treatment."

After discussing this case with the Works Manager of Die Casters, I received confirmation of the existing position from personnel employed at an adjacent factory. I then interviewed a Mr. Joel, Administrator of the Lyell McEwin Hospital at Elizabeth, who substantiated the fact that the Lyell McEwin Hospital is not a hospital designed to treat casualty patients, whether road accidents or industrial injuries; it is primarily a maternity and general diseases hospital where local doctors, after treating their patients or operating on same, have them at this hospital so that they can receive their attention.

As there are no residential doctors at the Lyell McEwin Hospital my committee feels that every effort should be made by the trade union movement to bring pressure upon the Government to establish such medical staff and premises as would constitute a proper casualty hospital at Elizabeth.

I think that is a fair request. I know we have to crawl before we walk and walk before we run but Elizabeth has passed the crawling and walking stages and is running along fairly well.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Never has one got so much without crawling, if I may say so.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I believe that the Government should consider reserving a section of the Lyell McEwin Hospital for casualties. This would be in the interest of the industries established at Elizabeth

and of the community as a whole. I hope that when I ask questions on this matter in the future I shall obtain satisfactory answers. I hope the Attorney-General will draw the attention of the Minister of Health to my remarks about the hospital at Elizabeth.

I notice that provision is made in the Bill for police and courthouse buildings—£1,100,000. The Chief Secretary said that the programme of construction of police stations and courthouses to serve the country areas is to be continued in 1963-64 and provision is made to complete a number of works which were under construction at the end of June last and to commence work on various new projects. A sum of £600,000 is provided for further work on the construction of the new police headquarters building and cell block in Angas Street. The building is estimated to cost £1,260,000 and will provide for the needs of the Police Department for some years ahead. In an effort to see what progress had been made and what work remained I examined last year's report. This did not help me, but confused me. Last year the Chief Secretary, at page 744 of *Hansard*, said:

Police and Courthouse Buildings, £800,000.—The programme of construction of police stations and courthouses to serve the country areas is to be continued in 1962-63 and provision is made to complete a number of works which were under construction at June 30, 1962, and to commence work on various new projects. It is proposed to commence work on the new police headquarters building in Adelaide and £201,000 is provided for this purpose. The new multi-storey building to be erected in Angas Street is estimated to cost £1,562,000, and will provide for the needs of the Police Department for some years ahead. Upon completion, two of the upper floors will be available for a number of years for the use of other departments. The sum of £1,000 is provided for initial work on a new cell block at police headquarters, the total estimated cost of which is £99,000.

The total of last year's figures of £1,562,000 for multi-storey buildings and £99,000 for a cell block is £1,661,000; yet this year the cost is estimated at £1,260,000.

I tried to work out when the work was likely to be completed and how much money would be needed. The sum of £201,000 provided last year and the £600,000 this year give a total of £801,000. If the figure given last year by the Chief Secretary of £1,661,000 is accurate the work would be half completed but, if the figure he gives this year of £1,260,000 is correct, at the end of this financial year it could be two-thirds completed. If anyone can work those figures out and tell me which is right I shall be happy.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Last year's figure was only an estimate. This year's figure is accurate.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I hope it is the latter figure because, if that is so, at the end of next June the building should be more than two-thirds completed. While this work is going on the Police Force must be working at some disadvantage, and I believe that the sooner the building is completed and the force is assembled under one roof the better will be its efficiency and the services it can give the community. I am prepared to accept that the Attorney-General may have answered my question. No doubt the Budget will show the figure exactly. It is not often that an amount of £400,000 is saved on an estimate. It is generally the other way around. It is satisfying to know that the estimate was excessive.

I hope my remarks on the Bill have been worth while. My criticisms were intended to be fair. I hope the Minister of Railways will do something about the Adelaide to Mount Gambier railway service and I hope the Government will give favourable consideration to extending the services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital at Elizabeth in the way I mentioned. I support the Bill.

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

ELDER SMITH & CO. LIMITED PROVIDENT FUNDS BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 594.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1): I support the Bill and wholeheartedly agree with the Attorney-General that it could have been a private member's Bill, but in view of the somewhat unusual circumstances and the superannuation money involved the Government saw fit to introduce it as a Government measure. As the matter will go before a Select Committee and the views of that Committee will be placed before the Chamber I agree that we shall have a more opportune time for full debate then. This Bill concerns the amalgamation of Elder Smith & Co. Limited and Goldsbrough Mort Limited. The female superannuation fund was non-contributory. The female employees of the old company will have their rights transferred, and the new company will provide them with a fund similar to the one originally formed in 1938. The fund for the male members was established in 1913. There is no need to debate this measure at length now, and I await the Select Committee's report.

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

BUSINESS NAMES BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 595.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1): I support this Bill. I speak for my colleagues when I say that we were indebted to Sir Arthur Rymill for his remarks on the measure, which is really related to the Companies Act. When that measure was before the Council many amendments were moved in order to provide a uniform Companies Act. I do not intend to deal with the details of this Bill, but there are one or two matters on which I wish to make comments. In matters of company law, and matters dealing with trade and commerce, where the Commonwealth is affected, and where the Commonwealth has no power to impose authority on the States, there have been conferences of Attorneys-General. I commend our Attorney-General for what is done, with the assistance of the Parliamentary Draftsman. It is not perhaps a question that he himself can determine, but should there not be a permanent committee to deal with matters affecting company law, including the registration of business names? These matters affect not only South Australia but other States also.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: A Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has been appointed and it meets periodically.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Yes, but I think it would be as well, in addition to having the assistance of the Parliamentary Draftsmen, for people practising company law to be seconded by the Attorneys-General to give their views on matters before the committee. I do not say that the Attorneys-General and the Parliamentary Draftsmen are not competent to deal with those matters, but the people engaged in practising the law would be able to make valuable suggestions. Recently this Council passed the Associations Incorporation Act Amendment Bill, which is another measure dealing with trade and commerce. As I said when we were discussing the Companies Bill, it is best that members make their suggestions when the measure is in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short title."

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney General) moved:

To delete "1962" and insert "1963".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 2 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Duty to furnish information."

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment to clause 12. I did not realize that the clause covered so many pages and I missed the time for moving the amendment. I presume I shall have to ask for the Bill to be recommitted?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 14 to 24 passed.

Clause 25—"Authority of Registrar to destroy documents."

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I move:

After "registered" first occurring to insert "or any record kept".

The explanation that the Parliamentary Draftsman has given me on this is as follows:

In its present form clause 25 will empower the Registrar to dispose of only statements and notices lodged with him in respect of business names where the registration has not been in force for 12 years. These amendments would extend that power to other records kept by him in the files relating to such business names where the retention of those records would be unnecessary.

I have discussed this matter with the Parliamentary Draftsman, who assures me that this is only to ensure that, where the principal records are destroyed, other records going with them can also be destroyed. It can be left safely in the hands of the Registrar.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I move:

After "registered" second occurring to insert "or the record was kept".

This amendment has the same effect as the previous one.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I am not quite clear on that.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: The insertion of these words does not make sense.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It does not seem to make sense.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I think it does. I will read the clause with the amendments:

Subject to Part III of the Libraries and Institutes Act, 1939, as amended, the Registrar may, if in his opinion it is no longer necessary

or desirable to retain them, destroy or dispose of any statement or notice lodged, furnished or registered—

and then we insert the words that I read out— or any record kept under this Act or under any corresponding previous enactment, where the registration of the business name or of the firm, individual or corporation, as the case may be, in respect of which the statement or notice was lodged, filed, received, or registered or had been kept and has not been in force at any time during the preceding twelve years.

I think it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN: That is what you moved previously?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes. When I say that, I am relying on my memory. I am sorry. I will read that last portion of the clause again:

in respect of which the statement or notice was lodged, filed, received or registered or the record was kept has not been in force at any time during the preceding twelve years.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: May I suggest that, in view of the question that has been raised about amending this clause, the Attorney-General report progress and have the amendment in print by the next day of sitting?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I should be quite prepared to do that, not particularly because of this amendment. I apologize to honourable members if it is not on their files. I thought it would have been and I am sorry for that. I had intended, in any event, to ask shortly that progress be reported because I see that the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill has an amendment on the file later on in clause 25, where he was to move to omit the word "twelve" and in lieu thereof to insert the word "fifteen", which would increase from 12 years to 15 years the period during which the Registrar would need to keep documents before destroying them. I take it that Sir Arthur Rymill would wish to make some submissions on that matter. In those circumstances, I am prepared to move that the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.3 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 28, at 2.15 p.m.