

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, July 30, 1963.

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS.

#### BETTING TAX DISBURSEMENTS.

**Mr. FRANK WALSH:** In the absence of the Premier, can the Minister of Works, as Acting Leader of the Government, say what sums have been paid by the Treasury to racing, trotting and dog coursing clubs for the 10-year period 1952-53 to 1961-62 inclusive? Can he also say what sums have been paid to each of the racing and trotting clubs and how the 1961-62 amount was disbursed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the Leader of the Opposition was good enough to indicate to the Premier's Secretary this morning that he desired this information, I have obtained a report from the Secretary of the Betting Control Board that sets out in schedule form the information he desires. The schedule covers the 10-year period from 1953-54 to 1962-63, and it shows in detail under various headings the sums paid by the Treasury to the various organizations—racing clubs, trotting clubs and coursing clubs—and the total for each year. The figures are collated from reports that have already been made public. The schedule is too long to read to the House, and I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### *Revenue Received by Clubs from Betting at Meetings.*

	Racing	Trotting	Coursing	Total.
	Clubs.	Clubs.	Clubs.	
	£	£	£	£
1953-54 . . . . .	431,444	143,701	235	575,380
1954-55 . . . . .	421,765	134,470	231	556,466
1955-56 . . . . .	465,411	132,112	159	597,682
1956-57 . . . . .	457,928	136,342	176	594,446
1957-58 . . . . .	422,693	148,880	151	571,724
1958-59 . . . . .	387,238	135,780	150	523,168
1959-60 . . . . .	402,967	149,560	226	552,753
1960-61 . . . . .	423,759	152,171	175	576,105
1961-62 . . . . .	429,167	150,123	196	579,486
1962-63 . . . . .	410,558	144,956	263	555,777
	£4,252,930	£1,428,095	£1,962	£5,682,987

#### ANGASTON WATER PRESSURES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I have had complaints from time to time regarding the poor water pressure in certain parts of Angaston and the adjoining areas. Can the Minister of Works say whether his department has any plans to rectify that position?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a report from the Engineer-in-Chief which says that a scheme to improve the water supply at Angaston is being prepared and will provide for a new pumping station, additional pumping plant, a new rising main and an additional storage tank of 500,000 gallons capacity. The estimated cost of these improvements is £50,000. To meet preliminary planning and investigation costs an amount of £2,500 has been included in the Loan programme for 1963-64.

#### TOWN PLANNING REPORT.

**Mr. HUTCHENS:** Last session members received a most enlightening document, known as the developmental plan for the metropolitan

area, which cost, I believe, £28,000. I asked the Premier then whether the Government was considering establishing a co-ordinating authority to put the plan into effect, and the Premier replied that he would consider the request and make an announcement later. Can the Minister of Works, as Acting Leader of the Government, say whether the Government has any plans to establish a co-ordinating authority in order that at least some aspects of the town plan might be put into operation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not able to reply definitely to the honourable member today but, when the Premier returns tomorrow, I will bring the question to his notice with a view to obtaining a reply for the honourable member.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): What has been the cost of the preparation and publication of the developmental plan for the metropolitan area of Adelaide, made pursuant to sections 26, 27 and 28 of the Town Planning Act?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson, for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The cost has been £18,901.

#### SCHOOL OF ART.

Mr. COUMBE: Only last week I asked a question of the Minister of Education regarding the new South Australian School of Art recently completed in Stanley Street, North Adelaide. In this morning's *Advertiser*, a resident of North Adelaide criticizes that building, particularly its architecture, as follows:

As a school of art, it is totally devoid of the inspirational character and intimacy which are so important. Brash and clumsy, its effective usefulness is typified by the way in which the sunscreening virtually excludes daylight in winter, but will admit sun in summer. A touch of Adelaide's own "Alpine Gardens Spirit" has found expression in the toadstool lamps of the courtyard paddling pond.

I cannot accept this criticism. In view of the Minister's reply last week to the effect that this building was one of the best of its type in the world, will he comment on this letter?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Unlike the honourable member's constituent, I make no pretensions to be a connoisseur of art or architecture. I am merely an untutored layman in this, as in so many other matters. Sir Herbert Read, who in Great Britain is President of the Society for Education through Art, President of the Institute of Contemporary Arts and Senior Fellow of the Royal College of Art, came to Australia recently to attend an art seminar at Canberra arranged by UNESCO. He was in Adelaide in June on a visit sponsored by the National Gallery, the Commonwealth Office of Education, the Department of Adult Education of the University of Adelaide and the W.E.A. He is a writer, art and literary critic and poet, as well as being an educator. Last month, accompanied by the Director of our National Gallery (Mr. Robert Campbell), Sir Herbert Read visited and inspected the new School of Art. This world authority on art teaching described it as "better designed and equipped than any art school I have ever seen".

He amplified that statement in a televised "Meet the Press" discussion when he said that his statement included anything he had seen in Europe or elsewhere. The architect for the school is the Lord Mayor of Adelaide (Mr. J. C. Irwin), a member of the Council of the South Australian School of Art, a patron of the arts generally, and one of the State's leading architects. He is a member of the firm of Woods, Bagot, Laybourne-Smith, and Irwin, which has been responsible for designing

some of the finest buildings in Adelaide. I think many of the buildings on North Terrace, in particular, are monuments to the members of that firm. His Excellency the Governor will officially open this school on Friday, November 15, and all leading representatives of the liberal arts will be invited to attend the ceremony and inspect the building. I leave it for them to decide whether the newspaper correspondent is correct or whether Sir Herbert Read and Mr. J. C. Irwin are correct.

#### WHYALLA BRIDGE.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Recently I asked a question regarding a second bridge at Whyalla, and the exceedingly dangerous position that had arisen while men were going to or returning from work. It has been suggested that, pending the building of another bridge, a temporary track be built to enable traffic to be diverted from the Playford Avenue bridge, thereby avoiding some of this danger. Will the Minister of Works representing the Minister of Roads, ascertain from the Highways Department whether it can of this danger. Will the Minister of Works, assist with the lay-out and grading of this temporary track?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall be pleased to bring that matter to my colleague's notice. Apropos the general question of the proposed new bridge, I have a report from the Highways Commissioner which, I am sure, the honourable member would like to hear. The Minister of Roads reports that, before the bridge could be constructed over the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Ltd.'s tramway at Norrie Avenue, the tramway had to be lowered. The B.H.P. Company said that this work would be completed during 1962. Tenders were therefore called, and a contract let early in 1963. However, as the company had not completed the lowering of the tramway, the contractor asked to be released from his contract. This was agreed to. The company has now lowered the tramway, but has not yet completed the excavation from the southern abutment of the proposed new bridge. As soon as this work has been completed, tenders will be again called so that the bridge can be constructed as quickly as possible.

#### EMERGENCY EXITS IN SCHOOLS.

Mr. HARDING: During 1959 and 1960 many disastrous fires occurred in schools, principally in the metropolitan area. In my letter of April 6, 1960, I asked the Minister of Education whether hopper windows were to be installed in all timber frame schools.

In his reply of April 26, 1960, he said arrangements had been made for the hopper-type emergency exit to be installed in each timber frame classroom in primary and infant schools in the metropolitan area and in the country. Can the Minister say what is the present position regarding the suggested hopper-type emergency exits in these classrooms?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: My recollection of the matter is as I stated in my letter three or four years ago. That letter was written shortly after an inspection that I made in company with the Director of Education, some of the principal officers of the Public Buildings Department and the officer in charge of the Finsbury Works Division of the Public Buildings Department. I was stating then what had been decided on as a result of the conference. It is a long time since I considered this matter or had occasion to discuss it with anyone, but I have no reason to think the decision arrived at then has not been carried out. I am indebted to the honourable member for raising this matter, will inquire into the present position, and report further on it.

#### RAILWAY COTTAGES.

Mr. JENNINGS: Recently, I have had several complaints from railway employees at the Dry Creek railway station, which is in my district, about the flooding of septic tanks in their cottages during the last six weeks or so. I admit that this is understandable because of the recent weather, but I understand the position is now so serious that many of the employees living in the cottages have not been able to use toilets or ablution facilities in their cottages for weeks. I understand that the Australian Railways Union has complained to the department, but no appropriate action has been taken. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Railways ask his colleague to see whether this hardship can be alleviated?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. I will bring the matter to the notice of the Minister of Railways and ask for a report. I agree the geographical name for this locality is somewhat out of context at the moment. There have been many cases of flooding during the last six weeks in areas that are very rarely subject to this problem. However, I agree that the matter should be investigated and I will bring it to the notice of my colleague.

#### EDITHBURGH FACILITIES.

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the Edithburgh breakwater?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member asked what progress had been made with the fishermen's facilities at Edithburgh. I have ascertained that the Harbors Board has been asked, following discussions with the leader of the fishermen's group at Edithburgh, to examine suggested modifications. I cannot say how long it will be before a revised plan will be produced, but I do not think it will be long. After that plan has been produced I will confer with my officers and examine the merits of the proposal.

#### TAILEM BEND TO KEITH WATER SCHEME.

Mr. BYWATERS: The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) and I have been interested in a scheme to supply water from Tailem Bend to Keith. Can the Minister of Works say whether work on this scheme will commence this year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The member for Albert asked me earlier today whether I had any information on this matter because he intended asking a question. In the joint interest of both members I can say that it is intended to include an amount on the Loan Estimates programme this year for the commencement of the scheme. Naturally it will commence at the river end—at Tailem Bend, in the honourable member's district. The purpose is to go ahead with the planning. Presumably construction will commence, in the initial stages, on a pumping station at Tailem Bend. The matter will be dealt with more fully when the Loan Estimates programme is presented to the House later.

#### FREE RAIL PASSES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Several times this session, and previously by letter, I have raised the question of free rail passes for students who live beyond Eden Hills on the hills line. Has the Minister of Education a reply?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have a fairly lengthy reply. On July 18, the Director of Education reported to me, *inter alia*, as follows:

In his letter of June 17, 1963, to the hon. the Premier, Mr. R. Millhouse, M.P., again refers to his earlier complaints in regard to the availability of free rail passes to students in his area who wish to attend a secondary school which is not the closest to their homes. He asks that free rail passes should continue to be available to girls and boys in his district to enable them to attend such schools as the Goodwood Boys Technical High School and the Mitcham Girls Technical High School even if this involves going past the Blackwood High School.

The children in the district represented by Mr. Millhouse are not the only ones affected by the change in the definition of the metropolitan area. A similar position occurs on the Port line in respect of children in the LeFevre Peninsula and this matter has been specifically raised by Mr. Frank Walsh. There is an analogous position in respect of children living at Salisbury who wish to attend the technical high schools at Elizabeth instead of the Salisbury High School and this matter has been raised by Mr. John Clark, M.P. It is clear that if the regulations are to be amended to provide for the issue of free rail passes to children in the Blackwood district it would be necessary to make the same concession to these other groups of children.

On July 22 I submitted this report to Cabinet and it was later referred to the Premier, as Treasurer. Yesterday, I received a minute from the Treasurer which reads as follows:

I think the correct action to take here is to allow students already enrolled and who have previously been receiving allowances to continue so to do. Special cases where the student cannot receive the education desired in the local high school to be considered by the Minister for special approval.

I have discussed this minute with the Director of Education and have requested him to implement the Treasurer's suggestions. Having now received the all-clear signal from the Treasurer, I shall exercise the discretion he has entrusted to me in my usual liberal manner.

#### LOW-DEPOSIT HOUSING.

Mr. CURREN: Last Thursday, in a reply to a question I asked about low-deposit housing in the Renmark, Berri and Barmera areas, the Premier replied:

The Radium Hill houses in each of these towns are already committed for sale on low-deposit (as low as £50), so it follows that the rental-purchase scheme has already been applied.

Will the Minister of Works, as Acting Leader of the Government, ascertain whether, when the supply of Radium Hill houses expires, solid-construction houses will be built under the £50-deposit rental-purchase scheme in the Upper Murray towns?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will direct the question to the Premier and get the information as soon as possible.

#### STOCKPORT BRIDGE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I understand that the Minister of Works has a reply to my recent question about the time for commencing work on the Stockport bridge.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, states that a tender

was approved in Cabinet yesterday, to be let to L. M. Robertson Constructions Limited for about £20,000, for the new bridge at Stockport. It is therefore expected that work will begin almost immediately.

#### KOPPERAMANNA FATALITY.

Mr. CASEY: I am informed that a fatality occurred at the Cooper Creek crossing at Kopperamanna in the Far North. Has the Minister of Works any information on this fatality?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I regret that I must confirm that an accident occurred some time yesterday at the Kopperamanna crossing and that an employee of the Engineering and Water Supply Department—I think a member of the northern road gang—was drowned as a result. I have discussed the matter with the Engineer-in-Chief this morning, but at the moment he is not able, because of the remoteness of the locality, to give me a definite report. At the same time I also discussed it with the Engineer (Northern), Mr. Steele, who is in Adelaide, and a report will be furnished to me as soon as definite details can be obtained. Photographs I saw this morning of the punt that was provided at Kopperamanna suggest that it is a well constructed and serviceable piece of equipment. It is difficult to imagine how an accident could have occurred. As soon as I have a report I will make it available to the honourable member. I cannot take the matter further now.

#### POWERLINES.

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked the Premier last week about the installation of underground power cables where the installation of overhead transmission lines would necessitate the lopping of trees or their removal?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a report from the Chairman of the Electricity Trust, as follows:

The use of underground powerlines would be very costly and would restrict funds available for development. In addition, it would in due course increase the cost of electricity to consumers. The trust's policy is to avoid tree cutting wherever possible. The trust is willing to co-operate and does co-operate fully with local authorities and with private land-owners on all practical proposals to achieve this. As is normal practice, the district council was consulted before the trees in the Tea Tree Gully area were cut. Most of these trees are on roads scheduled to be widened and, when this occurs, they would have been removed in

any case. Where tree cutting is involved, alternative routes for the lines are carefully examined, and, if the incidence can be reduced, lines are deviated even if there is some increase in overall costs. Re-routing of lines to meet these conditions has occurred in many instances.

#### THALIDOMIDE BABIES.

**Mr. HUGHES:** According to a recent press report, the New South Wales Government has decided to co-operate with the Commonwealth Government in providing artificial limbs to assist in the rehabilitation of thalidomide babies by paying half the cost of the project. New South Wales has 12 babies with limb deformities resulting from the use of the drug thalidomide by the mothers during pregnancy. Does the Minister of Works, as Acting Leader of the Government, know of any such babies in South Australia? If there are any such babies, will the Government co-operate with the Commonwealth Government, as has been done in other States, to help such children lead as near as possible normal lives?

**The Hon. G. G. PEARSON:** I cannot say from my own knowledge whether any deformities have occurred in this State as a result of the use of this drug, but I will pass the question to my colleague, the Minister of Health, and ask him what Government policy will be regarding assistance if there are such cases.

#### EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

**Mr. BOCKELBERG:** In view of the much improved water position on Eyre Peninsula with the linking of the Port Lincoln Basin and the Polda Basin, will the Minister of Works give further consideration to reticulating water to Eyre Peninsula beyond Ceduna, from Parla Peak to Colley Hill and from Cleve to the Hundreds of Smeaton and Yadnarie?

**The Hon. G. G. PEARSON:** The honourable member's question refers to several schemes which, in my memory is correct, have been considered at some time or another; some are of long standing. The water position on Eyre Peninsula is much better than it has been since 1956, which is due to the harnessing of the Lincoln Basin, the harnessing of the Polda Basin, and the better intake into the Tod River reservoir itself. Based on my own observations over the weekend, I would say that the Tod River reservoir would be nearly three-quarters full. It was last full in 1956. However, water extensions on Eyre Peninsula have to be decided against a background of

the total resources, not only in the wet years but in the succession of drier years, during which we get a restricted intake into the Tod River reservoir. Although various underground basins have proved extremely valuable, the major source of supply for the whole of the Eyre Peninsula network is still the Tod River reservoir. The outlook for extensions appears to be somewhat brighter now than it has been before, and, in the light of that, further extensions will be considered. However, as the honourable member knows, several large areas are awaiting reticulation and to serve them will require considerable additional resources of water. The main factor, which is yet undetermined, is the extent of the resources of the Polda underground basin, and steps have been taken throughout this year to make further explorations. The Mines Department has a programme of drilling under way to test the area, and that programme will continue, I think, for probably two years more before the actual perimeter of the basin can be determined. Until something further is known of the resources of this basin, I am unable to assure the honourable member that major extensions are possible. All I can say is that the prospects are better than they were and that I hope that as a result some of the long standing smaller reticulation schemes may be satisfied. These matters are constantly under review and representations are constantly before us for a re-examination of some proposals that have been deferred because of shortage of water. As soon as I can be satisfied that the water is available and the Engineer-in-Chief is prepared to make recommendations for further extensions, I will consider them sympathetically.

#### WOOLGROWERS' MEETING.

**Mr. HALL:** As eggs were generously and actively used last night at Hamilton, Victoria, to pelt Sir William Gunn at a meeting of woolgrowers, will the Minister of Agriculture say whether there is any truth in the rumour that he is endeavouring to introduce this type of audience participation into South Australia in order to relieve the yearly South Australian glut of eggs?

**The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN:** I do not know if the honourable member is aware that eggs are in particularly short supply. I understand that the flour industry was involved as well. I, like most other people, deplore this form of argument. Speaking on behalf of both industries, I do not think they will seriously look to this kind of behaviour as a solution to their problems.

## UNLEY FLOODING.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked on July 23 about flooding in the Unley area?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that the responsibility for drainage such as that referred to by the honourable member rests with the local authority.

## EXAMINATION FEES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Following my statement, which appeared in the press last Friday, concerning examination fees, the *Advertiser* in the third section of its editorial yesterday suggests that the receipts from the fees amount to more than £30,000. It goes on to say that the higher fees could represent a burden for some parents, and that there is a suspicion that it is intended to deter students from sitting for examinations. Is the Minister of Education able to state whether Cabinet has considered the increases and, if it has, whether it is the intention of Cabinet to accept the increases as approved by the university authorities?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: First, let me say that under the regulations pursuant to the University of Adelaide Act dealing with public examinations it is the university which fixes the fees and not Cabinet. I would hasten to add that I am quite certain that the council of the university, and later the senate of the university, had no such ulterior motive, when they increased the fees, of deterring or endeavouring to deter candidates from sitting for examinations; what I have been told is that it was the very laudable motive of paying an increased fee to the markers of the examination papers, because it was considered that they were not receiving sufficient remuneration. That was the official explanation that accompanied the amended regulations, and that was what was told to me in person by representatives of the university. Cabinet had a look at this matter, but it had really nothing to go on because the university is an autonomous body which insists most vociferously from time to time on its prerogatives, in writing and orally. A Chancellor of the university has so insisted from time to time on the university's independence. I think it would be improper for Cabinet to lightly override the decisions of the council of the university, supported by the senate of the university, unless some good reason existed. As the Leader has raised the matter in the press and now, perhaps more importantly, in

the House, I shall be only too pleased to refer his question and his statement to Cabinet for a decision.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The Minister indicated that the senate of the university had the right to fix fees. Has Cabinet, under any regulation, the right to review these fees? The Minister also referred to fees that are paid to examiners. According to the press article I quoted, there is doubt about these fees. No-one would want to reduce fees for a service, and if examiners are being underpaid, we should be told. Can the Minister indicate what fees are paid to the examiners, or is this matter regarded as confidential? Is Cabinet entitled to review the fees proposed by the University Senate?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am only too pleased to reply to these questions, but perhaps I can clarify the situation by saying, as I did earlier, that public examinations conducted by the Public Examinations Board are covered by regulations promulgated under the University of Adelaide Act. These regulations provide that the University of Adelaide shall hold examinations in general, commercial and technical education as specified in the regulations; that there shall be appointed annually a Board of Public Examinations; that the board shall annually elect a chairman; that the duties of the board shall be to advise the University Council on matters relating to public examinations, to recommend to the council the subjects and syllabuses of the examinations, to conduct the administrative works of the examinations, to nominate examiners, and to report to the council on the results of the examinations; that the board shall annually appoint committees for the subjects of examination; and that the chief examiners shall then be convenors and chairmen of their committees. Paragraph 10 of the regulations states that candidates must on or before the prescribed date give notice on the printed form issued by the Registrar of their intention to present themselves for examination. Paragraph 11 states:

The following fees, for subjects in which the Board examines, shall be paid by each candidate on entering his name for examination. In no case will the fee be returned; but if not less than seven days before the examination, a candidate shall notify to the Registrar his intention to withdraw, the fee shall stand to his credit for a future examination.

The regulations set out in great detail the fees charged for the Intermediate, Leaving, Supplementary Leaving (in February) and Leaving

Honours examinations. These fees were approved by the University Council and were referred to a meeting of the senate where they were approved. They were sent on to Cabinet, as all regulations are. Cabinet has inherently the power to review these fees, the same as it has to review any other regulations from any regulation-making authority. However, the ostensible reason given—and I am sure it was the correct reason—for the council and the senate deciding to increase these examination fees, was to increase the fees paid to the professional examiners of papers. I am quite sure that there was never any intention on the part of the many members of the University Council to deter candidates from sitting for the examinations. Since these fees were raised by the university a new feature has been brought into the matter—there was an outcry by students and parents about the conditions of holding examinations in the Centennial Hall and elsewhere in the height of summer. As a result, the Public Examinations Board decided, and the Chairman (Professor Neal) announced, that they would be held in all the schools.

Mr. Frank Walsh: He is having two bob each way.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am advised that this new decision will cost up to £20,000 more than obtained last year. I was rather pleased to hear the Leader say that the Chairman of the Public Examinations Board, Professor Neal, was having something each way; I, as Minister of Education, would not have the temerity to speak in the vernacular about such a learned person as the Professor of Education by saying that he was having two bob each way, but it certainly read that way to me when, speaking as the Chairman of the Public Examinations Board, he differentiated by calling himself Professor of Education.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister realizes he cannot debate the matter?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I do, and I am coming to a hasty conclusion. As member for the district of Glenelg, nothing would please me better than to be a cheer chaser and say that I disapproved of all examination fees and indeed all fees from kindergarten to university; that would help me once again to win election for the Liberal and Country League. However, as Minister of Education I have some sense of my responsibilities.

Mr. Frank Walsh: What about the fees for the examiners?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have been told that that was the only reason for increasing the amounts.

Mr. Frank Walsh: What are they?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I do not know, but I shall be only too pleased to obtain them for the Leader if I can do so. There again I am caught between two fires; I have great respect for the Speaker and I do not want to wear out his patience. Perhaps on some other occasion the Leader will ask another question.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Can the Minister inform the House what fees are paid to the examiners?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to endeavour to obtain the information, but I have no absolute right of access to it. For example, on two occasions two predecessors to the present Chairman of the Public Examinations Board informed me in rather offensively polite or politely offensive language—

Mr. Hutchens: That you should mind your own business!

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes, that I should really mind my own business. Professor E. F. Barnes, a former chairman of the board, wrote to me as follows:

On several occasions recently, members of the public have written to you concerning their special difficulties in taking public examinations. These difficulties are usually caused by time table, sickness or injuries. The Public Examinations Board has a set of established rules for dealing with such special cases; although these are not part of the university statutes, they are based on decisions of the board. The chairman of the board is, of course, responsible for any action taken, and any rule or any particular decision may always be discussed at a meeting with the board and reported to the University Council. In all cases referred by you to the board, a decision has been made on this basis, after a careful checking of the facts when this was necessary. Generally, the applicant had been informed of the board's decision before your letter was received.

These special cases already occupy a disproportionate amount of the time and attention of the Public Examinations Office at a time of great pressure in the general organization of the examinations. In the circumstances I am writing to ask whether you might see fit normally to tell members of the public who write to you on such matters either that they are matters on which representations should be made to the secretary of the board or that you have referred their requests to the board for decision.

I replied to Professor Barnes, as follows:

I received your letter of November 16, concerning approaches which are made to me from time to time by members of the public

concerning their special difficulties in taking public examinations, and I have noted your statement that these special cases already occupy a disproportionate amount of the time and attention of the Public Examinations Office. Out of common courtesy and in the interests of public relations, I have endeavoured to reply to all correspondence and inquiries addressed to me personally as a member of Parliament or a Minister of the Crown, and to supply any legitimate information either at my disposal or within my power to obtain. Over a period of many years, this practice has absorbed much time I could ill-afford to spare. Your letter absolves me from continuing it concerning any inquiries about the Public Examinations Office. I am delighted to adopt your suggestion. Indeed, to persistent correspondents and inquirers I shall take the liberty of quoting your letter in full.

As the Leader has asked this question and as I have received numerous inquiries from other members of Parliament, the President of the School Committees Association, the President of the Teachers Institute, and other bodies, although I have not the temerity to keep on approaching such an august person as the Chairman of the Public Examinations Board, at the special request of the Leader of the Opposition I shall, with great diffidence, endeavour to obtain this information.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Parliament will be concerned later with financial matters relating to the university. This is not a threat, but if we are not able to get the information we are seeking we will have to resort to some other method. Will the Minister convey to the gentleman in question the sentiments I am endeavouring to express, namely, that he will need evidence to support any increase in fees?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes, I shall endeavour to convey the very vague innuendo of the Leader.

#### SKELETON WEED.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Minister of Agriculture has been forewarned of the questions I now wish to ask him. Can he say what research the Department of Agriculture is doing at present to control skeleton weed; secondly, how much of this work is being done with departmental funds other than those provided through the wheat research funds; and, thirdly, in view of the ever-increasing menace of skeleton weed to the agricultural lands in South Australia, does the department intend stepping up work on seeking an answer to this problem?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is difficult to place a figure on overall departmental

expenditure on skeleton weed because of the undetermined time spent by district agricultural and horticultural advisers in this direction. However, it could be said that work financed from the ordinary Department of Agriculture estimates is exceeding probably three or four times that financed by the Wheat Industry Research Fund. In co-operation with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization and other State departments, an increased programme of experimental work is current on skeleton weed control. The honourable member gave me notice of his three questions the other day, and I have detailed answers. The answers are too long to be given verbally, but as they contain matters of general interest to the House I ask leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without their being read.

Leave granted.

#### SKELETON WEED RESEARCH.

1. What research work is the Department of Agriculture doing at present to control skeleton weed?

A. Work begun 1960 and continuing.

(1) Attempted eradication using soil sterilants. At Loxton and Murray Bridge using Polybor chlorate; Borasec; 2,4-D — Trysben; Methyl Bromide and Banuel.

Borasec: Killed skeleton weed but totally sterilized the soil.

Trysben: Gave satisfactory control with regrowth pasture cover after 12 months.

Methyl Bromide: At heavy rates gave good control.

These trials are being continued to try to develop economic and practical management techniques.

(2) Skeleton weed suppression: Barley and wheat crop studies including before and in crop spraying trials with weedicides and plant nutrients at Loxton. These trials include study of competition between skeleton weed and various cereal varieties at several levels of nitrogen.

(3) Skeleton weed in horticulture: Trials designed to introduce medic and clover competition for skeleton weed in irrigated stone fruit orchards and to selectively suppress skeleton weed at one site.

B. Work started in 1963.

(1) and (2) Logarithmic spray with lucerne trials at Karoonda and Lameroo using four different weedicides.

(3) Annual pasture, nitrogen trials at Sandalwood to look for competitive suppression methods.

(4) Medic by seeding density trial at Loxton to introduce competitive suppression of skeleton weed.

(5) Skeleton weed by nitrogen trial at Parilla.



(6) Wheat variety x nitrogen x crop spray trials at Parilla.

2. How much of this work is being done with departmental funds other than Wheat Industry Research funds?

(1) The work started in 1963 above is being carried out by the Skeleton Weed Research Officer appointed with Wheat Industry Research funds. A survey of skeleton weed in the Karoonda district was also carried out with W.I.R. funds.

(2) Two interstate conferences and inspection tours by two weeds officers to co-ordinate research on skeleton weed between the different Australian States occupying 30 man days was paid for out of W.I.R. funds.

Work done using Department of Agriculture funds.

(1) Work shown under A in question 1 has been carried out by departmental officers using departmental funds and this has occupied 165 man days in three years and with administration, travelling and materials cost approximately £2,000.

(2) Other work carried out by departmental officers using departmental funds since 1960 includes:

- (a) a survey of skeleton weed in the Murray Mallee districts of Parilla, Peebinga and Gordon occupying 50 man days;
- (b) a survey of skeleton weed in the Clare district occupying 60 man days;
- (c) follow-up skeleton weed suppression work in the north occupying 51 man days;
- (d) inspection, extension and control work on Eyre Peninsula involving 12 man days;
- (e) preparation of mounted specimens and delivery to some 50 district councils occupying 8 man days;
- (f) field days, bureau conferences and bureau meetings, on skeleton weed and assisting district council weeds officers, 71 days;
- (g) posters and leaflets prepared and published at a cost of £86 and distributed.

The above work totalling 252 man days cost approximately £3,000, making with (1) a total of £5,000 directly spent by the Department on skeleton weed in three years.

In addition to the above there is an undetermined amount of time spent by the various District Agricultural and Horticultural Advisers and Soil Conservation Officers inspecting skeleton weed areas, advising on treatment and crop management plus photography, film, radio and TV extension work.

3. In view of the ever-increasing menace of skeleton weed to the agricultural lands of S.A. does the department intend stepping up work on seeking an answer to this problem?

The S.A. Department of Agriculture is working in co-ordination with other States, particularly N.S.W. and Victoria, and the C.S.I.R.O. in experimental work on skeleton weed. In addition to South Australia's own share of the programme outlined above:

- (1) Urea — 2,4-D trials at Karoonda, and perhaps other sites, are being planned for later this season.
- (2) Work to determine the efficiency of 2,4-D and Banvel-D is being planned for September and will probably be carried out at Parilla.
- (3) Field assessments of skeleton weed—lucerne competitions are also being made.
- (4) Additional experimental work arising out of assessments being made in both S.A. and other States will be begun from time to time and it is intended that the total volume of work in each State will continually be increased.

#### TRAFFIC LIGHTS.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Recently the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) asked a question of the Minister of Works regarding lights at intersections in the St. Peters council area. I believe the Minister has a reply to that question.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, states that where traffic lights are required at intersections and the roads are used by other than local traffic, the department has invariably accepted responsibility for the roadworks involved. At simple four-way intersections the installation of lights has been the responsibility of the local government authority. Where complicated intersections are involved, the department has also, on some occasions, assisted with the cost of the traffic lights. The maintenance of the traffic lights, however, remains the responsibility of the local government authority. Any alteration to the present system does not appear justified, as the department invariably bears a much greater proportion of the cost than the local government authority involved.

#### VIRGINIA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister of Works obtain for me a report on the progress his department is making in its investigation into the feasibility of providing a reticulated water supply to the Virginia township and district?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will have to check on this matter and give the honourable member a reply tomorrow or Thursday.

#### OCCUPATION CENTRE.

Mr. BYWATERS: A committee of parents of mentally retarded children has been established at Murray Bridge, and steps have been

taken to obtain an occupation centre in that town. A representative of the Psychology Branch of the Education Department was at Murray Bridge recently and spoke to parents on this matter, and he said it would be an advantage if a suitable building could be rented or purchased. Following that, a suitable house has been discovered and it is considered ideally situated. I have a letter from the owner, which states that it is a seven-room house, and she is prepared to sell for £4,250, or alternatively rent it for two years with the right of purchase should the department desire to purchase later. This house also has three garages and two outside stone buildings, stands on four acres of land, and appears suitable for the purpose required. Will the Minister of Education, as a matter of urgency, investigate the possibility of either purchasing or renting this house?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be very pleased to do so and am indebted to the honourable member for bringing the matter forward. As other honourable members know, we have had great difficulty in the past in establishing occupation centres because of the scarcity of skilful and dedicated teachers and of the lack of suitable premises.

The department now trains retarded or backward children in no less than 90 special opportunity and remedial classes. In recent years these classes have grown in number and usefulness. They aim at assisting these children to overcome their retardation and eventually resume their places in normal grades. The skilful and patient efforts of these self-sacrificing teachers are becoming increasingly successful. There are some children, of course, who are never able to compete on an equal footing with other pupils. They continue throughout their school life in such classes, learning according to their varying aptitudes. Moreover, six occupation centres have recently been established at Kent Town, Woodville, Berri, North Adelaide, Kings Park and Whyalla, and another has been approved for Mount Gambier. But as the honourable member for Mount Gambier knows as well as I do, the difficulty there has been to find a suitable building or block of land on which to place a building. We desire to establish new occupation centres at Elizabeth and elsewhere as the need arises. I shall be very pleased to take up, as a matter of urgency, the question and the suggestion by the honourable member for Murray to see whether at least the investigation of the purchase of this property can be expedited.

#### EXPLOSIVES THEFTS.

Mr. FRED WALSH: A theft from the powder magazine at the Yatala Labour Prison was recently reported in the press, and it was believed a quantity of gelignite was stolen. It was also reported that it was the second theft from a quarry powder magazine in recent weeks. There have been a number of safe-blowings recently, and in the last day or so there has been one of considerable extent. This is not the first time I have raised this question of breaking into quarry powder magazines. I ask the Minister of Works, as Acting Leader of the Government, to request the Chief Secretary to call for a report on the protective measures being taken at the Yatala Labour Prison to guard against the theft of explosives from the quarry powder magazine, and to ascertain whether these measures are efficient?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will do that.

#### BLACKWOOD ROADS HAZARD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, an answer to my question of last week about road hazards at Blackwood?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a report from the Minister of Roads, which states that funds have been allocated for the widening of Cliff Street and Shepherds Hill Road between Brighton Parade and Northcote Street during 1963-64. A survey will be undertaken soon and plans prepared, after which the road can be widened if the council is prepared to carry out the work.

#### WHYALLA TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I understand that the Minister of Education has a reply to my recent question regarding the development of new ovals for the Whyalla Technical High School.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have been informed by the Director of Public Buildings that plans have been submitted for the development of the area adjacent to the Whyalla Technical High School to proceed.

#### TELEVISION EDUCATION.

Mr. LAUCKE: Can the Minister of Education foresee the use of television as a regular teaching medium in our State education system, and are any steps being taken regarding the future use of this medium?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes, I certainly can, and not in the dim and distant future, but in the near future. This is a very lively topic that was discussed at considerable length at an interstate conference of Directors of Education a couple of months ago.

It was further discussed for a lengthy period at an interstate conference of the Australian Council of Education, which consists of all the Ministers of Education and the Directors of Education of the Australian States, and discussions have also taken place with representatives of the Australian Broadcasting Commission.

I do not think that television will take the place of the teacher in the classroom, at any rate in the foreseeable future or to a large extent, but it is a powerful aid to teaching and it can reach a large number of pupils in many ways in which the ordinary teacher cannot. I believe that it is necessary, and, in fact urgently necessary, to begin to train a group of selected teachers in this new art of teaching by means of television. We hope to do that. I discussed it recently with the Director of Education, and we intend to select some of our outstanding teachers, probably from our leading demonstration schools, to train for this purpose and, if it is not too expensive, to experiment with the use of a demonstration school and a studio with a closed television circuit to see how far we can go in teaching in this new art. It is used extensively in America, Great Britain and other countries of Europe, and I consider that it will have a tremendous impact on South Australia in the comparatively near future.

#### PETERBOROUGH HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about paving an area at the Peterborough High School and providing new toilet facilities there?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department has advised me as follows:

1. Funds have been approved for repairs to the paving at the Peterborough High School. Tenders will be called shortly for the work as part of a group paving contract for various schools in the area.

2. A scheme for the construction of new toilets and the demolition of the existing ones was prepared in April this year. However, following representations by the honourable member, the Education Department asked that the scheme be amended. Sketch plans for the new scheme have been drawn and an estimate is now being prepared. The new scheme will be re-submitted shortly to the Education Department to ascertain whether it meets with the revised requirements.

I regret that in one way there has been a delay, but I think it will be beneficial because it will be a revised, amended and improved scheme.

#### MARRABEL PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the playing area of the Marrabel Primary School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department has informed me that funds have been approved for the regrading and resheeting of the playing area at the Marrabel Primary School. Tenders will be called shortly for this work as part of a group paving contract for various schools in the area.

#### BERRI TEACHERS' HOSTEL.

Mr. CURREN: A teachers' hostel at Berri is provided for the accommodation of single female teachers of the Berri, Glossop, Monash and Winkie Primary Schools, and of the Glossop High School, but at present it is overcrowded and recently a replacement teacher for Berri was unable to take up her duties because of lack of accommodation at the hostel and because she could not obtain board in the town. Can the Minister of Education say whether the department has plans in hand to extend the teachers' hostel at Berri?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: If the department has any plans, they have not been communicated to me. I have had the pleasure, from time to time, of visiting this hostel and being entertained by several very charming lady teachers there, but on those occasions the hostel was far from full. I do not doubt what the honourable member has said, however, because he would be speaking from personal knowledge. I shall be pleased to take this up with the department to see whether it has any plans and, if it has not, whether any can be devised, because I know that hostels for teachers in country towns serve a most useful purpose.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE SALARIES.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked on July 25 about Public Service salaries?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a report from the Public Service Commissioner, as follows:

A classification return covering practically all clerical officers was published in the *Government Gazette* on July 11, 1963. This gives effect to the Arbitrator's determination which was made retrospective by him to April 29, 1963. Offers relating to most other officers in the service have been made by the Public Service Commissioner to the Public Service Association, but finality has not yet been reached. At this stage it is not possible to say from what date such increases will operate.

**ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL.**

Mr. Lawn, for Mr. DUNSTAN (on notice):

1. Is it not the case that aged patients needing permanent nursing care have so filled Royal Adelaide Hospital beds at Northfield Wards, Magill Wards and at North Terrace, that the hospital is pressed for bed space?

2. Is not pressure put on some of these aged patients to vacate and enter privately conducted hospitals and nursing homes?

3. What plans has the Government for providing additional infirmary accommodation for chronic aged patients?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON, for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1. Currently the Royal Adelaide Hospital is experiencing the usual winter demand for accommodation for acute cases of illness. It is expected that, as usual, the demand will ease with the onset of warmer weather.

2. It has been the practice to encourage patients in either Northfield Wards or Magill Wards, who are no longer in need of treatment of the standard provided therein, to seek private accommodation when available and within their means. However, the recent decision to the effect that pensioners with medical entitlement are to be accommodated without any charge other than Commonwealth hospital benefit, has removed any incentive for patients or their relatives to arrange for private accommodation. The problem has become more acute due to the absence of sufficient private or non-profit nursing home accommodation at a cost which can be met by pensioners and/or their relatives.

3. Apart from the present provision of 165 beds at Northfield Wards for accommodation of patients requiring extensive medical and nursing care, the Government is aware of the work being done by the geriatric subcommittee of the South Australian Council of Social Service gathering information and preparing a scheme for the establishment of cottage infirmaries where aged indigent pensioners may be cared for adequately in return for their pension and Commonwealth hospital benefit entitlement. This work is nearing completion, and on presentation of a scheme it will be considered by the Government as a matter of urgency.

**ROAD GRANTS.**

Mr. McKEE (on notice):

1. What road grants have been made to the Port Pirie Corporation and the Port Pirie District Council respectively, for the year ended June 30, 1963?

2. What grants are contemplated for 1963-64?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Commissioner of Highways reports that during 1963 the following grants were made available for:

(a) District Council of Pirie:	£
Main roads . . . . .	3,500
District roads . . . . .	3,800
(b) Corporation of Port Pirie:	£
Main roads . . . . .	600
District roads . . . . .	4,500

The approved allocations for 1963-64 are as follows:

(a) District Council of Pirie:	£
Main roads . . . . .	3,500
District roads . . . . .	3,500
(b) Corporation of Port Pirie:	£
Main roads . . . . .	700
District roads . . . . .	4,000

**MAIN ROADS.**

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Will the Government have published a list of the roads which have been proclaimed main roads pursuant to section 30 of the Highways Act?

2. If so, when will this be done?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Main Roads Schedule was published in 1938 and a few copies are still available at the Government Printing Office. A few amendments have been added from time to time, but it is proposed to revise completely the existing schedule at the earliest opportunity, and, therefore, it is felt that a reprint of the present one is unwarranted.

**RAILWAY FLASHING LIGHTS.**

Mr. TAPPING (on notice):

1. How many flashing light signals have been installed by the South Australian Railways Department in the last five years in the metropolitan area and in country areas, respectively?

2. How many applications were received for such installations during that period?

3. How many actual installations were approved in the same period?

4. What installations have been approved for erection within the next two years, and what is their order of priority?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Railways Commissioner reports as follows:

1. Thirteen in the metropolitan area, five in the country.

2. Thirty-eight.

3. Twenty-two.

4. Approval, in principle, has been given in respect of eight additional installations. As several of these are joint projects involving the department and a local authority, it is not possible to say whether all will be undertaken or completed within two years. For the same

reason, it is not practicable to specify the order in which the installations will be carried out.

### SCHOOLS.

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. How many primary and secondary schools are there in Elizabeth?

2. How many of these are wholly or mainly of permanent construction?

3. What is the ratio between pupils and teachers in the Elizabeth primary schools?

4. What is the pupil-teacher ratio at the primary school of temporary construction at Para Hills?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The replies are:

1. Nine primary and three secondary.
2. Ten.

	Average Number of pupils per teacher
3. Broadmeadows .. . . .	35.0 to 1
Elizabeth Downs .. . . .	36.7 to 1
Elizabeth East .. . . .	34.8 to 1
Elizabeth East Infant .. . . .	38.2 to 1
Elizabeth Grove .. . . .	37.3 to 1
Elizabeth Grove Infant .. . . .	32.8 to 1
Elizabeth North .. . . .	36.3 to 1
Elizabeth North Infant .. . . .	39.5 to 1
Elizabeth Park .. . . .	34.3 to 1
Elizabeth Park Infant .. . . .	37.3 to 1
Elizabeth South .. . . .	35.3 to 1
Elizabeth South Infant .. . . .	39.6 to 1
Elizabeth Vale .. . . .	37.3 to 1
Elizabeth Vale Infant .. . . .	36.9 to 1
Elizabeth West .. . . .	34.0 to 1
4. Para Hills .. . . .	38.0 to 1

### COTTAGE FLATS.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice): How many pensioner cottages does the South Australian Housing Trust plan to construct on LeFevre Peninsula during the next two years?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson, for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust reports that the Housing Trust expects, during the current financial year, to build 24 cottage flats for pensioners and the like on LeFevre Peninsula. Detailed consideration has not yet been given as to what additional cottage flats will be built there during the next financial year, but it can be expected that further flats will be built.

### EXCESSIVE RENTS.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice):

1. How many tenants have approached the Prices Commissioner objecting to increases in rents since the operation of the Excessive Rents Act?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to amend existing legislation to assist tenants who cannot take action in the local court because of the legal costs involved?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson, for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The South Australian Prices Commissioner reports:

1. Fifty-two tenants.

2. It is not the intention of the Government at this juncture to amend the existing legislation. The Government has already indicated that, in the case of tenants in necessitous circumstances objecting to increases in rents, it would arrange for the Prices Commissioner to obtain legal aid for these tenants in order to test cases in court if he believed that they should be so tested. It is understood that up to the present no cases have been tested in court either at the instigation of the Prices Commissioner or by tenants acting on their own behalf.

Prices officers are endeavouring to assist tenants who approach the department in every way possible and, in a few instances, rent increases imposed by landlords have been withdrawn as a result. Other tenants have been advised to seek legal advice where this has appeared warranted, and in several instances where it has been considered that the premises being occupied by tenants could be of a sub-standard nature, the matter has been referred to the South Australian Housing Trust with a view to action being taken under the Housing Improvement Act.

### FLUORIDATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What are the estimated capital and annual costs of adding sufficient fluoride to water supplies in South Australia to reduce tooth decay?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson, for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The estimated capital cost of installing fluoridation equipment to serve all areas connected to the metropolitan supply and also Mount Gambier and Murray Bridge is £78,000. The estimated annual cost in respect of these areas is £20,000.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 25. Page 164.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the motion and join respectfully with His Excellency the Governor in those expressions of rejoicing and sympathy contained in paragraphs 2 to 5 of his Speech. I should also like to say a word of welcome to the members for Yorke Peninsula and Mount Gambier, who are new to this House, and to assure them that I listened with very great interest to, and later read, their maiden speeches in this Chamber. With their permission, I desire to

adopt substantially all that has been said by members on this side of the House in the debate so far in praise of the Government's activities during the last 12 months.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in South Australia is a happy one at present. In particular, it seems to me that we have a stable economy, and while I would be the last one to say that that is due entirely to the efforts of the Government—such a claim would be silly—I do say that the activities and the outlook of the Government have been contributing factors.

Mr. McKee: You aren't going to give the Government the credit for the rain we have had?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, all I say is that that is one of the contributing factors. For the benefit of the member for Port Pirie, I am sure that if the Government had been composed of members from the other side of the House the situation would not have been nearly so rosy. However, I do not desire to develop that theme. Other members on this side of the House are capable of developing it should they so desire. I consider, however, that it would not be right for me simply to concentrate on the good things, because no Government or any other organization is perfect. While the overall situation in South Australia is satisfactory, I consider that I would be failing in my duty if I did not refer to matters that I believe need correction or alteration, because I consider the most effective way of supporting the Government is by proffering, from time to time, constructive criticism. Unfortunately, in this House precious little constructive criticism comes from the opposite side, although that is traditionally the role of the Opposition in a Parliament. As insufficient (if any) constructive criticism is made from the other side, it falls to the lot of back benchers on this side of the House to supply it. That is why I shall mention some matters. An additional reason, if any other is required, is that the Address in Reply debate is usually regarded (in fact, it has been so described by a number of Ministers to me, and who am I to deny what they say) as a safety-valve debate, during which members can let off steam!

I consider the gap between sessions of this Parliament has been far too great. The last day of sitting last session was, I believe, November 1. We did not meet again until June 12, a period of seven months.

Mr. Hughes: Seven and a half months.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe that is far too long. Parliament has two functions. The first, and this is important to the Government, is the granting of supply and the consideration of Bills for changes in the laws of the State. It appears that we have always been able to get through all that sort of work in a session of a few months. That is a reason given for the long gap between sessions, but I believe that Parliament also has another function that cannot be carried out effectively unless we sit more frequently.

Mr. Hall: Don't you think that it would lead to a lengthy Address in Reply debate?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member for Gouger has never been noted for his patience, but if he bears with me I will develop the point and perhaps satisfy him on the matter he has raised. I believe the second great function of Parliament is to act as a forum for discussion on all issues that arise in the community. If the discussion is to take place here, we must sit to have it. Many issues arose during the seven months we were not in session that could not be debated in the very place where they should be debated.

Mr. Bywaters: If this is constructive criticism you are offering, I point out that it has been offered by this side of the House from time to time; so we do offer some constructive criticism.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It appears that the member for Murray is on my side on this occasion and I accept his correction. This matter of Parliamentary sittings is something I believe in wholeheartedly and something I considered deeply during the recess between November, 1962, and June, 1963. One other thing (and I say this with all charity to the Ministers) is that I find it fairly difficult to obtain replies to queries by letter when we are not sitting. I do not know whether other members have had this experience, but from what the Leader of the Opposition said during his speech last week, I gathered that he had had this problem. It is easier to get a reply to a query from any of the eight Ministers when the House is sitting than when it is not. I had one example of this experience during the last few months which, I hope, came to a happy conclusion today. Since this session began, I have asked several questions about free rail passes for schoolchildren. I first raised this matter with the Minister of Education by letter on February 18, and it was not until today, some 5½ months later, that I received a reply. In all fairness to the Minister, I say that,

although that is the longest delay I have had in recent years, I have had the same sort of experience when dealing with other Ministers. This indicates that, when the House is not sitting, it is not possible to keep in touch as effectively as when the House is in session. Regarding the remarks of the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall), perhaps I could ask him how more frequent sittings would lead to longer debates and a waste of time.

Mr. Hall: I was referring to the initial Address in Reply debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand now what the honourable member was saying. Some time ago a representative of one newspaper asked members what they thought about having one or two sessions of Parliament. I was not asked, so what I am saying now is fresh. For once I entirely agree with the member for Enfield who, I understand, suggested that it would be a good idea if Parliament met during more normal business hours. I assume that he meant during the afternoon and perhaps in the morning and not at night, so that the work would be spread over a longer period. This would give members an opportunity to raise, in this House, matters which otherwise they could not raise here. The objection to this suggestion may be that Ministers are too busy to spend much time here. Well, if that is so, then the answer is simply to increase the size of the Cabinet so that the work load may be spread more evenly. When the member for Burra was appointed Minister of Lands, there appeared on page 1 of the *Advertiser* of January 9—alongside his photograph with the Premier—an article stating that the question of whether the new Premier's Department would involve the appointment of an additional Minister would be discussed at a meeting of the Parliamentary Liberal and Country Party before the Parliamentary session began.

Mr. Ryan: You haven't had that meeting yet!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, we have.

Mr. Ryan: Was it secret?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course. Our meetings are always confidential and we never divulge what is discussed at them, unlike other Parties, let it be known! I was disappointed that the Governor's Speech contained no reference to the creation of the new Premier's Department or about increasing the size of Cabinet. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) to some extent put this right, by asking a question. However, I think it would have been better done had it been divulged in

the Governor's Speech. After all, the Governor's Speech is supposed to be a forecast of the coming legislative programme as well as a review of the previous 12 months. I have raised this question about the meetings of Parliament because I am very much afraid that the long gap between sessions is definitely misconstrued and misunderstood—and perhaps it is not so much of a misconstruction and misunderstanding—by the general public. If we do not meet, and have such long gaps, people will inevitably start asking whether there is any need for us to meet at all. By our not meeting we are, to some extent, undermining the federal system of government to which all members on this side subscribe.

During the last few years there has been a fantastic passion amongst our Ministers for uniformity of legislation between the various States of the Commonwealth. That, to my mind, is undermining the federal system of government, because if we require uniformity—and I do not believe we do—to the extent to which we have tried to implement it in recent years, it simply underlines the fact that State Parliaments are no longer necessary and that all we need is one Parliament for the whole of Australia. Let us consider some of the legislation we have had before us. We have had the Hire-Purchase Act and the Companies Act, and the Uniform Business Names Bill is to be restored to the Notice Paper.

Mr. Harding: Matrimonial causes?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That was a federal matter that could be legitimately so dealt with under the Constitution. We have had this fantastic desire for uniformity. It is a desire that can never be fulfilled because of the idiosyncracies and quirks of members of the various State Parliaments involved. Our Attorney-General, the Honourable C. D. Rowe, in his outlook and private conversation is one of the greatest upholders of the federal system of government, yet what do we find him doing? He has been traipsing around from State to State attending conferences of Attorneys-General at which uniform legislation has been discussed, and apparently he has agreed to introduce such legislation in South Australia. That, to me, is simply another nail in the coffin of the federal system of government. I am sorry that he has done it. We have the example of Mr. Ludovici, the Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, who seems to spend most of his time at conferences in other States with other draftsmen trying to work out details

of uniform legislation. I believe all this is completely unnecessary. If I am wrong, it simply underlines the reduced importance of the States in the legislative sphere in Australia.

I congratulate the Minister of Lands (Hon. P. H. Quirke) on his appointment to Cabinet. I was surprised he was not congratulated earlier in this debate. I am delighted at his appointment. It is often said of people that they are fearless in the expression of their opinions. During the eight years I have been in this House I have found that that is true of the Minister of Lands. He has certainly had what we can call a chequered political career—almost Churchillian in its range, but we hope that it will not be quite Churchillian because Churchill ended up where he began, and we do not want the Minister of Lands to end up as an Independent where he began in 1938.

Mr. Ryan: That's likely to happen!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For his sake, I was pleased when only nine days after the death of his predecessor he was appointed to office.

Mr. Ryan: You've changed your mind, have you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: About what?

Mr. Ryan: About being pleased with the appointment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. I said that for his sake I was pleased.

Mr. Ryan: You were hostile when the appointment was made.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think so.

Mr. Ryan: Oh yes!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the member for Port Adelaide presumes to be a mind reader, he is a poor one. I was pleased with the appointment, for the Minister's sake. For my own sake I was rather disappointed—and perhaps this is what the member for Port Adelaide had in mind—because I well remember that frequently the member for Burra, when he sat opposite as an Independent, was the only member of this Chamber who bothered to support me in various matters. That, of course, showed his good sense. I am afraid, however, that unless he is able to sway his Cabinet colleagues with his persuasive eloquence, I may be left on my own when debating such questions as price control.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You will only be enjoying my experience.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Be that as it may, I am pleased with the appointment. However, there is one aspect of his appointment that

I regret—and I say this in all charity to him, because it is beyond his control and beyond the control of any of us—his age. I do not raise this matter in a personal way, but it is a serious matter, and relates to the age of our Ministry. The Minister of Lands is aged 64.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I was 65 yesterday.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Then many happy returns of yesterday. I am glad to be the first to congratulate the Minister on that, too. Whether that makes any difference to the average age of our Cabinet I do not know, but the average age of our Cabinet is 58 years, which is high. I use the average because I do not want to single out any particular Minister. Let me refer to the age composition of this State's population. I shall quote from the *Statesmen's Pocket Year Book*, 46 of 1962, issued under the imprimatur of the Chief Secretary which, therefore, makes it impeccably accurate. The table on page 29 shows that in South Australia in the 1961 census there were 376,000 people in the 0-19 age group, 433,000 in the 20-54 age group, and 160,000 in the above 55 age group.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: They have not far to go.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the point I am making.

Mr. Hutchens: What will people say about us?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall be coming to that in a moment.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Are there any exceptions?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am going on averages. Cabinet in this State is of the average age of 58 whereas the vast majority of the population is much younger.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I would not like to point out that I was below average; you might take me the wrong way.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad for the Minister's sake that he is. This high average age indicates a trend that I think is unfortunate.

Mr. Coumbe: Would this be similar to the position in other States?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know. I am thinking of President Kennedy, who is 46. I believe that the average age of the British Cabinet is now substantially lower than that of the South Australian Cabinet and lower than it has been for the whole century.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Some of them are too young!



Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think we would be running that danger in South Australia. I have raised this matter because I think it is important.

Mr. Ryan: This may be remedied after the next State elections!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It will not be remedied in the way the honourable member means, but I hope it will be remedied on this side of the House. Lest there be any misconception by people who think I am pushing my own barrow, which I am not doing, I should like to use a phrase that I have heard used by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) when new members have come into this House—"There are a number of young men in their forties in this House." They could well take on the responsibilities of Cabinet.

Mr. Shannon: We think that is what they are destined to do.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so. I would not have ventured to raise this matter except that the Labor Party is endeavouring to take some drastic action on this very point to put its own house in order. If one considers the ages of members of the Opposition one realizes that they are much older than members on this side of the House. I am an avid reader of the *Advertiser*.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Isn't that the official organ of the Liberal and Country League?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If it is, the Labor Party gets much good publicity in it. In this paper on June 10 appeared an article relating to the Annual State Convention of the Australian Labor Party, in which was the following report:

The convention decided that no member of Parliament who was eligible for a Parliamentary pension and who would be over 73 at the completion of the ordinary Parliamentary term for which he was seeking endorsement would be eligible for pre-selection. Members opposite will correct me if this is an inaccurate report. Leaving aside the card system, which always distorts the decisions of Labor Party conventions, 88 were in favour of the motion and 73 were against, so members were fairly well divided on the matter. Mr. Clyde Cameron, who is, I think, the reigning czar of the Labor Party in South Australia to whom everyone else must bend the knee, said that the Labor movement had not been formed to keep people in well-paid Parliamentary jobs long after men in other occupations were compelled to retire. I guess those who attend this week before the committee that will be inquiring into Parliamentary salaries will be careful to explain away the description "well-paid Parlia-

mentary jobs". I am sure that members opposite would say if this were not a correct report.

Mr. Loveday: That is not all that was said.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. I will continue:

After a lively two-hour debate—

My word; I bet it was lively!

— the convention last night decided to increase the present 2½ per cent levy paid by South Australian Labor Members of Parliament to the Australian Labor Party's election campaign fund to 4 per cent. The resolution, which was adopted by a narrow margin, also appointed a five-man committee to enquire into a "just" contribution by members of Parliament to the fund.

I warn members that that had better be explained when they go along to the committee that will be deciding Parliamentary salaries, as apparently the rank and file of those at the Labor Convention thought that members were paid so well that they could afford to pay a little more into the coffers of the Party. However, that is by the way, and it arose rather deviously.

Mr. Shannon: That is an unkind cut, I think.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the honourable member think so?

Mr. Shannon: I do not think members opposite supported the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, the conference did, but we are not allowed to be there so we do not know who opposed it. These comments all arose from the matter of age, which I felt it incumbent on me to raise. I intend to raise one other general matter on which I suppose not all members will agree with me. The member for Torrens, during the course of his excellent speech in this debate, referring to the Premier's last overseas trip, said:

The statement he made to the House and the subsequent investigation into the use of atomic power may well be one of the most significant contributions to our future development and way of life.

With that I entirely agree. I am entirely sincere in saying that words can never express the admiration I feel for the Premier—for his capacity, his tenacity and his sheer physical endurance as Premier of this State for so long. However, we must face the fact that while he was away he had his 67th birthday. Even including the Minister of Lands, I know of no other man of that age who is in such undiminished vigour of mind and body as the Premier, but he is now in his later sixties, and the time must inevitably come in the course of nature when he will no longer be with us. We must face that whether we like it or not.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You will be in a bad way when he does go.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will be in a bad way, which is the very point I was about to make. We have been told (and I accept the fact) that the Premier went overseas for two purposes, the first concerning the paper pulp industry in the South-East.

Mr. Ryan: Did you read about it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought I had just managed to capture the interest of the honourable member and that he would let me develop this point. I think even he will agree that the Premier went overseas for two reasons. The second reason for the Premier's visit overseas concerned the possible use of atomic power in South Australia. He was the only Minister to go overseas this year. We know that he went because it was considered that he personally had connections that would be useful to the State, and I have no doubt that he had. But, Sir, may I remind you that there are on the front bench two Ministers, each of whom is peculiarly responsible for one of these aspects. The Minister of Agriculture and Forests (Mr. Brookman) is peculiarly responsible for the question of afforestation and forest production, and the Minister of Works is, I understand, the Minister responsible for the Electricity Trust.

Mr. Nankivell: Under the Act the Woods and Forests Department and the Electricity Trust are answerable only to the Treasurer.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On financial matters.

Mr. Ryan: They are answerable to the Treasurer on all matters, apparently!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I am correct in saying that the Minister of Works is the Minister in charge of the Electricity Trust. Even if I am wrong, it does not really affect the point I am making, namely, that it would be a very good thing if on this trip either one or the other of those Ministers or some other Minister—

Mr. Fred Walsh: Whom did Uncle Bob take with him?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not particularly concerned about Uncle Bob, another man in whom we all have a very great interest and who is the envy of all members opposite. My point is that the time has come, in my respectful opinion, for the Premier to take with him one of his Ministers at least when he goes on a trip of this nature.

Mr. Ryan: Have you the right to raise that matter inside your own Party?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course I have; that is one of the things about our Party: we can raise any matter in this House, which is more than members opposite can do.

Mr. Ryan: You are only explaining what does not go on.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am saying what I think should go on, and maybe it will go on in future. Having got those few points off my chest, Mr. Speaker—and this is a safety-valve debate—I desire to raise three other matters. Sir, we know that His Excellency's Speech is prepared by Cabinet; that has been a tradition in British Parliamentary circles, to my belief, at least for the last two centuries. However, I could not help feeling that on this occasion it was rather a tepid document, remarkable more for what it omitted than for the matters that it raised.

Mr. Loveday: It lets the Governor out, doesn't it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think anybody blames His Excellency for the contents of the Speech; everyone knows it is a Government document. The Speech omitted three matters which, in my respectful opinion, should have been mentioned, and I desire to raise them because they are undoubtedly issues of public moment now and Parliament is the place in which they should be decided. The most glaring omission, I thought, was that connected with town planning. Until the Deputy Leader (Mr. Hutchens) this afternoon raised the matter by way of a question without notice, not one word had we heard this session about the question of town planning. I need hardly remind members that the developmental plan for Adelaide was laid on the table of this House on October 24, 1962, and today is the eleventh sitting day on which it has been lying on the table. Under the Town Planning Act, pursuant to which that report was prepared (under section 26, I think), it has to be laid on the tables of both Houses, and during 28 sitting days it is competent for any member to move that it be referred back, either in whole or in part, to the Town Planning Committee for further examination. I think that sums up the substance of the thing. However, not one word was contained in the Governor's Speech about this matter.

I think every honourable member will agree that the report, a long one, is magnificently produced. It contains an enormous amount of information about the metropolitan area, quite apart from the proposals for channelling its development in the next few decades. I

think it is fair to say that the reaction to the plan has been mixed, and there has been much criticism of the plan as contained in this document. Like the Minister of Education with the new School of Art, I am no expert on these matters and I am unable to say whether that criticism is entirely just or unjust. All I say—and I say it most sincerely to all members in this Chamber—is that some plan is better than none at all, and if I read the omens aright this document is in danger of being ignored entirely.

Mr. Lawn: Do you believe in planning?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe in town planning, yes.

Mr. Lawn: What about economic planning?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am talking about town planning, and I do not want to be sidetracked by the member for Adelaide. I asked a question on notice about this matter, and I was surprised at the answer given: that the total cost of the preparation and publication of the plan was only £18,901. I had understood—as did the Deputy Leader—that the report cost about £28,000 to print.

Mr. Bywaters: We were told that last year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. Even if the overall cost since 1955 is only just under £19,000, that is a lot of money just to throw away and not use.

Mr. Hutchens: It would do something towards our roads.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I suppose so. Chapter 23 of the report states:

The effectiveness of the development plan will depend on the legislation needed to implement the plan.

Then a paragraph contains the following:

The principal measures needed to guide the development of the metropolitan area are:

- (a) additional measures to control the subdivision of land more effectively;
- (b) a unified system of zoning to govern the use and development of land;
- (c) new measures to ensure that land for essential public purposes, such as highways, schools and open spaces, is available at the right time and place;
- (d) a more effective way of obtaining land for public open space.

Chapter 24, the last chapter in the book, tabulates the legislative recommendations to bring this plan into operation. Those recommendations consist of six proposals for amendment of the Town Planning Act, one for amendment of the Public Parks Act, and new legislation to enable land needed for public purposes to

be reserved. All those things are legislative. One would have expected that some mention would be made in the Governor's Speech of this matter—which is before the House now—but there was not even a word saying, "We do not like the plan; we think it is not worth having, and we are not going to take any steps to implement it," or "We think they did a good job but they were on the wrong track." The Speech contained nothing at all about the matter. I do not know whether this plan of itself is good or bad. All I believe is that some plan is better than none at all, and if we are going simply to let all these recommendations go by the board, where will the metropolitan area of Adelaide be, and what will it look like in a couple of decades?

Mr. Casey: A ghastly mess.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right. We have a duty to do something in this matter and I am glad the member for Frome agrees with me. Someone on either side of the House should do something, even if the Government is not going to do it, to initiate a debate on this matter in the way laid down in legislation passed in 1955, that is, within 28 sitting days of the plan being laid on the table of the House.

Mr. Lawn: Are you complaining about the Government not having taken you into its confidence?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I never get cross about that.

Mr. Lawn: Does the Government ever take you into its confidence?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has not said anything about town planning. Another matter is the fluoridation of the water supply. My decision to refer to this arose out of the answer the Premier gave to a question at a large and enthusiastic meeting held recently in Parkside.

Mr. Jennings: In a 'phone box at Unley!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Certainly not. It was at a meeting last Wednesday night to launch the campaign for the seat of Unley at the next State elections, and I know the perturbation that it caused opposite because a question was asked about it last Thursday.

Mr. Lawn: They tell me that you, the Premier, the candidate, and Susie were the only ones present.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is whistling in the dark. He is probably thinking of his own meetings. The meeting was held in a large hall that was comfortably filled.

Mr. Lawn: With you, the Premier, Mr. McLeay and Susie?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, there were many more than that. I estimated that there were 100 to 150 people there. I did not count them, but there were certainly 100 people and they were very enthusiastic.

Mr. Lawn: They tell me a Mitcham cheer squad went down to it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, the meeting would have been packed out if I had taken those boys along. I was probably the only one from Mitcham at the meeting. The only jarring note that evening was the answer the Premier gave to a question about fluoridation which, incidentally, was asked by a dentist. The answer made me cross, if I may say so with great respect to the Premier. He said that the Government would not fluoridate the water supply because the same result could be obtained by buying pills and taking them.

Mr. Ryan: The master has spoken, so that's that!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier may be right in theory, but I do not know whether he, not having had for so long a time young children in the house, has forgotten how difficult it is to try to give each child a pill. The pill has to be taken every night to have any effect at all. Perhaps other members with young children may sympathize with me.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: It may be more difficult for them to drink water.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know about that. There are 101 reasons why a pill is forgotten. I have checked on the expense and have been told by a chemist who practises in a western suburb that the cost of the pills varies from 7s. 6d. for 200 to 15s. for 100.

Mr. Shannon: Would fifteen shillings for 100 mean one pill a week?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, it is one a day. Whether the pills are a halfpenny or a penny each does not matter, because the cost to a family man with more than one child—and we have four running at the moment—is considerable over a period of time. I do not know why the member for Hindmarsh is laughing.

Mr. Jennings: I think he said that the cost was going to increase in your case!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It does not worry me because I am on a reasonably good income, but for people who are trying to give young children protection on the basic wage this is

an imposition. I say that seriously, and I am sure that members will agree with me. I do not say necessarily that I am absolutely in favour of this, but what I complain about is the time the Government is taking to make up its mind about what it is going to do. During that time all children in South Australia up to five years of age are suffering because of the lack of action in this matter. My grouch in this matter is that days pass and the Government does nothing about it.

Mr. Ryan: It does nothing about many things.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe, but I am talking of fluoridation, and any further delay means tooth decay amongst children under five years of age. We have heard much in opposition to fluoridation. I have had representations on this matter from people I respect in my district.

Mr. Corcoran: They are mainly minority groups.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe they are, but I respect their views while not agreeing with them. About 12 months ago a bulletin was issued by the United Kingdom Information Services containing a report on fluoridation of water. As it may help the Government to make up its mind, I remind it of some of the statements in that bulletin. I assume they are entirely authoritative: indeed, I have no reason to think that they are not. The bulletin states:

Dental decay is one of the most widespread of all diseases in Britain and its incidence has increased rapidly in the post-war years. The report says, however, that there has been a substantial improvement in the teeth of young children living in three parts of Britain—Watford, part of Anglesey and Kilmarnock—areas where since 1955-56 the fluoride content of the water supply has been raised to one part per million. Among children who have had the benefit of this level of fluoride all their lives the average number of teeth affected by dental decay has been cut by more than half and nearly twice as many children as formerly have completely sound teeth.

The bulletin continues:

The main findings for the combined fluoride areas are: the average number of decayed, missing and filled teeth was 66 per cent less at age three years, 57 per cent less at age four, and 50 per cent at age five. The proportion of children free from caries shows a similar improvement, the percentage rising from 32 to 60 per cent at age three, from 22 to 42 per cent at age four, and from eight to 31 per cent at age five.

On the question of cost, the report states:

Experience gained in the study areas showed that the cost of fluoridation is about 10d. per annum per head of the population supplied.

Whether that ties in with the estimated costs mentioned in reply to a question this afternoon—£78,000 capital cost, and £20,000 annually—I do not know, but the costs are certainly moderate when compared with the dentists' bills that must be met by parents and by people throughout their lives. The report continues:

This committee states that no information has been received from doctors practising in the study areas indicating harm arising out of fluoridation. A number of special investigations were carried out to test specific hypotheses or allegations of harm and in none of them has evidence arisen of any harmful effect. The committee's conclusion is that no harmful effects from the addition of one part per million fluoride to the drinking water have been demonstrated in any of the very extensive medical evidence which they collected and reviewed. In their opinion "the raising of the fluoride content of drinking water to a level of one part per million is safe".

Under the heading "World Support", the report states:

These conclusions are in line with those of a World Health Organization Expert Committee on Water Fluoridation which concluded in 1958 that "the effectiveness, safety and practicability of fluoridation as a caries-preventive measure has been established".

This is something that the Government could at least examine. Above all else I ask that it come to some conclusion on the matter and let it not drift on as it has done since I have been a member.

In common with other members I have had a spate of letters in the last few months concerning aspects of our Licensing Act and the question of a T.A.B. system of off-course betting. Perhaps you, Mr. Deputy Speaker will be kind enough to transmit my remarks to the Speaker, who is interested in these matters. I respectfully agree with the Premier's attitude expressed here last week. Since he announced that no Bill would be introduced by the Government relating to the T.A.B. system, there has been much criticism in the community of him. It has been suggested, for some reason, that he is a dictator, and that this was his personal decision; but that criticism is entirely unjustified. Every member of this House has the right, if what is wanted is a debate on this matter, to put a motion on the notice paper. Any member can table a motion either for or against this system, so that it can be debated. I have no doubt that if, as a result of such a debate, the majority of members favoured the proposal, the Government would find it impossible to resist the pressure to

bring in a Bill to give effect to that express motion.

Mr. Corcoran: Why is there need for a motion? Could not the Government introduce a Bill and let Parliament decide the matter?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What a cockeyed situation that would be! The Premier would have to introduce a Bill that he did not favour. I have suggested the remedy. If the Speaker feels as strongly about this matter as apparently he does, the remedy is in his hands.

Mr. Frank Walsh: You could act as Speaker, if necessary.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Heaven help us if I did, but I am not suggesting that I act as Speaker. However, my point is that, if the Speaker feels strongly about this matter, he can return to the floor of the House and move such a motion. It is wrong for anyone outside the House to say that the Government has stifled debate on this matter.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Would he move it as the member for Ridley or as the Speaker?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should imagine that he would have to resign as Speaker and move it as the member for Ridley.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Would he do it as the member for Ridley or as the chairman of the racing fraternity?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is beyond my ken.

Mr. Shannon: The sponsor of this system is not prepared to move that motion. Anyone else can bell the cat, but not him!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All I am interested in doing now is pointing out to the critics that a motion may be introduced by any member on either side of the House. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition already has a notice of motion on the notice paper relating to another matter, and there could be a notice of motion on this subject. I regret that several other matters were not mentioned in the Governor's Speech, but there will be other opportunities on which to raise them.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the motion. I believe we have been entertained by an extraordinary speech from the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Why "entertained"?

Mr. HUTCHENS: I thought that his speech was entertaining, because it was so unusual. The member demonstrated the difficulty of taking pills but, having criticized the Premier, I have no doubt that it will not be long before we witness him swallowing a bitter political pill. He made some extraordinary statements.

He said that the conference of the Liberal Party was highly confidential.

Mr. Millhouse: I am afraid you misheard me.

Mr. HUTCHENS: The honourable member said that it was highly confidential.

Mr. Millhouse: I certainly did not mean to say it.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I thought not, particularly as the honourable member shortly thereafter told us all about the troubles of the Liberal Party and the things it had done.

Mr. Ryan: He mentioned the things it had not done.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I thank the honourable member for his correction. The member for Mitcham had the audacity to refer to the Labor Party czar and said that there was no-one like that in the Liberal Party. He immediately proceeded to criticize the age of Cabinet members and quickly pointed to the Premier as the czar on his side of the House.

Mr. Millhouse: You are using my phrase, but that is how I described Mr. Cameron.

Mr. HUTCHENS: In words perhaps but I concluded that the honourable member was skillfully describing his own Premier. The honourable member said the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) was on his side in respect of one matter, but I think the situation is the reverse: the member for Mitcham is coming to the side of the member for Murray. I was delighted with his criticism of the Government for the lack of explanation in the Governor's Speech about matters that should be considered this session. Hindmarsh, the district I represent, is an area where much new development is taking place. It is an old area where some decay is setting in because many of its buildings were constructed a long time ago when little attention was given to planning. The district has many problems. I agree with the member for Mitcham (and I am sure other members will agree) that the sittings of this House should be longer and the recesses shorter than in the past so that members might air their grievances and take part in debates on behalf of their constituents. The many problems I have in my district are resolved far more quickly by taking them to a department or going direct to a Minister when necessary.

I do not intend to deal with local matters, but will speak on broader lines. I have pleasure in congratulating both new members who have addressed this House for the first time. The member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson)

made the type of speech that we who know something of his past expected him to make. It was well arranged and clear, and I thought he was wise to discuss matters with which he was well acquainted, which he did to his credit. I am sure he will be a valuable member, and I wish him well. Unlike the member for Yorke Peninsula, whom we expect to be moderate if only because he is a member of the Government Party, the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) was provocative, but nobody will deny that his advocacy was clear and his arrangement good. His advocacy for his district was forthright and he showed much determination. Members of the Opposition regret the passing of his predecessor, who was a great fighter for his district. However, Mr. Ralston has been replaced by a member who will fight equally as well for his district and in the interests of this State.

The member for Mount Gambier dealt with the productivity of his district and its great potential, and he then turned quickly to its needs. I noticed that pink was coming to the cheeks of the member for Yorke Peninsula and that this turned to a deep crimson as the remarks continued, which convinced me that the member for Mount Gambier was effective and the member for Yorke Peninsula affected. With apologies to Tennyson in his poem *The Brook*, I say about Mr. Burdon:

Hills may come and hills may go  
But Mount Gambier will progress to the better.  
We should congratulate all who were associated with the planning for the last Royal visit. Mr. King (Under Secretary) undoubtedly did a fine job, and I congratulate him. The Police Department did a magnificent job. Every officer, from the most junior to the most senior, carried out his duties in a manner that won for the Police Force the most sincere respect of the people of this State. I express my gratitude to the officials of the Education Department, and I wish to correct one or two things that were said, I think unjustly, about that department's handling of the events that took place on Children's Day. One regrettable feature about the occasion was that the Minister was not present (at least, I did not see him), and I heard several comments about this, although there may have been a good reason for his absence. Much propaganda appeared in the press about children who fainted during the assembly. We should be more moderate in our comments, as I think it was the desire of every child in South Australia to express loyalty to Her Majesty by being present. It was a trying day and

that, together with the tension, caused some children to faint. Let us remember, however, that men who are trained and considered to be physically fit sometimes just topple over on such occasions; even members of guards do this on ceremonial occasions. The teachers in charge were most attentive and concerned about the welfare of the children. No reflection should be cast on them, as they did their utmost to give comfort to the children. The Music Festival was an outstanding event, as I am sure everyone will agree. Everyone who had the privilege of witnessing that function must have felt proud of this State and of the people responsible for the arrangements.

The Governor's Speech referred to the visit to Australia by the King and Queen of Thailand, and it was said that the visit was a manifestation of the bonds of friendship between the two countries. We must have this manifestation. Although different in many ways, Australia and Thailand have the responsibility of assisting in determining the world's destiny. It is essential to have a real bond of friendship between Australians and Asians.

I join with other members in paying a tribute to departed members of Parliament. I refer to the Hons. L. L. Hill, A. C. Hookings, A. J. Melrose, and Sir Cecil Hincks, Mr. Ralston and Mr. Edgar Russell. With some of these gentlemen I did not agree politically, but all gave of their best for South Australia, some in the face of strong opposition. To differentiate between them would be cowardly and undemocratic, and would bring politics to the lowest level. I give thanks to the Highest for their courage and the service they rendered. May their relatives find comfort in the knowledge that we in this place deeply respect their memory, because we realize that they served with courage, sincerity and civility.

I join wholeheartedly with the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) in his remarks about the Governor's Speech. He has said the Speech is intended to indicate the legislation the Government intends to introduce during the session. This year the Speech has a sad disappointment. In past years we have heard in it much about foreshadowed legislation. Time after time Bills have been introduced dealing with matters that seem to have come out of space. There may be good reason for this, but there can be no reason for Bills being mentioned and then not proceeded with. We do not need to go back far to remember the many matters that have been mentioned

and then forgotten. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said that all the Government's promises had been implemented. In true Australian language, whom does he think he is kidding? Paragraph 10 of the Governor's Speech last year said:

In pursuance of its policy of developing new industries in various parts of the State and thus providing a measure of decentralization, my Government proposes to create a new department charged with the function of securing new industries and assisting them in their initial stages and generally promoting production within the State of commodities which are now imported.

Has the Government given up the idea of developing new industries? Nothing was done about it last year, and in the Governor's Speech this year there is no mention of the matter. Does the Government admit that it does not want decentralization? Is it prepared to move at a snail's pace in securing new industries or to let those that have come go bankrupt? Many new industries are going bankrupt. I believe that South Australia has more bankruptcies than has any other State. Last year the Governor's Speech stated that we must promote production within the State of commodities that were being imported. Is that no longer important? It was left to the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) to draw attention the other day to the promise made in the Governor's Speech last year. On April 12, 1962, the matter was of major importance; otherwise it would not have been included in the Speech. Although the matter was raised forcibly in the last State election campaign, no word was said about it here until Mr. Bywaters referred to it the other day. We should be told what is happening. Was the Government having a little fun with the electors? Some people say that L.C.L. stands for a lot of clowning loosely. Some say the present Government will go down in history as the Government that had a lot to do about nothing. I agree with that, and I have a supporter on the Government side of the House.

Mr. Millhouse: I did not say that. I said I accepted everything said in praise of the Government.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I do not know what the honourable member had in mind, but I made my deduction. I was glad of his support earlier, and I am sorry that he now takes it away. I do not agree that the proposals made 12 months ago are the answer to the question. I do not favour executive control and, because of the way in which Parliament

is constituted today, I doubt whether I would support a move to establish a department. I do not say I would not support such a move, but I must see the legislation first. When I spoke in the Address in Reply debate last year I made a proposal. I am not a State-righter, because I am an Australian with an Australian outlook. This matter of development in Australia is more urgent than most people imagine. We must find markets in Asian countries for our goods. We shall be driven to finding them in the near future. We shall have to consider how to provide those countries with the wherewithal to purchase the goods we have to sell. That is important. We must refrain from manufacturing certain goods in Australia because, if we do not, we will deny those people an earning capacity to purchase our goods. Therefore, I believe we should set up in Australia a committee representative of both sides of all the Parliaments, because in most States the Opposition may become the Government and should know what industries have the opportunity to be established and function successfully in Australia for as far ahead as we can see. It is wrong for us to permit industries to be set up and then, by trade or import restrictions, to close them down or to allow them to go bankrupt after we have given them encouragement.

I believe it is necessary for this matter to be viewed broadly. I sincerely believe that some move should be made to establish the type of committee I have suggested. I acknowledge, of course, that a committee is operating today under the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Parliament: a committee of experts is making these inquiries. However, I believe that, rather than allow unfortunate past events to recur, we should have a committee consisting of members who are closely associated with the people, in order that it may be able to say to the people, "This is what we as a people have to provide as security for ourselves."

I now refer to item 18 of His Excellency's Speech last year. The member for Mitcham drew attention the other day to the subject of a Clean Air Act. I will refer to this matter later in the session, so at this stage I will say only that nothing has been done about it since it was mentioned in the Governor's Speech more than 12 months ago. It has appeared to me that the Government has had no intention of doing anything about this matter. The member for Mitcham addressed a question to the Premier recently and the reply, in effect, was "Well, we may do something about it this session, but I make

no promises." Last year, 12 months ago, this was something that was essential, apparently, because, if it was not essential, it was wrong to write it into the Governor's Speech. It was wrong because those promises aired so openly built up hopes, expectations and a feeling of satisfaction. Not to honour a promise that has been made is deceitful. I suggest that recent events in another part of the British Commonwealth of Nations have emphasized that it is an unpardonable sin to mislead Parliament. A member that deceived a certain House resigned, and I suggest that that is a pretty good lead that might be accepted by others.

Mr. Jennings: He resigned for slightly different reasons.

Mr. HUTCHENS: That is so, but I will not go into that. Such items as I have referred to tend to render the Governor's Speech rather a doubtful and meaningless document, and no Government should be guilty of that action. I consider that it is so much a waste of time to debate such items at this stage, for the past has shown that they are but the wind that blows from the Liberal and Country League for the purposes of political aggrandisement.

I now come to a matter that was referred to by the Leader in the course of his remarks. When dealing with the railways, the Leader said that the number of passengers carried per annum had dropped by 2,500,000 over the past 10 years. During that period the population of South Australia has grown by about 300,000. The Railways Department's interest Bill has increased in the last four years by about £400,000 a year. I acknowledge that it is difficult to compare railways in the various States. In some States the population is far more dense than it is in South Australia, and in this State we have vast barren spaces where little profitable work is available in haulage for the railways. The Railways Commissioner's report, tabled on October 31 last year, discloses one or two interesting items which, I consider, support the Leader's contention. Under the heading of "Financial Review" the following appears:

The earnings (for the year 1962) were £13,992,106, an increase of £50,441 on the previous year. Ordinary working expenses increased by £229,424 to £14,394,545. There was a net surplus in the working results of £88,607. The earnings were the highest so far recorded.

Labor fully appreciates the need and the value of a railway service in this country, and it is conscious of the necessity of an efficient railway system in the development of the State



towards a sound and healthy economy. It does not expect the railways to show a profit, but it is convinced that a long-range policy should be determined at once, with the primary consideration given to service for the development of industry, which in return would more than compensate for the cost incurred by the department. Labor's policy is clearly stated and is available to all: there is nothing confidential about it. I quote its policy:

(1) The co-ordinating of all transport services under a Minister of Transport responsible to Parliament with all necessary amending legislation to provide—

(a) subject to the discretion of the Minister, railways and tramways to be managed by boards on which the employees shall have representation.

I could not agree more with my Leader when he says that the whole trouble with the Railways Department today is that it does not consider the desires of the public and is never ready to hear the views of those directly concerned with the railways. Then:

(b) the proper co-ordinating of road transport as an auxiliary of public transport.

The Government has made some attempt to convince the public that it has adopted part of this policy.

Let us look at what has happened. The 1961-62 figures from the Railways Commissioner's Report show that railway patronage is falling in South Australia. Country passenger journeys were down by 25,000 for that year, though the distance travelled seems to be 3,000 miles greater. The earnings in this respect were up by £16,000. Some people will say, "This is good economy", but I think I can show to the contrary. Suburban passenger journeys were 392,000 fewer, while the distance travelled decreased by 129,000 miles. Earnings were down by £14,000. The overall position for 1962 was that the railways had 417 fewer passenger journeys than in the previous year; the trains travelled 126,000 fewer miles, while the income from passengers was up by £2,000. Surely this indicates that the emphasis is on £ s. d. and not on services? Further evidence of this comes from the average earnings from each passenger, which, in the country, amounted to 210.5d. in 1962, whereas in 1961 it was 200.12d. From suburban passengers the average earning was 13.22d. in 1962 and 13.12d. in 1961. This tends to prove that the Leader was correct when he claimed that the railways operated on a

short-term policy, concentrating on finance and not on services—a sure way to financial tragedy.

This is the cause of our consternation. There is a definite feeling by the public that the railways are doing everything possible to drive away passengers. We do not ask that public transport services open up in reckless competition with one another—rather the contrary. We ask for a proper co-ordinating of these services. Until this is an accomplished fact, we feel that the following suggestions may be considered: First, decrease fares to a level where additional patronage will be attracted in sufficient volume to ensure greater revenues. This takes me to the point that every time fares are increased the number of people using the railways decreases. Secondly, introduce regularly timed rail services on suburban lines. This means trains departing at regular intervals with additional trains at peak periods between regular trains. For people coming into the city of Adelaide, there is no trouble to the traveller on the buses that run in opposition to the railways. A bus leaves on the hour, with other buses at regular intervals but, if people want to travel by train, one train leaves at five minutes past one, the next will leave at twenty minutes past two, and the next at five minutes past three. They are all over the place: there is no regular time table. A man coming to Adelaide cannot say, "If I miss one train I will catch another in ten minutes' time." He has to carry a time table in his pocket because it is difficult to remember the train times. He will say, "I do not know when I can catch a train, so I will take a taxi." An efficient railway service is essential.

The next suggestion is the provision of modern air-conditioned rolling stock to provide services convenient to the public instead of expecting intending travellers to time their needs to the services timed to suit the availability of the inadequate rolling stock now in use. I make no apology for referring to inadequate rolling stock. What do international visitors think of South Australia when they catch a train in Melbourne to travel to Western Australia? They enter beautiful air-conditioned carriages to travel to Adelaide, where they must transfer to an antiquated vehicle to be taken to Port Pirie. In the winter-time these coaches are cold, windy and draughty; in the summer-time the windows have to be opened to allow air in, and in blow the dust and grit. These carriages are terrible contraptions. The passengers then enter modern air-conditioned carriages to be taken

to Western Australia. The part of the journey from Adelaide to Port Pirie is a disgrace and discourages people from coming to South Australia. This is driving passengers away from the railway all the time.

My next suggestion is for this programme to be supported by a survey of the requirements of people living in areas served by the railways, passengers not being asked to accept the convenience of the railways. Rather should the railways set out to attend to the needs of the

public. These things should be considered until such time as Labor's policy is put into effect, providing the railways with the purpose of serving and developing the State as we would desire to have it developed. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.09 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 31, at 2 p.m.