

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, September 17, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

CAR ACCIDENTS

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: My question, to the Chief Secretary, concerns motor vehicles involved in accidents, both fatal and non-fatal. Can he say whether any records are kept by the police or whether any investigations are made and reports submitted with suggestions for necessary steps to be taken regarding the ages of the cars involved in these accidents and the length of time prior to the accidents when they were last serviced?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not know of any such records, but I shall make inquiries and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

KADINA HOSPITAL

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Part of an article in the Yorke Peninsula newspaper *Country Times* of September 11 states:

\$427 in cheques was presented to the Secretary of the Kadina Hospital (Mrs. Blowes) by Mr. Lloyd Hughes M.P. on behalf of the Government.

Can the Chief Secretary say whether it is the normal practice for the local member to present cheques to local hospitals on behalf of the Government, or whether this was a special concession given to Mr. Hughes?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I know that most of the matters concerning the hospital in that area do come through Mr. Hughes.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: A wide-awake member.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Quite possibly. This is the first I have heard of this particular matter. I shall make inquiries and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

PARA WIRRA NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On September 4 I asked the Minister of Agriculture if he would obtain information from the Minister of Lands with reference to the fencing of the Para Wirra National Park. Has the Minister a reply to that question?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My colleague, the Minister of Lands, advises that the National Parks Commission is taking steps to improve the condition of the fencing on the boundaries of the Para Wirra National Park. Finance is not available in this financial year for replacement but a limited amount is available for maintenance. The available funds do not permit the erection of a kangaroo-proof fence around the park but the commission has given an assurance that it will take whatever steps it can to overcome this problem.

FLUORIDATION

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: In August the South Australian Health Association issued an article on fluoridation, paragraph 11 of which claimed that a Russian professor, when addressing the association, said that fluoridation had been introduced and used in Russia for 11 years and then abandoned. Does the Minister know whether this is true and, if it is, for what reason it was abandoned?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I realize that some information on the fluoridation of water supplies is coming from Russia and I believe that in some areas of Russia fluoridation of water has not been persisted in but that, on present information, it was largely connected with the chemical action of the fluoride on the water pipes in those areas. However, I will refer the honourable member's question to the Public Health Department for a full reply to the question.

The Hon. SIR ARTHUR RYMILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: There is at present plenty of chlorine in the Adelaide water supply, and now we are to get fluorine. Will the Minister consider adding bromine, the third partner of this chemical group, to our water to keep everybody calmer over the addition of fluorine?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This is a very pertinent question at this stage. Having had some experience with bromine, I do not intend to advocate it.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I desire to make a short statement before addressing a question to the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Some 3½ years ago the then Minister of Roads, the Hon. Mr. Bevan, was reported as opening the first stage of the freeway through the Adelaide Hills. At that time the first stage (as it was called) went from what is known as Measday Hill to Stirling. Ever since that date, I think I can say categorically that at least half of this opened part of the freeway has been closed. From time to time, from week to week, we find even more hazards placed against the motoring public. Will the Minister make a personal inspection of this work and report to this Council on its expected future progress?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have made a personal inspection of the area to which the honourable member refers; that occurred about five weeks ago. I agree with him there are many problems there facing motorists, who are forced to use that part of the freeway, and sections of it that are under construction, and understandably the going is not easy when a vast undertaking of that kind in an area such as that (the terrain being what it is) is under construction. However, to bring the matter up to date, I will obtain the report the honourable member requests and bring it down as soon as possible.

FARINA ROAD

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The South Australian Government Tourist Bureau provides tourist maps of the Wilpena Pound and of areas to the north of this State, on which maps the road from Farina to Andamooka is shown. However, this road is ill-defined; there are no signposts along its route; and it is generally in a poor condition. I venture to say that if tourists were to become lost in that territory, it could be quite costly. Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when was the last time the Highways Department graded this road? Also, when is it likely that a grader will be put over the road to bring it into serviceable order for those people who wish to travel from Farina to Andamooka?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall ascertain that information for the honourable member.

HIGHWAYS EQUIPMENT

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: In many sections of pastoral country people would be prepared to pay a hire rate for the use of some of the heavy earth-moving equipment that is used by the Highways Department (when carrying out roadworks in those areas) to construct and maintain air strips and also to improve access roads to homesteads. It is believed that some of the equipment is not available from any other source and that it could possibly be hired from the Highways Department to carry out these small jobs while those machines are in the areas performing their normal work. Will the Minister therefore take up this matter with his department to see whether such machinery could be used on hire for such jobs?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall take up this question and bring down a report for the honourable member.

MOUNT GAMBIER BUS SERVICE

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: The Mount Gambier Chamber of Commerce is extremely interested in the establishment of a weekend bus service from that city to Adelaide, its idea being that the bus should leave Mount Gambier early Friday evening and return from Adelaide early on Sunday evening. This service would provide facilities for a reasonably specialized group of people such as teachers, bank officers and the like, who live in Adelaide but work in Mount Gambier, and it would undoubtedly provide travelling facilities for special occasions, such as football matches, to say nothing of the ordinary every-day run-of-the-mill traffic. As not only Mount Gambier people but the people along the proposed route of this service (the Coorong) would be served, and as no alternative method of transport is available for these people, especially at weekends, will the Minister consider such a request?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: When I was in the South-East some months ago representatives of the Mount Gambier Chamber of Commerce Incorporated spoke to me about the proposed weekend bus services to which the honourable member has referred. Subsequently, the

matter was investigated very carefully. Problems, however, arise in regard to the alternative operator, who is at present licensed to operate a bus service from Mount Gambier to Adelaide, and they also arise in regard to the passenger rail service. In view of the question, however, and in view of the great interest in this matter in Mount Gambier and in other parts of the South-East, I shall obtain a detailed reply for the honourable member.

ANZAC HIGHWAY

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about the possibility of providing ranking bays on the Anzac Highway?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Highways Department is currently investigating the widening of Anzac Highway to provide for bus bays and other service areas. The bus bays would need to be at regular intervals, so, with parking bays and service bays at shopping centres, the total length of work would be substantial and costly.

The stormwater drains now along the outer kerb lines may not have to be relocated in alignment, but they are old and may have to be replaced over the length of all bays for adequate strength. The relocation in depth for sufficient cover to carry the loading, and to construct and drain the bays is also likely. Any necessary depth variation of drains for the bays will require complete relaying of the entire drain to maintain the necessary hydraulic gradient.

Very old Engineering and Water Supply Department and Gas Company mains are under the bicycle tracks. These would require replacement with new pipes and relocation in depth under bays. The authorities concerned may also require relocation in alignment away from the bays, and more extensive work if the depth variation interferes with requirements.

All the above work would be costly. However, a very comprehensive investigation would be needed for exact answers. Experience and study of old plans indicate the likelihood expressed.

DERAILMENTS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of September 5 about the condition of the Angaston railway line?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The honourable member's question also dealt with derailments. Derailments took place on the Angaston line at North Gawler on May 27, 1968, and at Light Pass on August 16, 1968. The costs

incurred as a result of these derailments amounted to \$21,300. It is considered that this line can be maintained satisfactorily without the necessity for further strengthening or ballasting.

WALLAROO INDUSTRY

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question about the bagging of grain at what was the old distillery at Wallaroo?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Director of Industrial Development reports:

The bagging of wheat at Wallaroo by William Charlick Limited has ceased temporarily due to a fall-off in orders from Arabian buyers. After the cut-back in orders William Charlick continued to bag wheat in anticipation of an early renewal of orders, but stocks built up to such an extent that there was no alternative but to close down activities. These stocks have been reduced in recent weeks by drawing on them to supply small orders for shipment ex Port Adelaide. This reduction and the recent receipt of new orders have now enabled the firm specifically to programme a vessel to load bagged wheat from Wallaroo next September. Because of the size of the orders and the reduction that has occurred and will occur in stocks at Wallaroo it will be necessary to recommence bagging operations at that centre some time prior to September to provide bagged wheat for the vessel. Continuity of work will then depend upon the receipt of new orders.

I am also advised that William Charlick Limited is at present investigating the possibility of bagging barley in the coming year. Should this prove a feasible proposition then additional work will be provided at Wallaroo. The firm is confident that bagging operations will continue at Wallaroo; but overall activity will fluctuate depending upon orders received from oversea buyers.

WILLIAMSTOWN SCHOOL CROSSING

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question relates to the crossing at the Williamstown school. Children have to cross the main Williamstown-Gawler road in order to get from the school building to the sports oval. I have received a letter from Mr. K. V. Mewett, Secretary of the Williamstown School Committee, asking that I draw this matter to the Minister's attention. Because I am familiar with this crossing I can say that it is on a rise, so visibility is not good. I do not know

whether an underpass, an overpass or school crossing lights would solve the problem, but I do know that some warning device is very necessary. Will the Minister consider this matter and bring down a reply?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall look closely at this matter and bring down a reply.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1968.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 5, Page 1095.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support this Bill, although not with a great deal of enthusiasm or confidence, and not because of the work programme it sets out. Indeed, the programme indicates a lack of work. During the last Parliament when I had the honour to be a Minister of the Government we heard much from members opposite about all the things that had been done to retard the progress of the State. Things that were said then did not improve the State's economy and certainly did not improve confidence within the State. During the election campaign the present Premier in his policy speech said that immediately his Party came to government people would start to regain confidence in the State and the Government would provide a situation where everything in the garden was lovely.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Getting South Australia moving!

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But they did not say we would move backwards.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What about the improved employment position?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I read the newspapers, too. The present Premier went out of his way to say how he was going to do it. My experience over the years has been that the building industry is always a good measuring stick of confidence in the economy of the State. However, in the second paragraph of the Minister's second reading explanation we find that, instead of the Government giving a stimulus to the building industry in an endeavour to regain confidence and to get the State back to prosperity, quite the opposite is the case. The Chief Secretary said:

The \$19,500,000 for housing is \$1,500,000 less than the \$21,000,000 so allocated last year. The decision to nominate a smaller

proportion of new moneys for housing, and thus to be able to allocate a greater proportion for other works, was taken after a careful examination of all requirements.

I was going to stop there, but to be quite fair I shall read the rest of the paragraph. It goes on:

This examination showed that recently there had been a considerable overtaking of the backlog in providing funds for housing finance, with a resultant marked decline in waiting time for individual applicants for loans. Also, it was clear that private enterprise was able and willing to provide a broad and satisfactory service in house construction, particularly sale housing. As a result, the pressures on the State Bank of South Australia and the South Australian Housing Trust have been reduced, and it is now both desirable and practicable to allocate more funds to other urgent works.

That does not give any impetus to the building industry or do anything to help the progress that everyone would like to see. I cannot reconcile the statement of the Chief Secretary with two statements of quite conflicting points of view that I have seen recently. The first statement I refer to is by the Commonwealth Minister for Housing (Dame Annabelle Rankin). This is in yesterday's *Advertiser*, and it is very illuminating. The article states:

The Federal Minister for Housing (Dame Annabelle Rankin), who arrived from Brisbane last night to address the Women's Agricultural Bureau Conference in Adelaide today, said the recent level of approvals for new buildings in South Australia, other than dwellings, should indicate a higher level of building activity for the State during the rest of 1968. This should assist in maintaining the level of building employment.

After a low level of construction in the December, 1967 and March, 1968 quarters, approvals for new buildings apart from dwellings increased sharply in South Australia. Approvals in this category for 1967-68 were 63 per cent greater than in 1966-67.

I immediately wondered why so much was wrong with the building industry and why there was so much unemployment in the building trades. Following that, I was amazed to read in last night's *News* what I can see now is obviously the correct situation. An article appeared in that newspaper headed "Slump in Work for Builders". The authority for this article cannot be refuted, despite what the Minister has said previously. The article states:

Employment in the building industry in South Australia at the end of June shrunk to the lowest level for many years. Figures released today by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics give employment in the industry at June 30, as 11,370. This was 398 fewer than at the end of March and 1,097 fewer than at the same time last year.

During the June quarter 1,501 houses were started and 1,738 finished. Commencements were 154 less than in the March quarter and 513 below those of the June quarter last year.

The value of buildings under construction at the end of June was \$112,000,000—an increase of \$1,500,000 on the March figure, but \$6,500,000 down on that of a year earlier.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Would those figures be authentic?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No-one challenges the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics. This will show to what lengths some people will go for political purposes. I was pleased to hear last night and to read this morning of the improved employment position in the State. Members have heard me say before that this has been one of my pet subjects because of my particular vocation over many years. I read of the better employment situation, but I could not see any mention of the building industry, which badly needs a lift. The position is not as stated by the Commonwealth Minister for Housing. However, the point I wish to make is that our Government in this State certainly did not help by providing \$1,500,000 less for housing than was provided last year. I think that is fair comment.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It had no intention of helping.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know. Unlike some other people, I would like to see everybody employed. At present 1.4 per cent of our work force is unemployed, and even though this is perhaps lower than it has been it still is not low enough. I do not think this Government can claim any credit for this reduced unemployment: I think it is caused purely by the seasonal conditions. We have to remember that the drought that affected our State last year affected not only our manufacturers of items such as refrigerators and motor cars but also manufacturers in other States. Some other parts of Australia have suffered from drought for the past two or three years and it goes without saying that their machinery, cars and household equipment are somewhat run down; so already they are taking a calculated risk and buying those products in anticipation of a good season and a good crop. I hope their anticipation meets with success.

For the Engineering and Water Supply Department this Bill provides \$28,420,000 to be spent this year. I searched through the list of proposed works, and I was surprised to find no provision this year for the Chowilla dam project. Like many or all other honour-

able members, I should like to see more water conservation in this State, and the continuation of the Chowilla dam project in particular, but unfortunately, as we all know, it was stopped. However, as I understand the position, a decision will be given towards the end of this year on whether or not Chowilla, as we know it as a project, will be proceeded with. My point (I shall be happy if any Minister can tell me this) is: assuming we get the answer we all desire—that Chowilla will be proceeded with, say, at the end of December or in January of next year—where can we find any money to proceed with that work if it is not provided by this Bill for the financial year 1968-69? I do not claim to be an authority on this, but I have always been under the impression that, if a line does not appear in the Loan Estimates for a project within a given financial year, nothing can be done about it. If my assumption is correct (and I honestly believe it is) it leaves me with this thought: either the Government has accepted the fact that Chowilla will not be proceeded with or it has accepted the fact that, if the green light is given for Chowilla to be proceeded with, nothing can be done until the financial year 1969-70.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What was the Government's promise in the policy speech?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As I understand it, it was said that, irrespective of what happened in the other States, it would be proceeded with forthwith.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That we would "go it alone".

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, that we would "go it alone", which I thought was one of the most foolish statements I had ever heard made. We as a State could not go it alone. I should like to know from the Chief Secretary, who, I understand, will be replying to this debate, the answer to that question, because I have heard it said that nothing would happen if what I was assuming was correct.

The Chief Secretary in his second reading explanation of the Bill said that \$11,600,000 would be provided for hospital buildings. Then he dealt with the main proposals for 1968-69, which I do not want to go through again, but in the main I was pleased with them because they were a continuation of the programme as I knew it just before the elections, with one or two exceptions. I will mention one or two points about hospitals. I do not criticize anything on which money has been spent in connection with hospitals, because the

work has all been planned and proceeded with as money has become available. In particular, I am pleased (I hope I am not speaking out of turn when I say this) that \$100,000 is provided for the Port Augusta Hospital. I take it that the Public Buildings Department and the Hospitals Department get together and proceed with firm planning for a firm commencement in 1969-70. That is as I remember it. For the sake of the people of Port Augusta who, over the years, have had many disappointments with their hospital, I hope that this work will be proceeded with according to plan. I understand there is to be a meeting of the board of that hospital tonight, and I have been told that it is to do with the proposed new building for the hospital. I know nothing more than that.

When these plans are provided in the early stages, there is some shifting of wards and internal structures but I sincerely hope that the Port Augusta Hospital is allowed to be proceeded with according to the programming that has been laid down and accepted. It is not easy. I know all the difficulties about hospitals. They involve big money. I appreciate all the difficulties and the matter of priorities. I know of no other public hospital in the State that needs replacing more urgently than the Port Augusta Hospital. It is our worst hospital, so there should be no question of priority there.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think the Leader will be happy with the answer he gets.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: My information (I have no objection to it) was that one ward would be changed and would become a labour ward, for convenience, and so forth. That is the type of thing talked about. Some people get very edgy about these things. That is what I suggest can be talked about. I hope that is a correct decision.

I see that \$150,000 is provided for the Modbury Hospital. I do not know that I was happy with the \$150,000; I thought more might have been provided this year. However, the hospital is in its early stages and the fact that it will continue and that \$150,000 is provided for it for this year encourages me to believe that the main part of it will be proceeded with in 1969-70. If that is the case, we shall not have much about which to complain. One hospital not mentioned, about which I had many problems when I was Chief Secretary, is the south-western districts hospital, a teaching hospital connected with Flinders University.

I would like to hear members regarding this, because many of them were vocal in their criticism of me and my Party when in Government. The Chief Secretary can smile, but he was one of the most vocal. I go to certain places for information, but I do not always get winning tips. I have nothing to confirm this, but I believe that it will be a long time before the south-western districts hospital is built. I believe a teaching hospital is necessary to cater for a need. However, if we accept what the people in the other States tell us, this could develop into another Chowilla. The Australian Universities Commission has to make a recommendation on this matter. If we do not get its recommendation, finance will not be provided for this as a teaching hospital. I have been told that we will not get the approval of the commission. If we do not, I hope every member of this Parliament takes strong exception. I understand that certain people in South Australia were told to get on with the job: I refer to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the university. I am not an authority on this matter, but I do not believe the Adelaide University or the teaching hospitals we have are sufficient to provide the number of doctors we need. If that is why we have not heard of the south-western districts hospital this year, I urge the Government to protest to the limit of its ability in an attempt to have the matter rectified.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The A.U.C. has not reported.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: If the Minister wants a little on the side, I will back my grapevine. True, the commission may not have reported.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We are continuing to plan the south-western districts hospital.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am glad to hear that. I turn now to the Prisons Department, about which the Chief Secretary said:

The sum of \$200,000 is provided to commence the construction of a rehabilitation centre at Northfield designed to accommodate 46 women under modern conditions. The centre is estimated to cost \$400,000, and will replace the existing inadequate accommodation for women prisoners at the Adelaide Gaol. The plans provide for single rooms and partitioned dormitories with adequate facilities for training, education and recreation purposes.

I was pleased that a contract had been let for this project. The sooner such a centre is built and the women transferred from the Adelaide Gaol, the better it will be for all concerned. I hope that the project will be proceeded with as soon as possible and that

the maximum security section proposed to be built at Yatala (to which it will be possible to transfer prisoners from the Adelaide Gaol) will be proceeded with as soon as practicable thereafter.

I am not concerned so much with the siting of the third project, which is the remand yard. I agree that we need more modern accommodation for people who are remanded for sentence or for trial before their cases are finally dealt with. It has been suggested that another department wants the land on which the present Adelaide Gaol stands. My views are different from those of people in the Education Department who consider that this would be an ideal site for a teachers' college. In my opinion, it is more ideal as a site for a remand yard and should continue to be used as such, provided the old buildings and warders' houses (which were built 100 years ago) were knocked down and rebuilt.

I pay a tribute to the late Comptroller of Prisons, Mr. R. Hearfield. I knew this man from the time I became Minister, when he was the Deputy Comptroller. I came to know him very well and to appreciate his ability. He took a keen interest in his work and, much to my surprise and pleasure, he took an interest in the unfortunate prisoners under his control at the Adelaide Gaol, Gladstone, Yatala or wherever they might have been.

He placed great emphasis on rehabilitation and he did more for persons in that way than most men in such a position are expected to do. Indeed, he did a remarkable job and I place on record my appreciation of his services to the Government and to the people of this State. I express my sympathy to his widow and family, who have lost a husband and a father at a somewhat early age. I now turn to an item in the Bill that rather surprised me, after the grilling I received in regard to it when I was the Minister in charge.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: When things are different, they are not the same.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: When one grows older, one accepts those things. I see that \$2,525,000 is provided for non-government hospital and institution buildings. I would like the Chief Secretary to correct me if I am wrong, but it appears that he introduced this section of the Loan programme simply by saying:

The major building projects at non-government hospitals and institutions, for which the grants are proposed this year, are as follows—He then referred to the Calvary Hospital and the Helping Hand Centre. I have no objection to either of those hospitals being helped.

Indeed, they are worthy of all the help they are given. In the main they were more or less granted assistance during the Labor Government's term of office. However, we got such a grilling on this matter that I wonder why, after members opposite said what they did when they were in Opposition, their Party is continuing with these provisions. All sorts of accusation were made against us. I wonder how anyone making those accusations has the audacity to continue to support the Government. In his statement on the Loan Estimates, the Treasurer said:

In reviewing the detailed departmental proposals which had a claim to participate in the available Loan funds, and which had been largely incorporated in the preliminary programme put before the previous Government in March last, the present Government gave serious consideration to the practicability of relieving Loan Account of the burden of those tertiary education and hospital building grants which had been charged consistently to Revenue Account until 1965-66. For reasons which I shall set out fully in the Government's main Budget statement early next month—

I have not yet had a chance to read that statement—

it is clear that Revenue Account is not yet able to meet those grants as it did in the past, and the Government is obliged, though reluctantly, to approve for this year a continuation of the policy initiated by the previous Government for these and comparable grants. However the Government proposes to shape its future financial programmes in such a way as will ensure the earliest possible transfer of these commitments back to Revenue Account, so releasing further Loan funds for essential capital works and development. This will enable progressive effect to be given to the Government's desire and undertaking to improve further allocations for school buildings and other capital works.

I want to refer first to the Chief Secretary's statement, which I clearly remember. His remarks about the step taken were relatively kind. He said that, whilst he agreed that the Labor Government's action was not illegal, it was not ethical. All I can say is: if an action taken by the Labor Government is not ethical, does a change of Government make that action ethical? Other honourable members, whom I shall not name, said that funds were misappropriated. One honourable member went as far as to say that I was crook. If those statements were right and just at the time I was Chief Secretary, what have those honourable members to say today about the matter?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think he must have meant that you were not well.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No; he repeated it. It is one of the things that I did not appreciate. I should like to hear the views of those honourable members on the present Government's stand on this matter. I do not think there is anything wrong with it: the practice has been followed throughout Australia, and I prophesy that it will continue in this State for many years to come.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Do you believe it is a good policy?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: It is not universally accepted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, it is. This practice is followed in almost all the States of Australia, and it will be continued in this State. It is easy to say things when one is in Opposition but it is a very different situation to put one's beliefs into practice when in Government. I hope members of the Liberal and Country League have learnt their lesson. When I was Chief Secretary statements were made about the Labor Government that should have been left unsaid.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They now wish that the statements had been left unsaid.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I wish to turn now to the statements made about Professor Richardson and to place my own views on record. During the Address in Reply debate the Hon. Mr. Kemp said some very unkind things about Professor Richardson, and he followed them with a series of questions that were nothing less than character assassination. To the best of my knowledge this has never previously been done in this Council. When I realized that the Hon. Mr. Kemp did not intend to proceed to secure a reply to his question, I asked the same question. I was given a reply that did not really answer any part of the question. On the following day I told the Minister that I did not think he had told the truth. When I made that statement my colleagues and I were convinced that we had not heard the answer that had been prepared for the Hon. Mr. Kemp. We are, however, now convinced that we did get the same answer.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You did.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. The matter, however, from the viewpoint of public confidence does not rest there. This was not merely a Minister's reply: it was dealt with, I understand, by Cabinet. It would have been bad enough if the Minister's reply had indicated to the public

that it was all right to allow an honourable member of this Chamber to start a character assassination of some person outside who could not defend himself. However, this was a decision at Cabinet level, and it has left a nasty taste outside.

This does not do Parliament any good, and it certainly does not result in people outside regaining confidence. If members opposite think that it does, then I can only say they do not meet the same cross-section of the community that I meet. If an honourable member goes outside and does something he deserves what he gets. At the same time, if the Government protects somebody in this Chamber who embarks on a character assassination, it deserves what will surely come its way.

Another thing that is even more serious in my view is the repudiation by this Government of the previous Government's appointment of the Director of Industrial Development. In the main, I am proud of the appointments my Government made, for we looked for and appointed people irrespective of their political views or leanings. Selecting the people who could best do the job was our first consideration, and I think that at the time we appointed Mr. Currie we secured one of the best possible men. The present Government apparently did not see eye to eye with that. However, it is not a question of who was appointed or of what happened: the kernel of this thing is that the present Government repudiated an agreement of the previous Government.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Be careful of your facts; you might be apologizing again if you are not careful.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Mr. Currie was appointed as Director of Industrial Development. As I understand the position, the present Government has appointed another person, and Mr. Currie's appointment today is Director of Industrial Research.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You said we repudiated an agreement.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The present Government repudiated an appointment. In the future, irrespective of what Government is in power, people will think twice before coming to a State when they know that with a change of Government they may not be able to hold any position they might come to, and that is a serious state of affairs.

Another thing that certainly has not caused a great deal of confidence is the regulation in connection with student teachers' allowances. If the Government thinks that that

regulation has caused any great confidence on the part of the public, it had better think again, because it has not done so. Lastly, I refer to the Budget that was introduced in another place recently. That has not created any confidence, either. I think most of the things set out in the works programme are necessary and worth while, but if the Government thinks that this Bill has increased the confidence of the people I advise it to have another look at things and to recast its thinking, because I assure it that the public is not satisfied with the Government's programme.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I support the Bill. I listened with a great deal of interest to the Leader, but I am sorry to say I cannot agree with him on many points. Honourable members can tell when the Opposition is on weak ground, because its members then get very vociferous. It is easy for a Party in Opposition to criticize, and that is what the Opposition is doing at present. Of course, it is the prerogative of an Opposition to criticize, provided the criticism is soundly based.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: If you are fair dinkum you will criticize the Loan programme, too.

The Hon. L. R. HART: In framing this year's Loan Estimates, the Treasurer had to be acutely conscious of the fact that the Treasury was faced with cumulative revenue deficits amounting to about \$8,365,000, which is big money. One thing that had to be avoided at all costs was the funding of the revenue deficit from the Loan Account. By doing this we would have attracted the penal consequences laid down in the Financial Agreement in relation to sinking fund provisions.

It has always been the policy of the Liberal and Country Party to meet the costs of non-revenue producing assets from Consolidated Revenue. It must also be remembered that Loan moneys must be amortized over 53 years through a sinking fund, together with interest.

The Liberal and Country Party has always placed emphasis on development, for we believe it is essential that we develop our natural resources. On the other hand, the Labor Party, in its socialistic fashion, has been more concerned with social legislation, which has been a burden on the Revenue Account. In fact, the Revenue Account has been so overloaded by social legislation that the Labor Party found itself in deficit. This is why we have had to transfer items from the Revenue Account to the Loan Account.

By way of interjection, I asked the Leader, "Does your Party believe that certain items which traditionally have been met from the Revenue Account should be transferred to the Loan Account?" He said, "Yes, we do." It is interesting to read what was said during the Loan Estimates debate of 1966-67, when the then Treasurer was talking on this particular aspect. He said:

There can be no dispute that if it can be afforded the practice of charging building grants against Revenue Account rather than Loan Account is desirable.

There was an admission by the Leader of the Labor Party in this State (Mr. Frank Walsh) that it was undesirable to charge building grants and other items such as hospital subsidies to the Loan Account. It has been done at this stage only for political expediency.

When there is a change of Government it is only natural that there should be a rearrangement of priorities: this is inevitable. The present policy in constructing the Loan programme is based on the current state of the Revenue Account. The Revenue Account, as I have already stated, has been affected by social and industrial legislation, which legislation is, I agree, desirable (nobody denies that) but we can expand social and industrial legislation only according to our means. It is fairly evident that we have expanded beyond our means in this connection in recent years. The present Government is faced with trying to balance a Budget and using the available Loan funds for the development of the resources of the State. It has done a good job in that direction.

The Leader raised several points. He referred to housing and what the Liberal and Country Party said in its policy speech. I have before me a copy of that policy speech, and it may be as well to address ourselves to it for a moment.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: But that was amended from day to day. Is that the first one that was made?

The Hon. L. R. HART: This is the policy speech made by the present Premier at Para Hills.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: But he altered that every day.

The Hon. L. R. HART: No he did not.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Yes he did.

The Hon. L. R. HART: This is the situation he faced at that time.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And he altered it.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Premier said:

When the Labor-Socialists took over the State in 1965 the building industry—to take one striking example—was renowned for its high quality, low cost housing, and was breaking records. Within a year it was sliding downhill into its greatest slump since the faraway depression years.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It is still sliding.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Premier continued:

South Australia has a unique housing problem. We have houses without people and people without houses. We have houses without people because the Labor Government has undermined the economy and reduced job opportunities. And we have people without houses because many South Australians cannot bridge the deposit gap.

That is a matter that this Government set out to rectify. Mr. Hall went on to say what an L.C.L. Government would do about the deposit gap:

We will encourage the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation to do more in South Australia. Further action will be: (1) Allocating a higher percentage of Commonwealth Housing Agreement money to building societies.

This has been done. He continued:

(2) Simplifying the Building Societies Act. (3) Amending the Trustee Act so that, subject to proper safeguards, investment in building societies is an authorized investment under that Act. (4) Amending the Money Lenders Act to facilitate lending of home finance on approved conditions. (5) Examining the possibility of raising the upper limit of housing loans from the State Bank above the present \$7,000.

Those are the things that this Government said it would do, and the Government has already done them.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: When shall we get those amendments?

The Hon. L. R. HART: In due course. When the present Government took over, the one thing that was uppermost in everybody's mind and was most important and had to be done straightaway was the redistribution of boundaries in this State, the introduction of an Electoral Bill. The Labor Party continually stressed this was the most important issue to be considered by Parliament.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Has not the Government control of the Notice Paper?

The Hon. L. R. HART: Mr. Dunstan castigated the Government all over South Australia, asking: why can we not get on with this important issue of the electoral boundaries? The present Labor Party is concerned about dragging up the issues in which it failed.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You did not bring it up on the Notice Paper.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. R. HART: Mr. Hall continued:

It is ludicrous that this State should have empty houses. We shall do our utmost to populate them by a revival in commerce and industry which will not only provide more job opportunities—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: No wonder he is being kept busy!

The Hon. L. R. HART: Let us look at the housing position. In August, 1967, we had 500 empty houses in South Australia because people did not have jobs, but in August of the present year, 1968, we have only 214 empty houses and recently some 128 have been let to Commonwealth Army and Air Force personnel. Before we can improve the housing situation, we have to provide the people with jobs. This has been most difficult over the present period because, as the Leader said, we are recovering from the aftermath of a severe drought.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That was not the reason you gave us.

The Hon. L. R. HART: At present nearly everybody with a business of his own connected with a rural industry in some way or other is working on overdraft and paying interest and, while these situations exist, we cannot plan ahead; but, once we get in the harvest and the wool cheques and other returns, this State will move ahead rapidly in the coming months. Then the Leader went on to talk about Chowilla. The Labor Government's record on Chowilla is not particularly bright, either. He made a statement that the present Premier in his policy speech said, "We will build Chowilla whether the Commonwealth Government is a party to it or not." This is what the Leader has just said. Let us look at what Mr. Hall said:

My Party started the Chowilla dam scheme and obtained the approvals of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth, Victoria and New South Wales for it in 1963. The Walsh-Dunstan Government, its gaze on other things, was caught unprepared for interstate resistance in 1967. Now, after agreeing to a deferment of its building, the Premier talks of a vague delay, while our householders, our industrialists, and potential investors ask the vital question, "Has South Australia enough water for its foreseeable future development?"

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is no longer a vague delay; it is a real delay.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It started in your time; it started with the promise of service payments.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Tell us what the Premier is going to do about Chowilla.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Premier went on to say:

We ask for your support now to complete the Chowilla project.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Get out your picks and shovels!

The Hon. L. R. HART: He continued:

In Parliament, we urged the Government to appoint an expert committee to investigate our water needs and resources. Their answer was to defeat the proposal and then turn around and appoint an oversea firm to carry out an identical survey. This is what we shall do:

(1) Get on with the Chowilla scheme.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: When?

The Hon. L. R. HART: Mr. Hall continued:

(2) Take every sensible action to safeguard the quality of Murray River water. The first people to back down on the Chowilla scheme were the Dunstan Government; they were the first ones to fall to resistance from other States. Not only did they give way to the resistance on Chowilla, but they gave way also on our offshore oil rights.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Was that to be included in Chowilla?

The Hon. L. R. HART: Here, the Dunstan Government had a good bargaining position. It could have bargained with the other States, and particularly Victoria, on the offshore oil issue—but no; it was too busy doing other things. What did Mr. Dunstan say to our representative on the River Murray Commission when he returned and reported on the scheme? He said, "You go away and make the best deal you can."

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not correct.

The Hon. L. R. HART: That is what he said.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I am telling you that is not correct.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It is quite correct.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I know what happened with the commission and I am not going to tell you. You are not correct.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I am only repeating what is on record.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Never mind about the record. Where is it on record?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Where is that record?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I have no reference to it at the moment.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Because there is no record.

The Hon. L. R. HART: There was no Government instruction.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I am telling you there was.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Premier said—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Never mind about that. I was in the Cabinet and I heard the instruction. All the Ministers know that that is true.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It hurts when their promises are not being put into operation.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I will not touch on this matter any further. There are a few other items in the Loan Estimates to which I wish to refer, and I refer specifically to the item of railway accommodation. Obviously, if we are going to use public transport to its best advantage, it is necessary that we have the Railways Department's rolling stock in proper order and that we have attractive sleeping cars.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You will not need them if you are going to close the lines.

The Hon. L. R. HART: We are closing only those that are not paying. It has been brought to my notice that only one goods train and two railcar services were running on a certain railway line each week. The railcar services also draw a freight van behind them. The proposal at present is to cut out the two railcar services. The passenger rate on the railcar services was indeed low, but the freight van conveyed behind the railcar is a payable proposition. I suggest that, rather than cut out these services altogether, they be reduced to one a week and, instead of dragging a freight car behind a railcar, the railcar could be converted into a passenger-freight car. There would probably be only about six passengers at a time requiring this service. The people using this line would be mainly those who have cream to get to the nearest butter factory, and with the provision of one railcar service of this type, together with the goods train service, they would get their produce away twice a week, and it would be a good service.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why didn't you go to the public meeting and put it to the people?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I may deal with that in a moment. I have made suggestions to the previous Government as I am doing now: I was not always critical. Perhaps the previous Government did not use all my suggestions. The other matter to which I wish to make brief reference is the provision of fishing havens and foreshore improvements for which \$210,000 has been allocated under this Bill.

Actual payments from the Loan Account for 1967-68 were \$92,000. I refer particularly to the Edithburgh jetty, which is well known to the Minister of Marine. This has been an unfortunate project from the start, because it was badly constructed in the first place, and it has needed certain refinements since then. Also, because of its poor construction, depreciation is taking place. Indeed, certain factors are associated with this jetty that make it somewhat unsuitable for the purpose for which it was erected. The manner in which it has been erected has caused seaweed to accumulate around it which, in turn, has caused the fishermen great difficulty. There is a lack of railing at the shore end for mooring boats to the jetty. The jetty is in two parts: the foreshore end, which is in the form of a solidly constructed wall, and then out from that is a short jetty. There is also an unfinished area near the slipway, and it is impossible for the fishermen to get vehicles near the slipway to get their engines out of their boats. Also, there are no steps to the freezing works where the fishermen take their fish. There is also a hoist on the end of the jetty to lift the heavy engines out of the boats, but it is impossible to get a vehicle out there, because of the width of the jetty.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Didn't they help by cutting off the jetty!

The Hon. L. R. HART: That is so. If a little local advice had been accepted, many of these problems would never have arisen. The jetty is eroding away in places where it has not been sealed with cement, and it will be necessary to do a little cement flushing to stop this erosion. I suggest that the Minister send one of his officers to examine this situation and that he confer with the local fishermen, because these are the people who have to use these facilities, as well as knowing the requirements of the area and the shortcomings of the present facilities.

I refer now to the Bolivar sewage treatment works, a multi-million dollar project which is nearing completion. Many people will be glad to see the final stage of this work completed because an unpleasant odour has emanated from this scheme. I trust that when the final stage is completed this odour will disappear. The problem is what to do with the effluent, which amounts to many thousands of millions of gallons each year, and which is at present flowing to waste. The area through which the effluent channel passes is a

huge gardening area that has supplied most of the gardening produce requirements of the city of Adelaide.

There has been rapid expansion of houses adjacent to the metropolitan area, which has caused a general movement by market gardeners to this area, many of whom are of migrant extraction. This area is particularly attractive to the gardening people because it is so close to the coast and, therefore, is relatively free from frosts. The most attractive aspect, however, is the supply of good quality underground water. Because of the huge withdrawal of water from the underground basin it is feared that the basin will become unduly depleted. Indeed, this area is a declared area under the Underground Waters Preservation Act. The situation is highlighted by a recent survey of the area. Over 4,500 acres of garden land in this area is drawing water from the underground basin. In addition, 6,500 glasshouses (which would account for a few hundred more acres, and which is not included in the above figure) also draw water from the basin. Then, too, there is the huge area under lucerne irrigation.

We are faced with the situation of having 815 families fully dependent on this underground basin. The number of persons fully employed in the area is about 1,300, and an additional 1,100 people are casually employed. So, this is quite a big industry, which this State must maintain because of the huge export market for much of the produce from the area. Also, Adelaide is dependent on the area for much of its garden produce. Therefore we should be looking more closely at the possibility of using effluent for gardening purposes in this area.

About 7,000,000,000 gallons of water is withdrawn annually from the underground basin, and the estimated output of the treatment works at present is 9,000,000,000 gallons a year. So, if the underground basin was completely depleted, we would have a ready source of water that could be used for gardening purposes. There has not been much enthusiasm on the part of either the present Government or the previous Government for using this water. I am not saying this critically, because other factors are involved, but I do believe we should be looking more closely at this possibility of using the effluent.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: They tell me that stock think it is nice.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Most of the garden produce in some areas is watered with effluent. Some lakes in the United States of America

are composed entirely of effluent, in which people swim. I am not suggesting, however, that a swimming pool should be established in this area, but we must make greater use of the effluent. I am pleased to see that provision is made for the long overdue extension of sewerage facilities to Gawler.

I am interested in the provision for continued work at the Strathmont Hospital for the training of the intellectually retarded. I am interested in the training of such people, particularly in the Elizabeth area. During the Address in Reply debate the Hon. Mr. Banfield made a very good speech about intellectually retarded people. No doubt he was well qualified to speak on the subject, and I compliment him on his speech, but I was disappointed that near the end of it he departed from the high standard he observed earlier in the speech. It was unfortunate that he dipped so low into the sewer to complete his speech. It was particularly disappointing because the Hon. Mr. Banfield is undoubtedly the heir apparent to the Leader of the Opposition in this Council, and we have come to appreciate a higher standard of debate from him than that which he exhibited near the end of his speech.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think you will agree that we are doing a fairly good job in South Australia in helping the mentally retarded.

The Hon. L. R. HART: This is borne out by the facts. Even the Hon. Mr. Banfield and the Leader of the Opposition agree with this. There are many problems associated with this matter and it is a question of knowing just where the Government should fit in. We cannot expect the Government to accept responsibility for all the problems in the State, but there are fields in which it could help to a greater extent, and it will undoubtedly do so.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think the best form of Government help is that of co-ordinating the services.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Perhaps we should consider why there are so many intellectually retarded children. Recent research has shown that much intellectual retardation is caused at birth. Perhaps modern treatment in maternity hospitals could overcome this problem to some extent. I was pleased to see the provision for facilities at the Roseworthy Agricultural College. I have seen some of the recently completed facilities, particularly the engineering centre, the science laboratory and the

plant breeding centre. For many years the college has been noted for plant breeding, particularly the breeding of modern wheats. It was pleasing to see that the importance of this college is fully recognized.

Regarding the provision for a loan to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, I commend the Minister of Agriculture on the firm stand he has taken in relation to the board and the general running of the abattoirs, which have been a political football recently. The present Minister of Agriculture has inherited a legacy of administrative decisions that have brought the board into disfavour not only with producers but also with the trade in South Australia.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Over how many years?

The Hon. L. R. HART: Over the last 12 months.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can go back 20 years.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It has been a political football over the years but the matter has been highlighted in the last few months. We must avoid the situation that occurred in Victoria, where there are too many killing works. The Victorian producers' co-operative established a new killing works, the most modern in Victoria, but it was closed down through lack of support. Also, the Portland works has had to close down temporarily through insufficient stock. There is a rumour that Metro Meat Limited at Noarlunga may have to close down for a time through insufficient stock. Also, the abattoir at Peterborough is kept going only through the slaughtering of goats obtained from nearby stations. The goat meat is exported to Mediterranean countries. We must foster our export markets.

The price of lamb is at present at an all-time low because of short yardings. In August, 1967, about 18,500 lambs a week were yarded, and the price was 30c a pound. At present lamb yardings in the abattoirs market amount to about 8,000—less than half the yardings of last year—yet the price is down to 16c a pound. This is virtually below the cost of production. On top of this, a levy has been imposed. According to the Abattoirs Board, this is to help defray the cost of shop inspections.

Under the Act, the board is required to carry out shop inspections. I believe that the present cost of inspections at the city inspection depot at Gilbert Street is about \$46,000 a year. Some revenue is gained from the inspections, because

meat brought in from outside is inspected at this depot. The revenue obtained therefrom is about \$17,000 a year.

It is on shop inspections that I wish to say a few words. Shop inspections are undoubtedly done to protect the health of the people in the metropolitan area. The people involved in the shop inspections are the local board of health, the Metropolitan County Board, possibly the Central Board of Health, and certainly the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. Of course, superimposed on that we can have the factories and steam boilers inspectors and the weights and measures inspectors.

This situation is farcical. The local board of health inspector is fully qualified as a meat inspector, because in his training he is also trained as a meat inspector. In fact, in some areas on the outskirts of the metropolitan area the local board of health does the inspections. A Metropolitan County Board health inspector is also qualified as a meat inspector. The Central Board of Health inspectors would also be qualified, and undoubtedly the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board inspectors are qualified for this work.

The local board of health and the Metropolitan County Board are the responsibilities of local government. I am not sure whether the Central Board of Health is financed by local government or central Government. The Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board inspectors are financed by the Abattoirs Board. We have the situation that all these inspectors, in turn, may visit butcher shops, and their requirements are often conflicting.

I do not believe that the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board should be responsible for shop inspections. At present, if the levy has to be imposed to cover the cost of this inspection it virtually means that the primary producer is responsible for the cost of the board's inspections.

I believe that food inspections should be a charge on local government. I believe that the local board of health inspectors should be qualified (indeed, they are qualified) to do all the shop inspections. These people, together with the Metropolitan County Board, inspect the bakeries and all other shops that handle and sell food, and I do not see that the need exists today for the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board to be involved in shop inspections. When the Act was first drawn up the situation may have been different. I suggest

to the Minister that he have a look at this question, for the board could perhaps be relieved of butcher shop inspections.

Although many other items on the Loan Estimates are interesting, I do not wish to deal with them at this stage. I am pleased to see the extension of school bus services in country areas, for this is of great benefit to country people in this State. With those few comments, I support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 4. Page 1035.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, which has three main purposes. Clause 4 amends the definitions section of the Act by making it clear that the expression "vermin" includes lice and fleas, the scientific descriptions of which are set out in the amendment. I would not attempt to describe the scientific terms, and I accept that the Minister of Health took the easy way out.

Clause 6 amends section 131 of the principal Act and provides for inspectors. The other principal provision of the Bill relates to the Morris Hospital. We are all very happy to know that tuberculosis is not as prevalent today as it was.

New section 131 gives the local board of health the power to deal with vermin-infested premises and articles in the same way as it can at present deal with premises harbouring persons suspected to be suffering from an infectious disease. I agree entirely with the Minister's comment concerning the cleanliness of schoolchildren, and I think it is the responsibility of people at least to keep their places clean.

Although the penalty has been increased to \$40, which seems to be a large sum, it is not imposed unless parents neglect to look after the cleanliness and health of their children. Therefore, I offer no objection to it. Clause 6 provides that, if the officer of health, inspector or any legally qualified medical practitioner certifies in writing to the local board, he can go into other people's places. I took some trouble to find out how this operated, because I, as I think most honourable members are, am loath to give any person the right to enter some person's home unless there is a need for it. I have to admit I was not

quite clear about the position. I have always understood that the inspectors should be correctly termed "inspectors", but there was no provision for that under the Act. They have been called "health officers". I tried to find out the correct terminology to be used, its meaning, and their responsibilities. The health officer is appointed by the Central Board of Health or a local board of health, and a medical practitioner is employed by the board to look after health. I asked, when I went around and about, "Where do the health officers come in?" I was told, "They are, in effect, health inspectors." I do not know whether this verbiage "officer of health, inspector or any legally qualified medical practitioner" is correct.

My first reaction was to ask, "What kind of inspector—an inspector of roads, buildings or something else? Does the wording say it is a health inspector?" We have already had a Bill this session involving such a technicality. When we give people the right to enter other people's homes, there should be no doubt about their qualifications or authority to do so. I do not know much about this and I ask the Minister to look at it because, when I have finished talking about inspectors, he will know that I have done some homework on the matter. I decided to speak to the Parliamentary Draftsman about it. He said, "Oh, obviously it means a health inspector." I asked, "Does it?" He then started to scratch his head. I thought, "All right. I know the qualifications of an officer of health and a medical practitioner; he has a certain standard." I wondered what standard, or qualifications an inspector had to have. So I set out to look at this Act, with all the latest additions to it, but could not find any definition of an inspector; so I looked at Part V—"Officers". Section 47 provides:

Every local board shall appoint an officer of health, and such inspectors and officers as may be deemed necessary by the Central Board.

Section 48 provides:

The appointment and dismissal of every officer of health shall be subject to the approval of the Central Board. The officer of health shall—(a) be when practicable a legally qualified medical practitioner; and (b) possess all the powers vested in any inspector.

I am still trying to find what an inspector is and what his qualifications are. Section 49 states:

(1) The appointment of every inspector shall be in writing, in duplicate, under the hand of the chairman of the Central Board,

or if the appointment be by a local board, under the hand of the chairman and the secretary of the local board.

(2) Every inspector shall be furnished with one of such duplicates, and, if required; shall produce the same to any person whose premises he may be inspecting or about to inspect. If he goes out as a health officer (and he has no right to be there if he is an inspector) he could be challenged. I still have not found out what qualifications an inspector must have.

Then I talked to the Parliamentary Draftsman, and together we thought of section 45, which states (and I think this is a real gem):

An inspector appointed under the Food and Drugs Act, 1908, shall have all powers, authorities and duties of an inspector appointed under this Act—

the Food and Drugs Act—

—so far as those powers relate to the matters mentioned in subsection (1) of section 43 of this Act, or any of them.

We do not get too far there. It does not help me. I still do not know what an inspector is or what his qualifications are. Nobody seems able to help me. I contacted the Parliamentary Draftsman again (I knew where I could get this information but I did it through the right channels) and, after some trouble, he said, "This is given to us in Part X of the Act—"Regulations"—under section 147", which provides:

(1) The Governor, on the recommendation of the Central Board, may make regulations for or with respect to

(m7) prescribing qualifications for persons employed as inspectors by local boards and county boards; authorizing the Central Board to examine persons and grant certificates of competency to persons passing such examinations or who are otherwise qualified therefor; providing that any such examinations may be conducted by persons appointed by the Central Board; prescribing the mode of determining such qualifications and obtaining recognition therefor in other States of Australia; providing for the cancellation or suspension of such certificates and the grounds upon and the manner in which such cancellation or suspension may be effected; and providing that after a day fixed in the regulations no person shall be employed by a local board or a county board as an inspector for the purposes of this Act or the Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1954, who does not hold such a certificate which is in force: Provided that no such regulation shall apply to or affect the status of any health inspector who holds such office at the time the regulation comes into operation:

(n) generally carrying into effect the purposes of this Act:

(o) imposing penalties not exceeding fifty dollars for the breach of any regulation.

(2) Any regulation purporting to be made before the first day of November, nineteen hundred and thirty-four, by the Central Board of Health pursuant to the Health Act, 1898,

with respect to any matters referred to in paragraphs (i) to (m), both inclusive, of subsection (1), shall be deemed to have been made by the Governor pursuant to the powers conferred by the said paragraphs.

So far, I have not found the qualifications of an inspector. Then the Parliamentary Draftsman helped me by telling me to look at regulation 37 in Part III of the regulations—"Qualifications of Health Inspectors". I tried to get a copy of these regulations, but they are not in print. There was no-one about and the only way I could get a copy was from the Parliamentary Library, which made me a copy of the only set of the regulations it had. That did not help me much, but this is the procedure one has to go through to find out what a health inspector is and what his qualifications are. After all that research, I still do not know. Regulation 37 (1) provides that the qualification for persons employed as inspectors by local boards and county boards for the purposes of the Health Act, 1935-1960, and the Foods and Drugs Act, 1908-1954, shall be a certificate of competency issued by the Central Board. Regulation 37 (2) provides:

The Central Board may issue the following certificates of competency:

- (i) Certificate of competency for the purposes of the Health Act, 1935-1960;
- (ii) Certificate of competency for the purposes of the Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1954.

Regulation 38, which appears to be the kernel of the situation, provides:

The qualification for the certificate of competency for the purposes of the Health Act, 1935-1960, shall be the Royal Society for the Promotion of the Health Certificate for Sanitary Inspectors, or qualifications accepted by the Central Board as being of equivalent standard, or the passing of an examination or examinations prescribed by the Central Board.

I still do not know what they are, although I have not had time to follow it right through. This Parliament gives these people authority to go into someone's home and cause trouble, although I admit it is necessary. Surely, however, if we are to give these people authority we should know what qualifications they have and readily be able to accept them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I do not know whether the qualifications have anything to do with the actions of an inspector.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think so. He has to make a report. Regulation 45 provides:

No local board or county board shall after the nineteenth day of May, 1960, employ a person as an inspector for the purposes of the Health Act, 1935-1960, or the Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1954, unless that person has been issued with a certificate of competency issued

by the Central Board which is in force at the time he is employed: Provided that this regulation shall not apply to or affect the status of any health inspector who held such office at the nineteenth day of May, 1960.

I query regulation 45 (2), which provides:

The Central Board upon being satisfied that a local board or county board has made reasonable efforts to obtain the services of an inspector holding a certificate of competency may grant permission for the temporary employment of any other person in that office for such period as the Central Board may deem necessary.

From my point of view, that is totally wrong. If the board cannot get its local health officer but instead employs someone without qualifications, that person should not be given authority to enter someone's home. Regulation 47, the escape clause, provides:

This Part shall not apply to the local board or the county board of a district that has either—

- (a) a rate revenue of less than \$100,000 per annum; or
- (b) a population of less than 5,000.

Apparently, if the board does not come within either of those two, it can employ whom it likes to do the job.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: That is right.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but does the honourable member think it should be so?

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: No, I do not.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is totally wrong that it should be so. However, this has been going on for years. How is the ordinary person to find out what a health inspector is and what his qualifications must be. I sincerely suggest to the Minister that this difficulty could be overcome if the interpretation clause showed what was a health officer and what was a health inspector, and if the Bill showed somewhere what these people must do under the Health Act. Also, the Health Act should not be mixed up with the Food and Drugs Act. I am loath to give additional people the right to enter someone's home unnecessarily. For this reason, I set out to find what was the position. However, I found out that, in the main, no other person (whether he calls himself a health inspector or a health officer) has the right to go into a house.

I understand that most of these health inspectors use the term "health officer" quite wrongly. If they do it for status, they should be told about it, and the public should know the difference between a health officer and a health inspector.

I have no objection to clause 12, which amends section 146 of the principal Act by providing that the fee for a licence for a

hospital or rest home will be fixed by regulation. The present fee, which was fixed in 1936, is the nominal sum of \$4. I agree that the fee for such a licence should be fixed by regulation. I would like to see an amount mentioned, but any regulation will have to be tabled in both Chambers and come before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. With that safeguard, I have no objection to the clause.

Clauses 14, 15 and 16 deal with developments in the control of tuberculosis which, according to my knowledge of the disease, has been fairly well controlled for the last decade or two. I know that the Hospitals Department has in view closing the Morris Hospital. That institution has been used for people who have not done the right thing and have had to be committed to an institution. Clauses 14 and 15 amend the definition of "institution" to which a person can be referred for treatment, not only in his own interest but in the interest of the general public. I fully support that provision. Indeed, the only opposition I have to the Bill is that I do not like the provisions relating to an inspector, and I would be pleased to hear the Minister on that aspect in reply.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): The Leader of the Opposition has made clear how difficult it is to interpret the qualifications of a health inspector, and he has my sympathy. I have never been able to understand fully what a health inspector is, even though at one time I was a medical officer of health. I ask the indulgence of the Council while I go through a little of the history of the matter with which this Bill is so much concerned. Clause 4 amends section 4 of the principal Act by inserting after the definition of "private place" the following definition:

"Vermin" includes—

(a) lice being of the variety *Pediculus humanis corporis*, *Pediculus capitis* or *Phthirus pubis*.

These have had a tremendous influence on the major epidemics of the world. Indeed, the major epidemics of the world have been mainly flea-borne and louse-borne. The great plagues of history have almost exclusively been the result of *pulex irritans* or, as it is known, the human flea. In the year 540 there was a plague in Byzantium. It is recorded by Procopius that the death rate was 10,000 souls daily. The city became so short of gravediggers (even they were affected) that the corpses were loaded on to boats and abandoned to the waves.

Typhus, plague, cholera (all caused by these little creatures) and typhoid have decided more campaigns than have Caesar, Hannibal, Napoleon and all the generals in history. It would seem that epidemics are blamed for a defeat and that the generals take the credit for a victory. Throughout history the pension lists prepared after campaigns showed that diseases accounted for more than 70 per cent of the people on the lists. It is said that 55,000 people died during the great plague of Athens and, as a result, this city lost much of its power.

In 88B.C., in the civil struggle in Rome, Marius had a great victory, but it was not a victory of arms; the struggle was decided by an epidemic that killed 17,000 men in the army of Octavius. It is worth remembering that the crusaders suffered from epidemics to a greater extent than they suffered from the Saracens. It is recorded that in 1099, when Jerusalem was taken, only 60,000 people were left in the forces, which originally had 300,000 men. These huge losses were caused, not by battles, but by epidemics.

In the 17th century the Thirty Years War was dominated by epidemic and disease. Prague, which is much in the news at present because it has been infested in another way, surrendered in 1741 to the French because 30,000 people had died from typhus, carried by body and head lice. It can be truly said that the *pediculus capitis*, or head louse, sticks to man very closely. Likewise, the *pediculus pubis* sticks to his body very closely. These two types of louse can interchange and can even infest other creatures. Lice can even adapt to human racial characteristics. For example, in Africa fleas and lice are seen to be black, when examined under a microscope. On a Hindu, they are a smoky colour, and on a Japanese they are yellowish. It is said that on a European person they have a dirty grey appearance. In other words, liberty, equality and fraternity govern the life of the louse and the flea: they do not belong to complicated societies, as do the bee and the ant. They parasitize, living peacefully and feeding abundantly, taking plenty of food which is always available. In return, they transfer any appropriate germ that they are carrying. Theirs is a purely materialistic existence.

The louse is man's inseparable companion, and dies only as a consequence of an accident or disaster that overcomes his host. This is the only time he will willingly leave the host's body. Failure of water supply, scarcity of

soap and delayed changes of clothes make lice particularly happy. In these circumstances they multiply and abound.

It may interest honourable members to know that the louse and the flea have played an important part in political history. In Hurdensberg, Sweden, in the Middle Ages the mayor was elected annually, and his status in the community was very high indeed. It was always difficult to choose the new mayor, so the people had a very simple method. The candidates who were pre-selected, as we would say, sat around a round table and each man put his beard on the table. Then, one flea was let loose in the middle of the table and the new mayor was the man whose beard the flea leapt into.

The mode of living in the Middle Ages led to lousiness and made it inevitable that all classes of people were affected, rich and poor alike. Reboux, a writer of this time, recalls the advice given to a 17th century French princess. As part of her education she was told, "It is bad manners to scratch if one does it by habit, not by necessity. It is improper to take lice or fleas or other vermin by the neck to kill them in company except in the most intimate circles." Nowadays, vermin can be banished, and scratching is only a reflex action. Nowadays, vermin have been banished, first from the fashionable class, because of better housing and hygiene, and later from other classes as a result of the widespread use of soap, water and clean clothes. Breeding on any scale today depends upon the existence of a feckless few in the community who act as a reservoir. From such sources anyone can become the recipient of a disease-bearing predator.

It is disturbing to note that the incidence of head lice in schoolchildren has increased in the last 10 years. Most honourable members will have seen a newspaper report to this effect. Does this mean that we are dirtier than we were 10 years ago, or does it mean that we live in closer communion with each other? It is worth remembering that the possibility of an epidemic always remains as long as these creatures exist. The remainder of the Bill deals with the campaign by the public health authorities against tuberculosis. As I have said before, public health and preventive medicine are often the Cinderella branches of medicine but, like Cinderella, they have a very important part to play in the well-being of society. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADELAIDE TO GAWLER RAILWAY (ALTERATION OF DRY CREEK TERMINUS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 4. Page 1035.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): On the surface, this Bill appears to be a non-controversial one and one designed to authorize the carrying into operation of a logical action regarding a non-operative section of railway. However, I am disturbed that action of this nature can be taken in regard to rail closure without an independent inquiry having been made. In his second reading explanation, the Minister of Roads and Transport said that under section 60 of the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act an express limitation was placed on the Commissioner preventing him from altering the position of any railway terminus. In my opinion, this is a wise provision. I believe it is right that there should be specific legislation before any section of any railway line is closed.

A provision in the Road and Railway Transport Act lays down the powers of the Transport Control Board in relation to railways. Section 10 of that Act sets out the power of the board to close and re-open railway lines, and subsection (4) thereof provides:

An order closing a line or part of a line of railway shall not be made—

- (a) unless the board gives notice to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works of its intention to make the order:
- (b) if the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works reports to the board within twenty-eight days after receiving the notice that it is expedient to keep the line or part of a line open.

Subsection (5) is as follows:

The board shall not make any order closing any line of railway or part of a line of railway under this section unless it is satisfied that there will be, on and after the day on which the order takes effect, other transport facilities for serving the area previously served by the railway or part thereof.

This is a wise provision, and I consider that it should apply to any closure of line. Apparently the Auditor-General agrees with me, because in his report, the introductory remarks of which are dated September 3, we find the following under the heading "Review of Rail Services":

The Royal Commission on State Transport Services, in its report issued in January, 1968, recommended that: "A complete review should be made of railway services, particularly some branch lines, to eliminate those which are uneconomic and where alternative services

could be provided, or to restrict them to a seasonal basis where justified. Some country rail passenger services should be replaced by road transport."

In terms of the Road and Railway Transport Act, 1930-1964, the Transport Control Board, if, after due inquiry and investigation, is of the opinion that it would be in the best economic interests of the State to close the whole or any part of any line of railway, may by order declare that the said line of railway or part thereof shall from the date mentioned in the order be closed. If it is necessary for the board to give notice of its intention to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and, if that committee reports to the board within 28 days after receiving the notice that it is expedient to keep the line or part of the line open, an order for closing that line or part of the line of railway shall not be made.

The Auditor-General goes on to say:

No railway line or part thereof has been closed since 1965. In 1965 the board was asked to give consideration to the closing of the Hallett Cove to Willunga railway, but it was considered inappropriate to consider closing any metropolitan railway line while the investigation by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study was proceeding. Recently, at the request of the S.A. Railways Commissioner, the board has resumed its consideration of closing this line. Also at the request of the Railways Commissioner, the board has recently taken some evidence with respect to the Eudunda-Morgan line. The Royal Commission, however, recommended a complete review of railway services, particularly some branch lines, but except as mentioned before no action has been taken in this regard by the Transport Control Board.

The important part of the Auditor-General's comment is as follows:

Following proposals by the Government that certain country rail passenger services should be replaced by road services, the board recently convened a meeting at which preliminary discussions on this matter took place with interested parties.

Apparently, this is accepted by the Auditor-General as being the normal procedure. Members of the Opposition in this Chamber were concerned regarding the Minister's references to the proposed elimination of certain country and suburban railway services. When he said that certain services would be discontinued, the Leader and I asked questions on the subject because we considered that an independent inquiry should be held. From the Minister's reply, which can be found on page 553 of *Hansard*, it is apparent that a line could to all intents and purposes be closed by the Minister or the Commissioner without any reference to anybody, and this is what worries me.

Apparently, all that would be necessary would be for a rake of trucks and an engine

to run over a certain line periodically (how often I do not know) for the line to be regarded as still open. This disturbs me, and I am concerned about it because of the Minister's reference to the restriction of services. A railway could be closed to all intents and purposes without the necessity of referring the matter to anyone. More important still, it could be done without the necessity to bring in a Bill for the purpose of closing the line.

I am sure that most people believed there would be some independent inquiry before the proposed restrictions of services applied, but apparently this is not to be so, for despite what was said by the Auditor-General only a very short time ago I understand that tenders have been let for road transport to take the place of rail transport in certain places. I understood that what was reported of the Minister's statements outside was that these restrictions that would be imposed would be considered by a committee, and I took that to mean the Public Works Committee.

This section of line is a matter of only half a mile, and the Minister told me that no committee was looking at it. It is not important that there was a precedent at Kingston for this half mile of line: what is important, to my mind, is that no inquiry was made in regard to either. If there were no reports from an independent committee on these cases, we could be faced with a situation involving a longer length of line. After all is said and done, we are told that this is merely the shifting of the terminus from one place to another.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The terminus could be shifted 20 miles.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes; it could be shifted 20 miles or 50 miles. We could close the Willunga or Victor Harbour line and say that we were only shifting the terminus from Victor Harbour to Mount Barker. That is not how this should be done. I am of opinion that this matter should first be referred to an important body like the Public Works Committee or the Transport Control Board for inquiry. As I understand it, the Transport Control Board calls evidence from the Railways Commissioner and other interested people when any proposal of this nature arises. Then, when it makes its decision, it refers it to the Public Works Committee, which in turn goes through a similar procedure. Here we take a very wise precaution before we start doing away with railway lines.

This procedure should be followed in regard to services, too. I notice that the Transport Control Board did convene a meeting and had preliminary talks on what was suggested by the Minister in regard to curtailments of railways. I want to know, too, in regard to the tenders that have been let for road passenger services taking over from the railways, whether these committees or the Transport Control Board reported on them. Another interesting feature is that the Minister refers to this one as "conforming to the M.A.T.S. Report". Statements of this nature seem to be creeping into the Minister's terminology these days. He differs from the Premier in this regard because his statement is different from that of the Premier: the Premier tries to give the impression that no decision on the M.A.T.S. Report has been made.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That is not so; there is no difference of opinion at all.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It appears so, because the Premier says there will be a six months' wait and the public will be given the opportunity of expressing its views on this; there will be six months for the public to look at it before any decision is made by the Minister.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I say exactly the same thing.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Minister says that he says exactly the same thing. He says, "This conforms to the M.A.T.S. Report and we are going ahead with it." Recently, I asked the Minister a question about the underground railway, because he is reported as saying that this will be integrated with the standardization of the railway gauges in regard to the Adelaide railway station. The Minister says this, but I asked him a question about it and he spoke of the underground railway then as being a foregone conclusion. I understand that gauge standardization could be regarded as almost a foregone conclusion, but not the underground railway until the financial aspects of the M.A.T.S. Report have been investigated to see whether the money will be available. The Minister has referred to it as "looking around for finances for the purposes of implementing the underground railway system as early as possible". That is what is reported.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Your assumptions are entirely wrong.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That is what the public has accepted.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I do not care what the public has or you have accepted; I am saying that my statements are identical with the Premier's.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: But they are not.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: There is the M.A.T.S. Report—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: May I join in the discussion?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Get the facts right!

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We are only saying what you are saying.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am concerned that there seems to be an anomaly between the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act and the Road and Railway Transport Act. When the latter Act was brought into effect, as a result of the powers that the Transport Control Board had over the co-ordination of transport in this State and the fact that this could bring about an alteration of railway services and perhaps the closing of some lines, Parliament was of the opinion that, if there was a move to remove a railway service or close a railway line, there was need for an independent inquiry. This was provided for in the Road and Railway Transport Act. I am sure that Parliament at that time thought that, if it was to come about that there should be such a movement in regard to transport services, there should be a proper inquiry beforehand.

I know that this closure of half a mile of line is logical, and that this line has not been used for a considerable time, but I am concerned about the Minister's stated intentions in regard to restricting some services. My concern is that there should be some independent inquiry before these things are done, because people are affected by them and they should have the chance to express their views about them. That is why this Bill, although not important in regard to what we are doing at present, is important from the point of view that it is creating another precedent.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Two wrong precedents never make a right one.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It was done at Kingston, it was done at Northfield, and it could be done at Victor Harbour. I do not intend to oppose the Bill but I should like to hear the Minister, in his reply, give me some assurance that,

before services are discontinued in certain areas and before some lines are closed, the appropriate committee and the Transport Control Board will have a chance to ask people to give evidence on those matters.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 5. Page 1084.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): The Bill empowers the Treasurer to give guarantees to certain approved institutions to enable loans to be made to a higher percentage of valuation than would normally be available. The Act has approved of 16 institutions, including the Savings Bank, but it appears that only two or three of that number are taking advantage of the provisions of the Act. When the Act was first introduced in 1941 there seemed to be a clamour by institutions to obtain approval to operate under it, but obviously since then their enthusiasm has waned considerably. I believe they have never operated under the Act because they found they would be able to save 1 per cent which it would be necessary to pay to the Government for any amount guaranteed, whereas they would not lose money under various other activities.

In 1941, when the principal Act first came into operation, the Treasurer could not exercise a guarantee if the loan exceeded \$2,000. That sum has been increased over the years. Indeed, in 1947 it went from \$2,000 to \$2,500; in 1949 from \$2,500 to \$3,000; in 1951 it went to \$3,500; in 1957 it was raised to \$4,500; in 1958 it was raised to \$7,000; and, apart from the present proposal to increase it to \$8,000, the 1958 figure has not been changed.

It appears that a loan of \$2,000 was sufficient in 1941 to enable a borrower to obtain a house, and it was not, therefore, necessary for him to obtain a second mortgage. It appears that the price of houses then was somewhere near the limit of loans available, which was then 85 per cent or 95 per cent of valuation. However, the situation has changed considerably today, and \$8,000 is a long way from the cost of a house. It is necessary, therefore, for borrowers even with \$8,000 to obtain a second mortgage if they operate pursuant to the provisions of this Act. I have no objection to the amount being

increased. It is necessary, in the interests of the purchaser, to have such an additional amount, and, if plenty of money is available, the figure should be further increased. The true figure, in relation to the 1941 figure, should be nearer \$10,000. I support the second reading.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADVANCES FOR HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 5. Page 1085.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): This is a similar Bill to the Homes Act Amendment Bill, in that it increases the amount available for a loan from \$7,000 to \$8,000. It applies only to the State Bank, and it is regrettable that the Government has not made more money available to the State Bank for the purchase of houses under the provisions of this Act.

The Hon. Mr. Hart stated that the Premier had said it was the Government's intention to get things moving in the State and one of the stated intentions was that the present Government would stimulate the building industry. However, to date I have seen no action by the Government that would stimulate the building industry in this State. Indeed, the reverse is the case. Although the Leader quoted a report from yesterday's press, I feel that this should also be quoted in regard to this Bill, as far as builders are concerned. In last night's *News* it was reported:

Employment in the building industry in South Australia at the end of June shrunk to the lowest level for many years. Figures released today by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics give employment in the industry at June 30 as 11,370. This was 398 fewer than at the end of March and 1,097 fewer than at the same time last year.

During the June quarter 1,501 houses were started and 1,738 finished. Commencements were 154 less than in the March quarter and 513 below those of the June quarter last year. The value of buildings under construction at the end of June was \$112,000,000—an increase of \$1,500,000 on the March figure, but \$6,500,000 down on that of a year earlier.

The fact remains that the Government is giving the State Bank a lesser amount for house building than it did last year, and by increasing the maximum amount of guarantee to \$8,000 it will not help build one extra house. Indeed, it will not help to stimulate the building industry one bit; it will mean that there

will not be sufficient money to go around, and not so many persons will be able to borrow money from the State Bank, because sufficient money has not been made available to it. This will, of course, mean that the people on the top of the waiting list will be quite happy about this Bill, but those who are further down the list and who find that their waiting time will be lengthened will not be so happy about it. However, the amount of increase is necessary so far as the borrower is concerned and, because of the increase in the cost of houses and the excessive amount of interest charges on second mortgages, the people who are able to borrow money under this scheme are indeed fortunate. I do not begrudge them getting the extra sum of money from the State Bank. However, this will not in any way stimulate the building industry, as promised by the Premier in his policy speech. I support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 5. Page 1085.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): This Bill makes amendments in line with the limit of loans being raised from \$7,000 to \$8,000, as is being done with the Homes Act Amendment Bill and the Advances for Homes Act Amendment Bill. This Bill also provides for an increase in the maximum amount which may be advanced by the State Bank to a settler for improvements and other purposes on his holding from \$4,800 to \$6,000. I have no objection to that. This Bill is in line with the previous two Bills and, because of the increase in the cost of building, Opposition members support these amendments.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.11 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, September 18, at 2.15 p.m.