

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

DRUG ADDICTION

Mr. HEASLIP: Today's *Advertiser* contains the following report, headed "LSD 'Manufactured and Sold' in Adelaide":

The really habit-forming drugs like cocaine and heroin are sent here from Sydney in small quantities to be sold at an exorbitant price to the relatively small number of people in this city who are addicted to them, Mr. Mosman said.

Mr. Mosman was a drug addict at one time.

The report continues:

But there is a ready supply of dexamphetamine sulphate (dexedrine) and "purple hearts" for sale to teenagers. . . . The Director of the Student Health Service at the University of Adelaide (Dr. R. C. Heddle) said he had come across a number of cases where students were suffering severe emotional problems, especially at examination times, through the taking of pep pills. We have had cases where the student has been so disorientated that he has written entirely irrelevant answers to questions and quoted in the answer incidents concerning his girl friends or motor car, Dr. Heddle said.

The report also states:

There is also a supply of locally manufactured LSD which is sold by the six young men who make it at \$7 for a sufficient amount of the drug to give the user a seven-hour trip.

Drug addiction is extremely dangerous, particularly to young people. However, apparently these drugs are freely available in South Australia. Will the Premier say whether he will introduce legislation similar to that introduced in New South Wales to control the trade in these drugs and to make it much more difficult for the teenagers of South Australia to get them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No complaints that seriously habit-forming drugs are freely available in South Australia have come to my attention, nor to my knowledge has anything been drawn to the attention of the Government about illegal manufacture of drugs that would otherwise be available only on prescription. However, I shall refer the matter to the Minister of Health and get a considered reply for the honourable member.

ORDNANCE FACTORY

Mr. CLARK: This morning *Advertiser* contains the report of a statement made by the Minister for Repatriation (Senator McKellar),

when replying to a question in Parliament last evening, that it was planned to build a Citizen Military Forces training depot at Elizabeth early next year at an estimated cost of \$388,000. Has the Premier any knowledge of this project and, if he has not, will he obtain a detailed report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have referred previously (and as late as yesterday) to the Commonwealth Government's announced intention to build an ordnance factory and a training depot at Elizabeth. I notice that the Minister for the Army said that it would be erected in 1970-71, which does not tie in with the reply given by Senator McKellar. However, I shall inquire further, but, when I was in Canberra, I did consult the Prime Minister on this as one matter in which the Commonwealth Government could give some stimulus to an economy that it had been responsible for depressing. I have had no reply from the Prime Minister on that matter, either.

Mr. HALL: On August 22 the Premier said that houses had been built at Elizabeth as a result of the Commonwealth Government's announced policy to establish an ordnance factory at Smithfield. On the same day, in reply to another question, the Premier said that the Commonwealth Government had, on several occasions, informed the Government of this State that it intended to build an ordnance factory here. Yesterday, in reply to a further question, the Premier quoted from a report of the General Manager of the Housing Trust, in which the General Manager states that, in the trust's many years' experience of major Commonwealth works, and in particular defence work, very little forward information is ever given in a precise form. The report continues:

In late 1964 and early 1965 the trust realized that following the completion of a trunk sewer roughly parallel with the main north line, the most convenient place for further housing development on the northern plain from a State viewpoint was in the general Smithfield area. Actually, the trust itself did not particularly wish to develop then in this area, but the economical use of State services swayed the decision.

The report continues:

However, I would like to stress that no precise details of labour requirements were given nor any binding promises made; nor did I ask for these, accepting the fact that this was not a matter which would normally be discussed.

In view of the report that no information was to hand about any possible labour requirements,

and in view of the announcement in this morning's newspaper that the Commonwealth requirements in this area will be only about 25 houses, on what additional information concerning the proposal to build this depot does the Premier base the Government's house-building actions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has carefully taken certain statements of the General Manager of the trust without referring to others in which he had detailed statements of the Commonwealth Government, which said that it would build this ordnance depot and that it regarded it as a matter of urgency. Having given details to the House yesterday, I see no need for me to expand further on the matter. The first statement of the General Manager of the trust given to the House is completely consistent with his answer detailed to the House yesterday. The trust's decision in this matter is perfectly clear, and I emphasize that it was made at a time when the trust was not subject to directions on policy by a Minister of Housing. The Leader said it was this Government's decision on housing policy: it was not.

Mr. Hall: You said it was.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was the trust's decision on policy in 1965; the Leader knows that perfectly well to have been the case, and the General Manager, whose answers I have read, has detailed the reasons why. I realize that the Leader, for political purposes, is trying to saddle the Government with a responsibility in this matter and to distort the answers of the General Manager to that end.

SOCIAL STUDIES

Mr. CASEY: I read recently the press report of a forceful speech made by Professor P. H. Partridge (Director of the Research School of Social Sciences at the Australian University) in which he said that school curriculum planners should consider introducing a course of social sciences in Australian schools and, in addition, that people who had received no social education were, as a result, generally ignorant of major issues and differences, etc., that were present in today's society. Indeed, from my own personal experience, I find that to be true: young people leaving school today to enter our adult society are often completely ignorant of what is going on around them. Therefore, I think it would be advantageous if students, particularly those in their fourth and fifth years of secondary education, could avail themselves of a course in which they could study the ramifications of our society,

so that they could prepare themselves for the future. Has the Minister of Education considered this aspect of education? If he has not, will he do so and inform me whether such a course is feasible?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: For many years (even long before I became a member of this House) I was always anxious to see social studies promoted in our schools. In the last few years, however, that subject has received a great fillip and much encouragement: it is now studied on a far greater scale than it previously was, and I invite the honourable member to go to some of our secondary schools and to see the extent of the work being done in this direction. In fact, the students in our secondary schools are taken out to see many facets of our social life, Parliamentary life, and industrial life. I believe that we are doing some fine work in our schools concerning social studies at present. In fact, the examples of this work which I have had the pleasure to examine recently are outstanding, and I believe that we are (at present, at any rate) adequately covering the subject of social studies.

ELECTRICITY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: First, I take it from what the Minister of Works said in reply to the member for Alexandra yesterday, concerning the breakdown in the power station at Torrens Island, that the estimate of the damage is above \$100,000. I ask the Minister what the precise estimate of the damage is. Secondly (and even more important), will he say what steps are being taken to ensure that such a breakdown does not occur again?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In answer to the latter part of the honourable member's question, I am confident that all possible steps will be taken to see that a similar accident does not occur. Yesterday I read a prepared report on the matter that I had only just received. As I expect to receive a further report at a later date, when it is to hand I shall inform the House.

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the Minister's statement yesterday that certain items in this plant were insured for over \$100,000, will the Minister ascertain the estimated cost of replacing the parts, and repairing and returning them to service the No. 2 turbo-generator? Also, will he ascertain what additional cost the trust will incur as a result of extra generation being needed from the older power stations, which have a lower operating efficiency?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall try to obtain this information, as well as the information asked for by the member for Mitcham.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I sympathize with the Minister, as the accident occurred at 4 a.m. when he may have been asleep. However, I point out that, although the Minister's statement yesterday took us some way (and he has now said that a further statement is to be made), members are unable to determine, from the information received, the magnitude of the accident that occurred. We merely know that it was a pretty big accident; we do not know the costs involved or what steps will eventually be taken to repair the damage. Can the Minister assure members that when the further statement is made they will be told what are the precise estimates of cost and whether the turbine that has to be returned to England can be repaired and restored to perfect condition? I understand that this equipment is intricate and difficult to repair. If the Minister will assure members that these matters will be covered, they might be able to be a little more patient. However, he must agree that members have now been waiting for some time since the accident occurred and have received little real information, other than the statement made yesterday.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As I have already said, I will try to get all this information. I repeat that I received the report I read yesterday only a short time before the House met. Since then I have not had time to talk to representatives of the Electricity Trust. However, I have noted members' questions, copies of which I shall send to the trust in an endeavour to obtain replies.

ELIZABETH INDUSTRY

Mr. CLARK: During the last few days I have heard constant rumours of the projected expansion of a substantial firm at Elizabeth which will employ considerably more people in that area. Has the Premier any details on this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. World Wide Camps Proprietary Limited has won a \$3,500,000 contract to supply 150 houses for the Mount Newman Mining Company Proprietary Limited in Western Australia, and contracts to supply camps to firms associated with the Mount Newman project worth an additional \$2,500,000. Houses will be prefabricated on the production lines of the company's factory at Elizabeth West and transported by road to

Port Hedland and Mount Newman, which are the focal points of Western Australia's iron boom. I am informed by World Wide Camps Pty. Ltd. that the Mount Newman contract is the largest single order that it has won this year. It will mean an increase of 70 men in the firm's present work force. Delivery of the asbestos-clad houses will start in about two and a half months' time and will continue until the contract is completed in about 1968. The subsidiary orders for camps have been placed by the Morrison Knudsen Corporation, which is building the railway line to Mount Newman, and by the Bechtel Corporation, which is the managing agent for the Mount Newman project.

MATRICULATION COURSES

Mr. QUIRKE: Can the Minister of Education say whether a final decision has been made as to which country high schools are to have matriculation classes, and whether Clare High School is to be included in that list?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: During the last week or so, I have had several inquiries in the House about this matter. So far I have not received a final report, but, as soon as I have it, I will inform the honourable member.

LIFTS

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Labour and Industry concerning the age limits applying in regard to the operation of lifts?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: My colleague has supplied the following report:

In 1960 a new Lifts Act was passed to repeal the one which had operated since 1908. At the time, it was recognized that the prohibition of persons under 18 years of age operating lifts, which was necessary in respect of old lifts still in existence, was not required in respect of modern automatic lifts. Accordingly, provision was made in section 14 (2) of the Act for the Chief Inspector of Lifts to grant an exemption from the requirement that no person under 18 years of age shall operate a lift. This exemption may be granted in respect to any lift which, in the opinion of the Chief Inspector, can be worked safely by any person under the age of 18 years. Although this provision for exemption is widely known by architects and lift manufacturers, the only application which has been received was in respect to the lifts in the Reserve Bank building. The exemption was granted.

NARACOORTE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. RODDA: Following the announcement by the Minister of Works that the Engineering and Water Supply Department intends to

augment the supply of water at Naracoorte by sinking three additional bores, I have had discussions with a spokesman from the committee concerned with Memorial Park, the drive of which park is to be bituminized so that the run-off will aggravate the nuisance caused by the water that already lodges in the area. The committee has informed me that certain areas in the park reserve would be ideal sites for a bore. I understand that departmental officers have examined certain sites, but I ask the Minister to have them look at a site either in or near the area known as Memorial Park, as this could be a means of disposing of some water that finds its way underground from the run-off in the area.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although I am speaking only from memory, I understand the department has put down three new bores and improved two existing bores. From what the honourable member has said, the committee concerned seems to feel that a location in this park would be a most suitable site for one of the new bores. As the department is always anxious to co-operate with committees that work in a voluntary fashion, I shall be happy to confer with departmental officers to see whether arrangements satisfactory to the committee can be made.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOUSING

Mr. BURDON: Following a meeting of builders which was held in Mount Gambier two or three weeks ago when various matters relating to Housing Trust contracts were discussed, I understand a deputation from the Housing Industry Association waited on the Premier and that subsequent discussions have taken place with the trust. Can the Premier give any details of what has transpired since that deputation waited on him, following the meeting at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Housing Industry Association informed me that the meeting had resolved *inter alia* that local work be let to local contractors using local subcontractors and local supplies wherever possible; that tenders be let in lots of five, not 50, and jobs must be 75 per cent completed before the letting of a further contract to that contractor; and that the Government be asked if Housing Trust tenders could be opened publicly and subcontractors' names be submitted with tenders to avoid the possibility of further cutting down of subcontractors' prices. As regards the last matter, I had already told the Housing Industry Association

that the Prices Commissioner would investigate the prices paid by Housing Trust contractors to subcontractors over the last three years, and that investigation is currently proceeding to see whether protection should be given to subcontractors, some of whom have alleged that they have been cut down in price. As to the other matters, the General Manager of the Housing Trust reports:

I refer to the motions carried at a Housing Industry Association meeting at Mount Gambier. These will be dealt with in general terms since the resolutions to some extent overlap, but this report will follow generally the order of the resolutions passed. The trust has always followed the policy of using local contractors, local subcontractors and local suppliers and material wherever possible; in fact not long ago the trust was criticized by the council in Mount Gambier because it was building too many houses in Mount Gambier stone. The fact remains; however, that the trust, like most other public bodies, must call for tenders for its work.

That means that we have to build to a tender price: this is a requirement on the trust by the Auditor-General. The report continues:

Advertisements for tenders are always advertised in local press and this practice will be continued. In any case, the trust would find it impossible to define "local", because some of the trust's best builders in country towns have settled in an area following the receipt of a tender in that particular area although they were not established there when they tendered. For example, a builder whose registered office is in Adelaide might have been building in an area for a number of years; presumably he would be a local builder, but any other builder would be denied the same chance of becoming established in the area.

When tenders were called at Mount Gambier and clearly the lowest price was from a builder who, although State-wide, has not yet built in Mount Gambier, because of the policy to help local builders the trust negotiated with a local builder who had previously proved his ability and who was the next lowest tenderer. The trust believes that it serves South Australia best by providing low cost housing and investigations by the Auditor-General have shown that, in fact, the trust provides the cheapest accommodation of its type in Australia. This it has done by using the economies of large-scale operations wherever possible. The suggestion of the Housing Industry Association, for example, that there should only be contracts of five houses at a time could never build up a country town like Whyalla and would also deprive South Australia of the benefits of large-scale production. Big contractors frequently do take longer to hand over the first house in a contract, but in most cases finish the whole contract more quickly than a small builder. The Auditor-General has laid down procedures for the opening of trust tenders and once a tender

is placed, subcontractors have to be approved by the trust. However, these frequently change during the course of a contract. As far as standards are concerned, the trust has a specification and it is the duty of the architects and clerks of works to see that these are fulfilled.

As mentioned in the attached notes for the Premier, it is trust policy that local subcontractors should be used as far as possible. In the case of Mount Gambier this policy has been implemented by the builder who was the lowest tenderer and who received a contract in this city. When he commences operations next week he will, in fact, be using 100 per cent local subcontractors. There are situations, however, when this policy is incapable of being implemented and, in fact, would be to the detriment of a particular country town if it were adhered to. If for some reason the trust's programme has to be increased rapidly in an area in which all building resources are being used (this, of course, was the case in Whyalla), the trust encourages builders to bring in outside subcontractors because this is the only way that the rate of building can be raised. This further illustrates the impossibility of having an inflexible single policy for all situations as seems to be implied by the resolutions of the Housing Industry Association.

BOAT HAVEN

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Marine comment on the statement about the \$2,000,000 boat haven for Port Noarlunga, making particular reference to what has been asked of the Government and what the Government intends to do?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This proposal at Port Noarlunga is sponsored by a private organization, the name of which I am not at liberty to give to the House at present. I understand that on Thursday the man concerned will submit to me sketch drawings regarding the proposal and that he intends to build up the reef, build side walls to it, provide havens for fishing and sailing vessels, provide a marine harbour in which marine life will be kept for show purposes, and build a shopping centre and many other facilities on the foreshore. Up to the present all that has been asked of the Government is that it grant a 21-year lease so that that work may be carried out.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Will the use of the reef be denied to the public?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I understand that it will be open to the public and that it will be entirely free of cost, except that a charge will be made for viewing the marine life that will be contained separately. I emphasize that I understand this to be so because I shall not receive full details of the

proposal until the Director of Marine and Harbours and I meet the sponsor on Thursday. However, I think the sponsor wants the proposal to be made known after that meeting and, if that is so, a comprehensive public statement will be made. When we receive a request we shall negotiate with the local council and discuss the matter with the member for the district to ascertain the feelings of the people in the area, as I think that is important.

FREE MILK

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: For many years the free milk scheme conducted in South Australian schools at the cost of the Commonwealth Government has been operating to the satisfaction of all parties. It seems to me from observations that, because of the natural increase in population, the quantity of milk required must be increasing each year. Indeed, the establishment of bottling and pasteurizing plants in major country towns enables supply to be made to many country schools that originally could not participate in the scheme because of the quality requirements properly laid down by the Commonwealth Government. Although this matter is not directly under the control of the Minister of Education, can he say what quantity of milk is consumed each day at present and what is the cost to the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As I do not recall the information, I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

ALTONA SIDING

Mrs. BYRNE: The Altona stopping point on the railway line to Angaston is not well sited from the point of view of the convenience of passengers alighting from or joining trains. The point is about 150 yards from the road but there is no pathway on the side of the railway line or a gate from the roadway to the stopping point. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Transport to consider relocating this stopping point or, alternatively, improving the present arrangement to make the stopping point more accessible for the use of passengers, and so encourage railway patronage?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that.

TOURISM

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Last Wednesday I referred to the provision in the Commonwealth Budget for a grant of \$1,550,000

to the Australian Tourist Commission in order to attract overseas tourists to Australia during the current financial year. I asked the Minister of Immigration and Tourism whether any spill-over to the South Australian Tourist Bureau from that money was likely and also whether action would be taken to ensure that the increased tourist traffic during the present financial year would benefit South Australia. The Minister said that a conference of State Tourist Ministers, at which the Commonwealth Minister in charge of Tourist Activities would attend, would be held in Adelaide on August 25. As I understand that that conference has taken place, can the Minister give a more specific reply to the question I asked last week?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The conference, held as scheduled, was attended by the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Chipp), and discussions took place on the activities of the Australian Tourist Commission. The Australian Tourist Commission has been established as a statutory body by the Commonwealth Government pursuant to the provisions of the Australian Tourist Commission Act No. 27 of 1967. The commission commenced operations on July 1, 1967. The function of the commission is to promote overseas travel to Australia. This previously was the function of the Australian National Travel Association, which will now be more of an industry body dealing with affairs within Australia. However, it will continue to exist.

The commission is financed by the Commonwealth Government. There will be no "spill-over" of funds to State Government tourist bureaux. Close co-operation will be maintained between all State Government tourist bureaux and the Australian Tourist Commission. Under section 6 (5) of the Act, the Governments of all States have the right to nominate two non-voting members to the seven member commission. The State Tourist Ministers have decided that each State Government Tourist Director shall serve as a member of the commission on a two-year rotational basis. The arrangement agreed provides for the State Directors to serve according to their State's population, starting off with the State with the largest population (New South Wales) and the State with the smallest population (Tasmania). While serving on the commission, State Directors are expected to represent and protect the interests of all States and not just their own. Every effort will be

made to try to ensure that South Australia receives its fair share of the overseas visitors who come to Australia.

OVERTIME

Mr. BROOMHILL: I notice in yesterday's *Advertiser* a report that a Commonwealth member of Parliament has again made statements that are most harmful to the business confidence of this State, and he is reported to have said that overtime in South Australia is now a thing of the past. Has the Premier factual information on the amount of overtime being worked in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As usual, the member for Adelaide in the Commonwealth House has been completely oblivious and careless of the facts when attacking the economy of this State, particularly in saying that overtime in South Australia is a thing of the past. The figures supplied by the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service for overtime worked in this State indicate that of the total employees in the survey as at June 23 (the latest available figures) 39.5 per cent worked overtime, whereas the Australian average of employees working overtime is only 34.4 per cent. Only Western Australia (43.1 per cent) has a higher proportion of employees working overtime than South Australia. The South Australian figure is much higher than Victoria's 29 per cent, Tasmania's 25.4 per cent, and Queensland's 32.3 per cent. New South Wales, which is supposed to be an expanding and prosperous State has a figure of 37.7 per cent, which is less than the percentage in South Australia.

TOW-TRUCKS

Mrs. STEELE: The Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1966, the purpose of which was to bring tow-truck operators under control, received assent on December 1, 1966, and was to come into effect on a date to be proclaimed. The insistence of the Opposition that the legislation passed by the House could not be effective was justified by the Government introducing the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1967. This received assent on March 23, 1967, but it cannot be proclaimed until the original Act has been proclaimed. At present New South Wales has similar legislation before its Parliament but, meanwhile, in South Australia the undesirable practices that the legislation was designed to cure continue and will continue until the Act is proclaimed. Will the

Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Transport when it is intended to proclaim this Act so that regulations can be drafted to bring the legislation into effect?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member soon.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Premier a reply to several questions I have asked about the charge of 83c made by the Railways Department for removing grain from silos to feed starving stock?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have had a reply through the Minister of Transport from the Railways Commissioner, but the matter is being considered by the Drought Relief Committee. The question is whether assistance should be given in one particular form or another, and as yet I have not had a final reply from the committee. When I receive it I shall inform the honourable member.

KEITH MAIN

Mr. NANKIVELL: On August 24 I asked the Minister of Works a double-barrelled question about the Keith water supply, and yesterday he answered one part of the question. Can he now say how the \$448,000 provided in the Loan Estimates for work on the Taillem Bend to Keith main is to be allocated?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am pleased that the honourable member has asked the question, because I was under a misapprehension at Coonalpyn the other evening, and avoided answering it. Of the \$450,000 allocated, about \$300,000 will be used for the Keith township water supply, and about \$150,000 for pumping on the route of the Taillem Bend to Keith main.

EYRE PENINSULA RAILWAYS

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate about railway services on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Transport states that it is hoped at least to maintain the current rate of re-laying in the Port Lincoln Division. In addition, every effort will be made to step up the rate of progress.

ABATTOIRS

Mr. McANANEY: At least once every three years the Minister of Agriculture is obliged to appoint a competent person or per-

sons to investigate and report to him on the efficiency of the plant, etc., of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. I recently asked the Minister about recommendations contained in a report that had been made 12 or 18 months previously, and the Minister assured me that he would ascertain what had happened to that report. Will he now say whether those recommendations have been implemented or whether he intends to give effect to any of them by way of legislation?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This was a matter for the board itself and, indeed, I understand that the recommendations that were made have been implemented.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister ascertain the quantity of boned meat treated for export in South Australia during the last financial year both by private works and by the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Although this information, particularly regarding the private works, will be rather difficult to obtain, I will ascertain whether it is possible to obtain it.

Mr. McANANEY: Some weeks ago the Minister agreed with me that stock was being taken to another State to be killed, and brought back to this State as carcass meat. At the beginning of last year the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board substantially increased its charges, and now it has increased them by nearly 14 per cent for the killing of lambs and sheep, and has introduced a new minimum charge for lambs. In view of this, does not the Minister consider that some inquiry should be made into the efficiency of the abattoirs and its administration to see whether it can be made to operate competitively, because it will not be able to do so by increasing its charges by such amounts each year?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I understand that no increase in charges has been made this year other than an increase for very small lambs on a minimum basis. I would not agree with the honourable member that there was a need for a special investigation into the running of the abattoirs. The efficiency of plant and stock is, as the honourable member has said, examined regularly, and I believe that is sufficient.

Mr. McANANEY: Perhaps I ought to apologize for asking so many questions on the matter, but I think that this increase in costs at a time when we are losing export markets is a tragedy. The Minister has said that he does not understand costs to have gone up,

but to the best of my information they have increased by from 2.5c to 2.9c. This week I saw sold a wether that cost a man \$3 to kill at the abattoirs, but the grower would have got less than that for producing it. This matter is of serious concern to South Australian farmers. Most Government abattoirs in other States are controlled by a board comprising only three full-time members who know the complete ramifications of the trade. However, in South Australia the board comprises representatives who come from various industries and who have different loyalties. I do not think that a board such as that works to the best advantage of the industry. Will the Minister consider adopting the methods adopted in other States for the control of Government abattoirs?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: My knowledge of the Abattoirs Board as at present composed goes back many years. Many problems are associated with meat generally and one of these arises mainly because so many people have different interests. I am not prepared to undertake to consider changing the composition of the board. This matter would need much consideration and discussion by interested parties before I could make a recommendation to Cabinet.

RHYNIE SCHOOL

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have been asked several times recently about the Education Department's plans for disposing of the school property at Rhynie. Will the Minister of Education ascertain the department's plans in this regard?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Tenders are usually called for old buildings, but I shall ascertain the precise position.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister of Transport said at the weekend that a letter had been sent to the Prime Minister in 1966 setting out the views of the South Australian Government concerning standardization matters affecting the North of the State and that the Government would not be "railroaded" in connection with this matter. As no statement whatever was made about the standardization of the Broken Hill to Cockburn line yesterday at the annual meeting of the Silverton Tramway Company, will the Minister representing the Minister of Transport ascertain the precise differences existing in this matter between the Commonwealth Government and this State? As I would have thought

that most of the matters involved would be dealt with by the standardization agreement, will the Minister ascertain the reason for the untoward delay on this important project?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although the honourable member will know that I cannot say at what stage negotiations have reached in this matter between the State Government and the Commonwealth (that being the prerogative of the Minister of Transport), I will refer the matter to my colleague, ask for a report, and ascertain whether he is prepared to make available to the House the details of the negotiations that are proceeding between the State and the Commonwealth Governments in this matter.

RATING

Mr. LANGLEY: In inner-suburban areas, including Unley in my district, many old houses are being demolished, and home units and other types of housing are being constructed often on a large area of vacant land, which was previously occupied by the one house and for which the former council rate was, say, \$50. However, up to 10 home units are now being built on these blocks, with the result that council rates for the same block are increasing, for example, to \$500. As I have received complaints to the effect that the Government is responsible for this council rating, will the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government ascertain whether this is the councils' prerogative and not that of the Government?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the matter to the Minister of Local Government. However, the Government is not responsible for this situation: it depends entirely on the type of rating adopted by the council concerned, that is, whether it bases its rating on the annual rental value or the unimproved value.

VINE NURSERY

Mr. CURREN: On May 25 last I attended a field day at the Merbein Research Centre in Mildura at which vine research work was explained. One address given related to virus-resistant and nematode-resistant vine rootstocks. As this work is being subsidized by the Australian Dried Fruits Association with growers' funds, will the Minister of Agriculture investigate the possibility of establishing a nursery of these rootstocks at the Loxton Research Centre, so that South Australian growers might benefit from this research in

obtaining rootstocks from a local source without experiencing any quarantine restrictions?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall be pleased to investigate the matter for the honourable member.

PARAFIELD GARDENS FOOTPATHS

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the completion date of footpath construction at Parafield Gardens?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Housing Trust expects to commence the construction of footpaths in the Parafield Gardens area in October next. The construction of all the footpaths should be completed by about November, 1968.

RIVER MURRAY COMMISSION

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Works say whether the River Murray Commission is meeting this week? If it is, what business will be before it?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although I am not sure of the date of the meeting, I understand that the commission will discuss what water will be available for irrigation and whether restrictions will be necessary.

UNIVERSITY FEES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday, the Minister of Education announced in the House that the Government had requested the two universities in this State to raise their fees by, he thought, 15 to 20 per cent. I have looked at section 18 of the University of Adelaide Act and section 20 of the Flinders University of South Australia Act, and I have in mind section 38 of the Acts Interpretation Act (these are the sections that deal with the making of regulations to fix fees). It is not entirely clear by looking at the three sections whether or not such regulations must come before Parliament for scrutiny and possible disallowance. I remember that in December of last year the former Premier said that the Government was prepared to go further into debt rather than increase hospital charges and university fees. In view of the change of attitude by the Government now, only about eight months later, and in view of the controversy surrounding any suggestion of raising the fees, can the Minister say whether the increases requested will be made by regulation and, if so, whether the regulations will be laid before this House? If they will not be laid before the House, will the Minister assure members that Parliament will have an opportunity to debate the proposed increases?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The universities were written to on the subject, as a matter of courtesy and, I believe, in accordance with previous practice. Whatever is done will be done correctly.

GERIATRIC NURSES

Mr. CUMBE: Some women constituents in the community have told me that they are anxious to engage in nursing (especially geriatric nursing) even though they are approaching mature age. They have informed me that the Canberra Community Hospital recently introduced a scheme for training women over the age of 40 years in this field. Will the Premier confer with the Minister of Health to see whether there is any merit in introducing such a scheme in South Australia to overcome the shortage of nurses, particularly in the geriatric field?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

HOUSING TRUST STANDARDS

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about a reduction in the specifications required in the construction of some Housing Trust rental-purchase houses?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There has been no reduction in the specifications of rental houses.

Mr. Hall: What about rental-purchase houses?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader listens to my reply he will find that the specifications to which he has referred are for rental houses and not for rental-purchase houses. The Leader has quoted from an addendum to a specification which the trust is currently using for a tender for houses at Christies Beach. The basic specification is certainly one that has been used for rental-purchase houses, but the houses concerned are not for rental-purchase but for rental. The confusion arises because it is the trust's policy to have as small a number as possible of basic specifications and to make any variations with addenda. Since the Leader has raised the subject, it might be as well to state why the trust has made the variations listed, none of which is structural in nature.

The trust realizes that its basic task, and its most difficult one, is to provide a rental house within the capacity of the workman who is not receiving substantial margin for skill. Before Chrysler (Australia) Limited commenced the erection of its plant at Christies Beach, it was kind enough to supply to the trust a complete break-down of the labour

force which it would need, both as to numbers and as to likely wage categories. Since the plant will employ quite a number of semi-skilled workers, there will be a number of families requiring ordinary rental accommodation the cost of which is within the earning capacity of such people. Traditionally this type of accommodation has been supplied by the trust by the erection of double-unit houses the rent of which has been kept as close as possible to one-fifth of the wage of a semi-skilled operative. When the trust received the information regarding labour requirements of Chrysler's it faced the decision whether it should build normal double-unit houses at Christies Beach or endeavour to supply a single-unit house to the same basic specification as a double-unit house in an endeavour to keep the rent reasonably within the capacity of the men concerned. The trust decided that it was in the interest of the district to continue to build single-unit houses but to use the basic double-unit specification as far as certain fittings were concerned; in order to effect this, an addendum to the single-unit specification was prepared and it is obviously a copy of this which has been handed to the Leader. Any housing authority would always like to build houses with as many conveniences and fine features as possible, but it is not in the interest either of the wage earner or the community to erect houses which are beyond the financial capacity of those whom it is hoped to house.

Regarding fittings for rental accommodation, the fittings that are to be supplied in single-unit rental houses are the same as those that are supplied in the double-unit rental houses, so there is no decline whatever in the standards provided by the Housing Trust for rental houses. The only difference is that we are supplying single-unit instead of double-unit houses; that is not a decline in standards, but is basically an improvement. Although it is contrary to the Standing Orders for me to display photographs, if the House is concerned I have photographs of these houses. I should have thought that any investigation at all of this matter would show that they were certainly not substandard houses but houses of which the Housing Trust and this State could be proud.

PASTURE PESTS

Mr. RODDA: The Minister of Agriculture would be aware that South-Eastern pastures have been ravaged by certain pasture pests, particularly the *oncopera* and the curl

grub. At the weekend I noticed at Struan Farm School, which is under the control of the Social Welfare Department, that pastures were being ravaged in a considerable area by a green caterpillar. The Superintendent (Mr. Giles) sent specimens of this caterpillar to officers of the Agriculture Department at Naracoorte but, because the specimens had become dehydrated, the officers could not diagnose them. I also noticed on Monday, when going through my district, that other considerable areas of pasture were obviously ravaged by this type of caterpillar. In view of this, can the Minister of Agriculture make a statement regarding this new type of pest?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will obtain a detailed reply for the honourable member and let him have it as soon as it is ready.

EGGS

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In view of the great opposition that has been expressed publicly, particularly by the consumer, to the new containers for eggs proposed by the Egg Board, will the Minister of Agriculture inform the board that it is not the Government's policy that the extra expenditure for such cartons should be imposed on the consumer?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Regarding the pre-packing of eggs sold direct to consumers by producer-selling agents of the Egg Board, this doubtless is one of the anomalies which have arisen as a result of the introduction of the non-returnable cartons. At present the board's policy is that all graded eggs shall be pre-packed. However, this matter will receive the full board's consideration at its next meeting on September 7, 1967. I do not intend to give the board directions such as the honourable member suggests. The board is a producer-elected board and has other nominated members: one is nominated by the Government, one by the agents and one by the retailers. This gives the grower-producer the main voting power on the board. As a result, the board is autonomous. I have had several discussions with the board members on this matter, and they know my views. However, it has been pointed out that these provisions have applied in every other State in the Commonwealth for some time. As previous answers to questions have shown, there is a need for this type of packaging, and I consider that opportunity should be given for experience before any such direction is given to the board.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister say how much the consumer is expected to pay for the carton when the new packages are used?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As I gave that information in reply to a question by the member for Mitcham last week, the honourable member should be able to find it in *Hansard*.

SHEARING

Mr. McKEE: I recently asked the Premier a question regarding an organization known as the Tally-Hi Shearing School. Has he any further comment to make regarding that organization?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: From the investigations made by my officers, it is apparent that some people in South Australia have been taken in by this organization. As a result of the approaches that have been made, my officers are satisfied that there is no means by which this school could teach shearing in the way it claims. Unfortunately, it is now receiving money from unskilled people in South Australia who have seen this as an avenue of employment. Although no breach of the law has been committed, the suggestion that it is possible to learn shearing in three easy lessons is a claim that anyone who knows anything about shearing would realize was completely absurd. Unfortunately, the people who are taken in by this advertisement are those who know nothing about shearing. I hope that publicity can be given to this matter or that newspapers might do as they have done regarding some other organizations they have found to be unsatisfactory and refuse to accept advertisements from them, because some people are being harmed by being taken in by the advertisement.

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A member of the legal profession has drawn to my attention a matter that arises under the Housing Improvement Act. Although I have not checked the Act, I understand that, pursuant to its provisions, the onus is on an owner to disclose to an intending purchaser that an order has been made under the Act. Of course, no note appears on the title of any such order or any other encumbrance at present. It has been suggested to me that in some cases this causes hardship to an innocent purchaser who cannot be aware, and may not be informed, that an order has been made. It has also been suggested that, even though it would be a separ-

ture from the general rule that there should be no notification on the title of such a matter, the Act should be amended to cover such circumstances and to allow of a notification on the certificate of title. Can the Attorney-General say whether he has considered the matter and, if he has, whether he has made a decision? If he has not considered it, will he do so?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer to the first question is "No"; the second question does not arise; and the answer to the third question is "Yes".

BUILDING ACT

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Local Government whether the Government intends to introduce an amendment to the Building Act, 1923-1965, particularly in regard to section 56, which deals with neglected structures?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

TOYS

Mr. McKEE: Recently I asked a question somewhat similar to this about another company. I noticed that a company known as Regal Toy Wholesalers, of Brisbane, was canvassing people in this State to have them manufacture toys in their homes. Will the Attorney-General say whether he is aware of the activities of this company?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, this is one of many companies centred in Brisbane that are working a racket by trying to get people to do work at home. The arrangements, of which particulars are being sent through the post apparently to addresses taken from the telephone directory, are such that anyone would be extremely ill advised to enter into them. The money paid over does not in due course produce the desired return. I have taken up with the Attorney-General in Queensland the matter of trying to provide some protection against the activities of these people. It is extremely difficult to control such activities conducted in another State but the matter is currently before the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General for consideration of whether we, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government, can devise some way of preventing these undesirable activities being carried on. In the meantime, I can only urge that anyone receiving a suggestion from Regal Toy Wholesalers about entering into a contract to provide them with work by starting out to purchase certain equipment from that firm

would be well advised to have nothing to do with the material sent to them.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. CLARK: Recently a gentleman who has been a particularly conscientious and able justice of the peace for many years told me that he was somewhat perturbed that documents requiring the signature of a justice of the peace and also requiring that the justice certify that the person was well known to him were being brought to him. Many people bringing such documents have migrated from other countries, such as Europe, and are completely unknown to the justice. However, if the justice does not sign the forms these people experience grave hardship. Reliable justices of many years' standing do not like to sign such forms when they do not really know the persons concerned as well as is required: yet they do not like not to sign, because hardship is caused to the persons concerned. Can the Premier say whether there is some way of obviating this difficulty?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: To the best of my recollection, the form prescribed by the South Australian Statutes containing such a requirement is the short-form proof regarding land titles.

Mr. Clark: That is the case.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In that case, where the parties are not known to the justice, the long-form proof should be used. That proof is also endorsed on a document and means that the document can be duly executed by people who make the necessary declaration and that the person concerned can be satisfied that there is due execution.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Signing it freely and voluntarily?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. Certain other forms, particularly Commonwealth departmental forms, require knowledge of the kind mentioned by the honourable member and in those cases the long-form proof cannot be used. In these circumstances, I should think that a justice would need to make due inquiry of the people who came to him and also of others who knew the people concerned so that he could satisfy himself that the people signing were, in fact, the people they claimed to be. It is not right to expect a justice to take at face value people he does not know. I appreciate the difficulty, but I do not see any way out in the case of these Commonwealth forms.

NAIRNE PYRITES

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Premier a reply to my question about the calling-up of money advanced to Nairne Pyrites Proprietary Limited?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The arrangement with Nairne Pyrites Proprietary Limited was fully reviewed in the House during October last year in answers to questions given by my predecessor (Hon. Frank Walsh). The Government did not call up the loan, for in fact it did not make it. It was made by the Savings Bank of South Australia under Government guarantee. The original loan was advanced by instalments as capital works proceeded and reached the guaranteed figure of \$2,000,000 by September 1, 1955. Of this \$1,600,000 was repayable by instalments over the 20 years to August 31, 1975, when the remaining \$400,000 also becomes due.

At August 31, 1966, the outstanding amount was \$1,151,760. The company had met all instalments of repayments as they became due, but had made no voluntary repayments. At that date the company had considerable investments outside its ordinary business, and the extent of these investments was far in excess of the expected requirements for the business. These investments were earning interest considerably in excess of the interest rates payable to the bank, and the company was required to pay no commission upon the guarantee. At the same time the Savings Bank was experiencing considerable difficulty keeping up with the demand for house finance, particularly in the face of a reduced volume of new deposits. Accordingly, it appeared reasonable to the Hon. Frank Walsh, as Treasurer, that he should request the company to repay such of the loan as might be practicable without prejudicing its future operations and finances.

The company agreed quite voluntarily to repay \$750,000 of the guaranteed loan and the dates of repayment were arranged as best suited the company's convenience as its investments could be realized or matured. The repayments were \$550,000 on October 31, 1966, \$100,000 on December 2, 1966, and \$100,000 on June 30, 1967. The outstanding balance is now \$401,760, which under present arrangements will not fall due until August 31, 1975. These arrangements have in no way embarrassed the company or prejudiced its productive operations and have made available for house finance through the Savings Bank an additional \$750,000 over the course of the past ten months.

HOSPITALS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Encouraged by the Premier's changed attitude, towards me, of co-operation when I asked a question a moment ago, I am emboldened to ask him whether he has replies to two questions about the possibility of a Department of Physical Medicine at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and about services at the Dental Hospital?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far from changing my co-operative attitude towards members of the House, the honourable member had co-operation from me by being notified yesterday that I had replies to these questions. However, in the course of my co-operation I shall give the replies to the honourable member. The honourable member asked whether provision will be made in the plans for rebuilding Royal Adelaide Hospital for a Department of Physical Medicine. The Acting Administrator of the Royal Adelaide Hospital has reported that provision has been made for this department in the rebuilding scheme.

Concerning orthodontic treatment in the Dental Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Administrator reports that it is not the policy of the Dental Department to "put off children who need orthodontic treatment". There is, however, a substantial demand for orthodontic treatment at the Dental Department and, unfortunately, a lack of trained staff to provide such treatment. No applicant for orthodontic treatment who is financially eligible to receive treatment in the Dental Department is refused the services of the Dental Department, but they must, of necessity, be placed on a waiting list. All such applicants for treatment are made aware of the inability of the Dental Department to provide immediate treatment.

The only way in which this treatment could be undertaken promptly would be by a substantial increase in specialist orthodontic staff, and the hospital is currently seeking such staff. Specialist orthodontists are in short supply throughout the world and, because of the opportunity for lucrative private practice, it is difficult for an institution to attract such staff. The hospital is currently negotiating for the services of a dentist with some experience in orthodontics from overseas, and it is hoped to obtain his services early in 1968. A position of orthodontist was recently created on the staff establishment of the Dental Department and efforts are being made to attract a qualified appointee to this position. The hospital is also endeavouring to have the salary rates of

certain dental mechanics up-graded in an endeavour to obtain the services of technical staff who are highly skilled in the technical aspects of orthodontia. If the hospital is successful in obtaining staff of the number and quality required, the facilities that will be available in the new Dental Department building can then be used to the extent that will enable the volume of orthodontic treatment to be substantially increased.

In regard to the particular patient referred to by the honourable member, he first attended the Dental Department on October 4, 1966, and was examined by the honorary orthodontist on April 11, 1967. His name has been placed on waiting lists for both restorative and orthodontic treatment. It is the policy to provide priority in orthodontic treatment, firstly to those patients who have the most severe malocclusions and secondly, to those who have been on the waiting list for the greatest length of time. If any preference in priority is given in this particular case, it could only be at the expense of patients in the two categories mentioned above.

WATER REQUIREMENTS

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I move:

That in the opinion of this House a qualified committee should be appointed by the Government to consider and report to this House on each of the following matters:

- (a) the additional quantity of reticulated water likely to be required annually for stock, domestic, industrial and public purposes in this State during the period up to and including the year 1985, and the areas and quantities in which the major increases may occur, and the sources from which these requirements may be supplied;
- (b) the additional quantity likely to be required for irrigation purposes from the Murray River within South Australia;

and that the committee should consider supply by conventional means, and in addition the beneficiation of saline and sea waters, reclamation of effluents, and what, if any, measures should be taken in the public interest, to conserve supplies of water.

Circumstances under which I speak to this motion are somewhat unusual, because the position in which we find ourselves calls for serious consideration and action in order to avoid a recurrence of similar circumstances. The problem of water supply in South Australia for essential purposes has been brought prominently before us recently. A shortage of water in metropolitan reservoirs has

occurred, and statements by the Minister suggests that, because of the lack of rainfall in catchment areas of the Adelaide Hills, water restrictions will almost certainly be imposed in the metropolitan area, at least, early in the forthcoming summer. The second circumstance relates to a matter, which has been considered at some length in the House and which has caused much concern outside the House: I refer to the cessation of work on the Chowilla dam. It is my purpose here not to make political criticism of the Government but to look fairly and squarely at the position in which we are now placed and try to avoid a recurrence of the present position. However, I must say that in respect of both matters the Government cannot escape some criticism.

In 1959, which was a year of extremely low rainfall, and in which climatic conditions and the rainfall pattern were much the same as they are this year (indeed, they were rather worse if anything because the drought was more widespread), the Playford Government was able to get through the summer without imposing water restrictions (at least no water restrictions were imposed in that year in the metropolitan area). That was because we recognized early the prevailing circumstances and commenced to pump water full-time through all the mains, particularly the Manum-Adelaide main, much sooner than the Government commenced pumping this year. Whatever may be the reasons for the Government's not commencing full-time pumping earlier this year, the fact remains that I believe full-time pumping should have commenced earlier than it did.

In spite of the breakdown of operations at Chowilla, I think it is apparent to any impartial observer that over the last two and a half years the project as a whole has lost momentum. The keenness with which the investigation and preliminary work were pursued in the three or four preceding years was not maintained. We ran into many problems which, I believe, a greater degree of initiative and drive could have prevented. If we had maintained our concentration on the project, I believe that we could by now have been well on the way to having the dam constructed. Indeed, during the 1965 election campaign, the Hon. Frank Walsh was reported in the press as saying that it was about time the Liberal Government gave up talking and got busy with building the Chowilla dam. Although problems have developed, I believe that the lapse of time that has occurred has been sufficient to incubate those problems and

to hatch them into realities. In addition, the passage of time has undoubtedly increased the costs of construction.

For some years we in South Australia have gone along feeling very happy with our water supplies. As I have said, we coped with bad conditions previously. We expected to have the dam on the Murray River constructed, and we believed that it would meet our future requirements and enable us to expand not only our irrigation activity along the river but also to draw off whatever supplies were required and to pump water to the metropolitan area in order to meet increasing demands here. However, I think we have realized in the last few months more than ever before that the development of South Australia depends on water supply: it depends on water supply to an extent far greater than it depends on any other element. We can experience financial difficulties, occasionally labour and manpower shortages, and fluctuations in the economy, but these are passing phases and tend to be overcome by remedial action as and when phases are recognized. But without an adequate water supply we are doomed to our present level of economy and our present levels of population and production (particularly in the primary and irrigation spheres), and we shall rapidly decline as a State unless we can find a way of overcoming the difficulty.

I believe that I have not overstated the problem. Having a little knowledge of the matters relating to water supply in this State, I have given much thought to what must be done. I believe that the steps proposed in the motion probably represent the minimum action that should be taken, having the long term in view. I am not suggesting for one moment that anything envisaged in the motion can be implemented in time to meet our immediate needs; of course, it cannot. The public has become interested in saving water, the Minister of Works has made requests, and various authorities have made suggestions. I was interested in one suggestion that people should put bricks in the cisterns of their toilets. I think it was in 1959 that I suggested to the then Engineer for Sewerage that South Australia should adopt as standard practice what was used largely in some other States, namely, the two-pint capacity cistern. At the time, I was informed by the officer concerned that this system was not applicable to South Australia because a certain degree of liquidity was essential in sewage so that it could be treated by the machinery at our treatment works; it

had to be sufficiently liquid to move through our sewerage mains at the gravitational gradients that were applied to their construction. Although I was not satisfied with that explanation, I felt that I had to accept it. What has been suggested now is another way of doing what I suggested then. I believe some thought should be given to this matter when considering future installation; that could be the basis of one of the minor recommendations of the committee that I suggest should be set up. I want all these matters explored with a view to the committee's making recommendations regarding them.

The purpose of this motion is to set up a qualified committee to investigate all possible aspects of water supply and to ascertain in just what directions, how, and at what speed we should move in these matters in order to provide for our future needs. The motion falls into two parts the first of which concerns reticulated water supplies. The member for Torrens will deal with the second part of the motion, which concerns the more technical aspects of irrigation and reclamation procedures. Anyone intending to question the need for a committee such as I propose could argue that there were already in existence certain bodies set up to inquire into and research water supplies: for example, the Water Research Foundation, the Water Resources Council and, in respect of the Murray River, the River Murray Commission. I have no criticism of any of these bodies or of the work they do. The Water Research Foundation is a semi-private organization which has done much research and the findings of which have been of considerable value.

The Water Resources Council (of which the Minister of Works, by virtue of his office, is a constituent member) was set up by the Commonwealth Government. The first Chairman (Senator Spooner) called all the State Ministers of Works (of whom I was one) together and we set up the council, the purpose of which was to explore water resources on a Commonwealth-wide basis and to allocate funds provided by the Commonwealth Government to assist the States in such work as stream gauging and underground water exploration. That council has done, and will continue to do, valuable work. However, South Australia will not be able to benefit as much as the other States from the work of the council because the other States have some flowing rivers the output of which is as yet unknown, whereas South Australia has no similar rivers.

Work in the underground exploration field in South Australia can be done under the aegis of the council. However, no organization or authority in South Australia, except the Engineering and Water Supply Department (in co-operation with the Mines Department with regard to underground supplies), can offer any real information to us on the question of our future water supplies. Considering other departmental activities, this problem is far too wide and deep for the officers of any one or two departments to cope with. As I develop the reasons for the need of the committee I propose, I think I can prove the position, as I have outlined it, to be true.

I have had a good, hard look at the areas from which our water supply comes. Our catchment areas are mainly comprised in the Onkaparinga, Torrens and Para Rivers, with one or two other minor catchments. We have a reservoir on the Eyre Peninsula and substantial supplies of water in the South-East that are at present unused (indeed, they have to be drained away to the sea). We have considerable sub-artesian water in several well-known basins, such as the Uley-Wanilla, Robinson and Polda Basins, and substantial areas of underground water supplies in the South-East, running from Pinnaroo along the border and extending across the South-East in the area north of Naracoorte. Practically all of these supplies, except for that in the South-East, have been fairly fully used.

Perhaps an additional reservoir may be established on the North Para River, although that would probably be at the risk of depleting the underground basin in the Two Wells area. Possibly another reservoir could be built on the Onkaparinga River; in many years the excess flow in that river would go a long way towards filling an additional reservoir. Beyond those two possible reservoirs and the possibility of bringing water north from the South-East, I see no promising area of future supply. That matter requires much further investigation, and it is the position, as can be seen on the surface. Against that, I will examine our likely needs. Being a country member, the first thing that occurs to me is the water requirement for settled areas outside the metropolitan area and main towns. I have a map which, under Standing Orders, I am not permitted to show in the Chamber, but I have used it to shade in areas which I know are at present settled or being developed and which do not have a reticulated water supply. I find that, in spite of the tremendous efforts

that have been made over past years to service all parts of the State, substantial areas are still unserved.

The history of water supply development in this State is an interesting one and, although I do not intend to canvass it at length, I will refer to one or two main principles that have guided our Governments in the past in respect to this matter. The history goes back to well before the turn of the century, and its pattern shows that we tried to satisfy the needs of the growing metropolitan area by building our first few small reservoirs in areas adjacent to Adelaide. For many years after that, requirements were met in this way: we built additional reservoirs and began to extend mains outward into the country to supply both stock requirements and water for domestic purposes.

The better higher-rainfall areas did not need water reticulation because their modest needs in those days were more than adequately satisfied by the rains that fell in their areas. It was not thought until recent years that the South-East of this State would require the attention of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. There were developments in the Mid North, and the needs of Port Pirie were satisfied. So the pattern went on: we obtained water in a catchment area adjacent to an area that needed a supply; a supply was therefore established and the area was served. The same sort of thing occurred on Eyre Peninsula in the early 1900's when the Tod River reservoir was built and one of the longest mains in Australia (from the Port Lincoln area to as far north as Thevenard—a distance of 284 miles) was built. This enabled a considerable area to be served from that trunk main.

About 12,000 miles of main of a major diameter have been laid in South Australia (I do not include in that figure any of the small service mains that run through township streets and suburban areas). In spite of our unique effort in laying that distance of major mains throughout the State, substantial areas are still not served. When I look at the developing areas, I realize the need for their having a reticulated water supply. I relate this to the problem immediately facing us in various areas on Eyre Peninsula: in the area west of Ceduna; in the area south-west of Poochera; in the Wanilla-Edillilie area; in part of the county of Jervois just north of Arno Bay; in a large area in the county of Buxton; and in the country immediately south of it behind Darke Peak. I have had no means of surveying these areas accurately, but I know

them well enough to be able to form a fairly reliable estimate of the area involved. About 5,300 square miles of country that is at present being farmed or developed as farm land has no reticulated water supply; this is a serious restraint on production. I do not have to tell the Minister the problem that the people in the District of Eyre are facing today in regard to a water supply in and around Kimba: he knows because he went over there, and the people treated him nicely. They were not tough on him.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Minister was not tough, either!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: He was not in a position to be tough. I am inclined to be a bit cross with him on this matter. This project has been before this House for some years, and the Government ought to get on with it. I make no apology for saying that, because nothing has prevented the Government from proceeding with the project. I make another comparison between this project and a problem tackled by a previous Administration. In 1959, we were faced with a water supply problem on Eyre Peninsula, when it was obvious that there was not enough water to meet the needs of stock that were served by the existing mains. I went to the then Treasurer (Sir Thomas Playford) and told him that, whichever way we worked out the sum, we would be 400,000,000 gallons of water short to satisfy the needs of stock in that area that summer. The Treasurer asked, "What do you propose to do about it?" I said, "We have two possibilities, one of which is harnessing the Poldia Basin." He asked, "How much will it cost?" and I replied, "\$1,000,000." He asked, "Have you got any money?" and I replied, "We have allocated some money for the re-laying of the Tod River trunk main, but that will have to wait in the circumstances. It is no use having a new main if we do not have water to put in it." The Treasurer said, "I will talk to the Under Treasurer to see if we can find a way to do the job." I said we would have to manage with the old main. Sir Thomas discussed with the Under Treasurer whether we had sufficient money to do the job and it was found that money could be made available. Specifications were prepared, the Public Works Committee considered the matter, and within four months of approval being given for the project to go ahead the Poldia Basin had been tapped, pumps installed, the main to Lock laid

and the water supplied. That saved our position in 1959. An additional storage tank was built at Lock to take the water from the Polda Basin.

I am not suggesting that that scheme was as big as the Lock to Kimba scheme, but it showed what a determined Administration could do if it applied itself to a project in time of an acute need. The main to Kimba should have been built by now and would have been but for the change of Government. However, this area is still without water. Anyone who drives around the peninsula will be impressed by the large area of extremely useful agricultural land that has been developed. There is another area of about 1,200 square miles not reticulated in the Upper North, while in the central area, in those parts around Upper Hummocks, Clare and Watervale, and in the other parts that I hope will be served by the Murray Bridge to Hahndorf main, another 300 or 400 square miles of country is not reticulated.

A large area of the South-East is destined to be served some day by the Tailem Bend to Keith scheme. In addition, in areas south of Meningie, in country previously regarded as hopeless but now carrying useful cattle and sheep population, increasing demand is being made on small pockets of sub-artesian water. A portion of the Murray Plains is also destined to be served, in part at any rate, by the new main from Swan Reach to Stockwell which is at present being constructed. A substantial area of lower Yorke Peninsula has come into useful production, particularly for barley growing and stock, but at present it has little prospect of getting a reticulated supply. The needs of areas in the District of Alexandra will require substantial additions to the trunk main from Middle River to Kingscote. This area includes the American River district, and some diversion of the principal main to serve that area will be involved.

The pattern of requirements has changed. There is also an increasing demand for water in areas that have a reticulated supply, such as in the South-East, the Adelaide Hills, and in other places where, although 20 years ago it was not contemplated that water would be required, there is now a need for water for townships and for stock purposes. This all adds to the total need. I have calculated that in South Australia about 9,800 square miles, or about 6,250,000 acres of arable agricultural and stock-carrying country, exclusive of metropolitan, town and pastoral areas, remains to be

served. That is a substantial area in anyone's language.

In addition, we have the requirements of townships and the metropolitan area, an interesting and challenging situation. Metropolitan reservoirs at present have a capacity of about 34,000,000,000 gallons and are proving inadequate for our needs in a year such as this. I am speaking from memory but I think I am correct in saying that in 1948 the average water consumption by each person for each day of the year was about 78 gallons. By 1960 the figure had increased by about 50 per cent to 115 gallons. Because our summer climate is hot, the average consumption by each person on a summer day increases to about 300 gallons. That requires us to have a system capable of meeting such peak demands. One may wonder how the average use of water by a person in the city of Adelaide on one day in summer could be 300 gallons. However, the figures are beyond contradiction.

Indeed, the people of Adelaide are not larger users of water than are people in country towns. In Port Lincoln about 8,000 people use 2,500,000 gallons a day, or about 300 gallons a head. When we relate the average of 110 gallons a person a day throughout the year to total requirements, we get a total annual use by each person of about 40,000 gallons, or a requirement in the metropolitan area of 40,000,000 gallons a year for every additional 1,000 persons. When the population of Adelaide reaches 1,000,000 we shall require an additional 14,000,000,000 gallons of water. Whence will we get that? This problem is common to all the expanding cities in the State, such as Whyalla, Port Lincoln, Mount Gambier and Naracoorte.

I was interested in the question asked by the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) about the establishment of additional bores at Naracoorte. I was the Minister when the Naracoorte scheme was commenced with three bores not more than 10 years ago. Since then another bore was needed, and now two or three more are required to supply the township. This problem may arise at Mount Gambier, and I know problems exist at Millicent. The member for Frome knows the problem in northern towns, particularly Hawker. In the past we have successfully adapted local supplies to local needs and, when that system was outgrown, water was carted for long distances: because it was a Government undertaking this could be done. The pattern that exists in other States (of councils controlling water supplies) does not fit in here.

A recent Government inquiry revealed that in present circumstances reticulation from the Murray River is required to irrigate 92,000 acres. However, the Government had favourably considered using an additional 12,000 acres for irrigation for which commitments have been entered into and licences granted. On the lower reaches of the river licences for a projected area of 13,000 acres were desired, but the Government could not consider granting them. According to the Government's own reports, the limit of diversion from the Murray River has already been reached, and there are outstanding applications for irrigation which cannot be granted. The proposed main from Murray Bridge to Hahndorf will have to be provided at the expense of other irrigation projects unless something is done. I have proposed investigations not only of problems that are likely to crop up in the future (say, in the 1970's) but also of those that are with us now, because, in the interests of the State's development, we cannot afford to ignore them.

I have not defined the composition of the committee referred to in my motion, except to say that its members should be qualified. However, I expect it would include a senior officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department; it would require the services of a geologist with a wide knowledge of the geology of the State, particularly with respect to water-bearing areas; it would require an officer of the Agriculture Department well versed in pasture and animal husbandry and it would need someone from the science faculty of the universities to consider the scientific and technical side of water reclamation. Perhaps it would not be fair to ask senior officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to serve on this committee, because they have much work to do now. However, several officers have recently retired from this department, all of whom would be capable of filling a position on this committee. Mr. Anderson, who was the Deputy Engineer-in-Chief; Mr. Campbell, who was Engineer for Water Supply; Mr. Murrell, who was Engineer for Sewerage; Mr. Hodgson, who was Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment, and Mr. J. R. Dridan, who now has a position with the Housing Trust: all these men have ample knowledge, and could take a leading part in the inquiry.

The inquiry must have depth, breadth, and length, and perhaps one or more members of the committee may have to travel overseas. I know of these problems and of the means we have used in the past to meet our water

supply requirements, and I am convinced that, whatever Government is in office in the next 10 years, one of its major problems will concern our water supply. Unless we devise means of meeting these requirements, South Australia will be restricted in its development. It is with these thoughts and beliefs that I move the motion.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I second the motion, the objects of which have been so ably outlined by the member for Flinders. His detailed argument deals with the first part of the motion, and I intend to deal specifically with the second part and with technical details. The motion should receive the support of the whole House and particularly that of the Minister of Works. It is timely now to be considering the motion, when we find that water restrictions in this State are probably imminent. We desire a special and qualified committee to be set up in order to investigate all aspects of future water supply in this State, its storage, reticulation, possible sources, use, and development in all possible spheres. We wish to consider the State's future needs, to ascertain how and when we can obtain supplies and how best to use them.

I believe that the Minister of Works and the senior officers of his department would be the first to welcome the setting up of such an expert committee; they would be happy to co-operate fully on such a committee; and, in fact, members of the committee would comprise departmental officers. It is, of course, a trite statement, but nonetheless true, that we must have water in order to live. Water, of course, is something that we too often take for granted; we assume that it is always with us, just as air is always with us. We assume that water is present in many parts of the State, both in quantity and quality. I refer here not to the arid parts of the State but to the reticulated areas, where we assume that water will come out of a tap when it is turned on. It is only when we are suddenly brought up short with the threat of restrictions that we realize that water is not always available and that its source is beyond our control.

Unless we can obtain further sources of water supply in this State, either in the way of naturally pumped water or by artificial means, this State will not be able to progress and develop as it must progress and develop, and as every member of the House wants it to progress and develop. What will be the position if we cannot find more water? Obviously, people will not come to live here as we wish

them to. Further, no large industrial undertaking will come to the State in future unless it can be assured of adequate, safe and reliable sources of water not only for its own factory processes but for servicing the domestic needs of its potential work force. It is imperative that we take steps now to safeguard our future water requirements. Not only must we have water for industrial expansion: we must also have water if our population increase, either naturally or through immigration, is to be absorbed. The natural increase of population alone will require more and more water.

Water is the basis on which all our future expansion and development must rest. Industrialists have spoken to me (as, no doubt, they have spoken to Government members) about the State's industrial expansion, and one of the things that sticks out as a possible hindrance to industries establishing here is the doubtful future water supply. Without an adequate future water supply, South Australia could stagnate. We all know that Australia has a disproportionately large share of the arid areas of the world; it is, of course, the driest of the Earth's land masses, and receives on average only two-thirds the rainfall that North America, Europe or Asia receives. In fact, the ratio of arid to non-arid land in Australia is about three to one. As we have seen, and as a result of this geographical phenomenon, the population is concentrated on the seaboard, more especially on the eastern seaboard, so that four-fifths of the continent has a population density of less than one person to each four square miles.

We find that these ratios when applied to South Australia are even worse; hardly anyone lives in at least one-third of this State. Ours is the driest State in the driest continent. There is only one major river running within South Australia, namely, the Murray River; our rainfall is meagre and unreliable (it is certainly not reliable in 1967). Fortunately, as South Australian Governments over the years have progressively pursued a vigorous policy of harnessing every available and likely source of water, we have today reservoirs and dams all over the place and pipelines criss-crossing the countryside. However, we are rapidly running out of natural water supplies. When the Kangaroo Creek reservoir is completed in a couple of years, we shall have an extra 6,000,000,000 gallons available for our use (that is, when the reservoir fills—and that may take a few years). After that time, however, no more major dam sites will be available in South Australia. There will be a few minor

sites, such as those to which the member for Flinders referred earlier; we can have a dam on the Onkaparinga River, and it may be possible to have one on the Para River.

We shall have to adopt stop-gap measures such as increasing the height of the Clarendon weir, but such measures will not add even one more gallon to the available supply of water; they will add only to the possibility of storing what we already have. When the Kangaroo Creek reservoir is constructed, with the exception of the minor dams, probably no more dam sites will be available, and we must therefore look for more water. It is planned to augment the through-put of the Mannum-Adelaide main by installing alternative pumps (that project having been reported on by the Public Works Committee). The Murray Bridge to Hahndorf pipeline, which is to be constructed from the Murray River to the Onkaparinga system near Hahndorf, will add, when it is completed and working to full capacity, about 110,000 acre feet to our available sources. But what will happen when these works have been completed?

The augmentation of the Mannum-Adelaide main cannot proceed at present because the Government cannot afford to shut down the pumps in order to undertake the necessary work. The Government is in a cleft stick. Where shall we obtain the extra water that we require? I am referring not only to the metropolitan area but also to the reticulated areas of the State that draw their water from the Murray River and from the reservoirs. I submit that we must now seriously consider alternative methods of securing water. To give members an indication of how serious is the position, I will quote from Parliamentary Paper No. 62, which is a report of the Public Works Committee on the Murray Bridge to Hahndorf main. Paragraph 4 contains the following evidence given to the committee by Mr. Collins, who is the Engineer for Water Supply and is directly responsible for the water supply of the State:

In 1948 when the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline project was referred to the committee the population of Adelaide was 338,000 and the average water consumption during 1947-48 was 70 gallons per day per head of population. The total consumption for that year was 10,000 million gallons. The average consumption per day per head in 1965-66 was 105 gallons and the consumption for the year was 27,700 million gallons for a population of 724,000.

The report continues:

In evidence given before the commission on the Kangaroo Creek dam it was stated that since

1961-62 the annual increase in demand in the metropolitan area had not been as high as expected. Undoubtedly one of the main reasons for this has been the cooler summers experienced since 1961-62, and the State could enter a cycle of hot summers at any time with a corresponding marked increase in consumption. Over the last 10 years the average rate of increase in consumption has been 1,000 million gallons per year. For the next 10 years it is considered that this figure would not be likely to be less than 1,500 million gallons per year, although it could be a little less in the earlier years of the decade. On this basis the estimated consumption for the next six years would be of the following order:

| | Million gallons |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 1967-68 | 29,250 |
| 1968-69 | 30,500 |
| 1969-70 | 31,750 |
| 1970-71 | 33,250 |
| 1971-72 | 34,750 |
| 1972-73 | 36,250 |

To these figures would have to be added evaporation losses amounting to not less than 3,000 million gallons per year. Several other reservoirs are feasible in the ranges adjacent to Adelaide and there is little doubt that these will ultimately be required. However, these reservoirs alone would not be capable of meeting the increase in demand and their construction must be considered as complementary only to the major proposal of a second pipeline from the Murray River.

Therefore, it can be seen that with the increase of consumption a head of population and with the increase in population, the consumption of water in the last 20 years has trebled. We depend vitally on the Murray River for our metropolitan water supply; we will depend more on the Murray in years to come when the second main from that river is built. If it were not for the Murray River, Whyalla would not be the place it is today, because that town depends greatly on the water supply from Morgan.

Also in the report of the Public Works Committee to which I have referred is an important statement by Mr. Beaney (Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department) dealing with the quantity of water that we can obtain from the Murray River and the future potential. He gives figures that are so important that they will probably form the basis of many future arguments about water supply. Incidentally, when they were given to the Public Works Committee it was probably the first time they had been released. The following information was submitted by Mr. Beaney (it is set out in paragraph 9 of the report) regarding the availability of water from the Murray River by way of allocation to South

Australia under the River Murray Waters Agreement:

The allocation to South Australia under the River Murray Waters Agreement is 1,254,000 acre ft. The usable component out of this supply has been variously assessed. The original agreement stated that 603,000 acre ft. should be available for use plus some unspecified amount for domestic and stock supply. This particularization was deleted in 1963. The agreement also can be taken to infer that 47,000 acre ft. per month is the base flow necessary to keep the river sweet, which would allow 690,000 acre ft. for diversion. Subject to research programmes now being undertaken the figure of between 600,000 and 700,000 acre ft. available is the best estimate that can be made. The maximum diversion capacity of the several pipelines is:

| | Acre feet per annum |
|---|---------------------|
| Morgan-Whyalla Main (original) | 12,000 |
| Morgan-Whyalla duplicated system (both mains) | 50,000 |
| Swan Reach-Stockwell Main | 18,000 |
| Mannum-Adelaide (augmented) | 65,000 |
| Tailem Bend-Keith Main | 5,000 |
| Murray Bridge-Onkaparinga Main | 110,000 |

Total pipeline capacity 248,000

At the present time licences for diversion of water for irrigation from the Murray River plus diversion in the uncontrolled parts of the river can take about 320,000 acre ft. per year. The above presents a rather critical situation, and one that is receiving very close study. On the other hand, there is believed to be rather more room for development than the actual summation of the various items may indicate.

Those figures show that there is a limit to the quantity we can take out of the Murray River. This brings me to the matter of the Chowilla dam, a project that we all agree is absolutely vital to the future of the State. Nearly everyone in South Australia had come to rely on the extra provision from Chowilla, and we received a major setback when we heard that work would not proceed at this time. As the matter was rather heatedly debated recently, I will not go into detail now. However, I point out that in South Australia we cannot afford to procrastinate any longer on this project. South Australia's whole future is to some extent bound up with the problem of getting the Chowilla dam project off the ground. Chowilla is important for irrigation and also for domestic, commercial and industrial use of water in the metropolitan area.

Irrigation from the Murray River is the basis of the citrus industry in this State. We have to be assured that we can get more water in the future, and not just hold what we

have. I know from experience that many companies and people want to expand on various parts of the Murray River. However, at present there is a restriction on the number of licences that can be granted to growers in that area because water is not available. This is a sad state of affairs. All members agree that further investigation has to be made to see if we can harness these resources, and so obtain more water for irrigation in that area. In this way, more licences can be granted, more people can work on the land there, and that part of the State will be able to produce more. In that connection, construction of the Chowilla dam must proceed. All members agree that we cannot procrastinate a moment longer.

Where else can we obtain water in the future? There is only one other way—desalination. It has been mentioned by other members, and I have said that perhaps we are not ready to go in for desalination, but I think the time has arrived for us to plan so that in a few years we can proceed with desalination, because sooner or later we will have to have it.

Mr. Casey: It is already here.

Mr. COUMBE: I will touch on that. As the member for Frome has mentioned before in this House, the Office of Saline Water in the United States has done much work on this. The United Kingdom is probably leading in this field: the Water Research Association, under the Ministry of Technology, has done a terrific amount of work in this regard. There are two useful publications on this subject in the Parliamentary Library: a British publication entitled *Desalination—Its Role in Water Supply*, and an Australian publication, issued by the Australian Water Resources Council (a committee of which Mr. Dridan was a member), entitled *The Hydrological Series No. 1*. This deals with a survey of desalination methods and their relevance to Australia.

Without going into the details of desalination, I should like to refer to the various processes. In distillation there is the single stage, the multi-stage and the multi-stage flash. There is the multiple effect method—a long tube vertical (L.T.V.). There is the vapour compression distillation method, the electro-dialysis method, the reverse osmosis (membrane) method, which today appears the most promising. This comprises passing the salt water up against the membrane, which retains the salt and lets the fresh water go through. This is being tried out in the North at present. There is also the vacuum freezing method the secondary refrigerant process, and the ion

exchange process. Solar distillation has been tried in many ways and for many years. In fact, I believe the Pharaohs used solar distillation methods in Egypt. There are also the hydrate process and the solvent extraction method.

Distillation or desalination has been going on in our midst for many years. Every ship of any size has a distillation plant aboard. The marine processes that have been developed for many years to supply passengers have been one reason why the United Kingdom is leading the world in many of its researches into desalting. The experience gained in ship-building has enabled that nation to get a good start. The methods used on board ships, however, are not suitable in many cases for use in communities, because those ships have available an abundance of waste power.

In Australia we have a number of small plants working. In Western Australia there is one at Northam as well as one on Rottnest Island, a holiday resort near Fremantle with no water supply of its own. In the pamphlet I referred to, both these plants are illustrated. In South Australia we have plants at Maralinga, and at the opal fields at Coober Pedy and at Andamooka, one using the membrane system (reverse osmosis) and the other the solar system. Cost is always a factor that holds up these schemes. It has been estimated that a distillation plant with a capacity of 50,000 gallons a day could produce desalted water for about \$4 a thousand gallons *ex plant*. On a larger plant which has a greater capacity the cost (excluding all reticulation and distribution costs) falls to between \$1 and \$2 a thousand gallons *ex plant*. The only way to get below that figure is to use a nuclear or mammoth type of plant, but I am talking about a useful and more practical type of plant. Therefore, the cost figure is out at present. As the cost of metropolitan water is 25c a thousand gallons, I believe that the reverse osmosis method with the membrane is the most promising. The improvements that have been made in the manufacture of various types of membrane are most hopeful indeed. Possibly the freezing method could be adopted, but at this stage the reverse osmosis method appears to be the most satisfactory.

Mr. Freebairn: To what extent can salinity be reduced by the reverse osmosis method?

Mr. COUMBE: To a large extent: to such an extent that the water is fit for human consumption. It also depends on what the water is needed for: if it is needed for stock one would only have to pass saline water through,

but for human consumption the salinity would have to be reduced considerably, thereby adding to the cost. It can be done and it is being done today. As anyone would realize, it is much easier to treat brackish or slightly saline water than to take it from the sea because one is always faced with the problem of what to do with the sodium chloride when it is taken from the water. We suggest that, without going into much detail, a full-scale investigation into these opportunities and methods should be conducted without delay. In reply to a recent question, the Minister said his department was looking into this question from time to time. We say that this is only one facet of the whole question of water supply in South Australia that should be looked at as part of the broad canvas. We will have to start desalting within the next decade or two whether we like it or not, so let us look at desalination now and be prepared.

Coupled with that question is the reclamation of effluents in South Australia, and I refer particularly to Bolivar effluent. This is spelt out as one of the things this committee should examine. When the Bolivar treatment works was approved by the Public Works Committee, the committee's report dealt particularly with the effluent to be discharged from the site, and it was recommended that a committee examine its possible use for agricultural and stock purposes. To my knowledge nothing except minor investigation has been done. The effluent is going out to sea. In a dry country such as Australia a valuable product is being wasted. Members who have been to certain parts of the United States know that effluent is treated and used for the purposes for which we use the water at Leigh Creek and Woomera. Many centres in the United States are forced to use this water because there is no other.

What I have said is emphasized by the restrictions being imposed on pumping from wells or bores in the Virginia, Two Wells and Salisbury area, as the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) knows. In those areas water is required principally for market gardening and agricultural purposes for vegetables needed on the Adelaide market. I agree that restrictions must be imposed, because otherwise no-one will get water. A constituent told me last week that his application for permission to put down a bore had been refused. The Mines Department has no alternative but to protect the small quantity of water available

for the people already established there and producing vegetables for the Adelaide market. Not only must quantity be maintained: quality must also be considered, and a drop in the water level affects quality. Several examples of that can be found, such as in the Uley-Wanilla and Poldas Basins.

The districts north of Adelaide to which I have referred are near the Bolivar outlet and the Public Works Committee expected that, when the plant was built, the effluent would be used for agricultural and stock purposes. We are saying that an expert committee ought to consider that matter because we cannot afford to let this water go out to sea. The member for Flinders and I have said that the time has arrived to set up a committee to investigate the whole matter of water supply in South Australia. We are threatened with restrictions now and, unless we have a guaranteed source of supply in future years, we shall not be able to expand or to attract people and industries. People will not come here if water is not available or if they think the future of the State will be limited to such an extent that people will leave.

The motion covers all the aspects that are sufficiently important to warrant investigation. We have set 1985 as a reasonable future time on which to work. We have provided for the investigation to deal with the quantity of water likely to be required for all purposes, the areas and quantities in which the major increases may occur, the sources of these requirements, the likely requirement for irrigation purposes from the Murray River, the beneficiation of saline and sea waters, and the reclamation of effluents. Although we have covered all the important points that we could think of, we have inserted a covering provision giving the committee power to investigate what, if any, measures should be taken in the public interest to conserve supplies of water.

The committee will be able to deal with anything affecting the future supply of water. The member for Flinders has suggested the membership of the committee, and we have gone further by suggesting that the committee report its finding to this House. Water supply will be a matter of importance for a long time and all members ought to be able to study and discuss the report. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 1 to 12 and did not insist on its suggested amendment No. 2.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments be insisted on.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Burdon, Dunstan, Hall, Hudson, and Millhouse.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to the conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 8.15 p.m. At 8.13 p.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sittings of the House being suspended. They returned at 9.51 p.m.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have to report that the managers have been to the conference on the State Government Insurance Commission Bill, which was managed on behalf of the Legislative Council by the Hon. S. C. Bevan (Minister of Local Government), the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, the Hon. G. J. Gillfillan, the Hon. C. D. Rowe, and the Hon. A. J. Shard (Chief Secretary), and they there delivered to the managers on behalf of the Legislative Council the Bill and the following resolution adopted by this House:

That the disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments be insisted on.

Thereupon the managers for the two Houses conferred together, but no agreement was reached. The managers of this House proposed to the managers of the Legislative Council that a reasonable compromise on this measure would be to leave out the right of the Government Insurance Commission to engage in life assurance, but that that would still leave a viable Government Insurance Office. The managers for the Legislative Council were not prepared to accept that compromise but proposed alternatively, as a compromise, that with the public the business of the insurance office be confined to motor vehicles and workmen's compensation insurance and that the insurance, other than life assurance, by Government officers and departments of any kind could be with the Government Insurance Commission, provided that, where a policy existed with an outside insurance office, that policy should continue for

three years. I pointed out to the managers that in fact the Government could now, without any Bill at all, cover all insurance for those officers and agencies with the Treasurer without let or hindrance, and that they were not proposing something that was more generous than before, but something that was less generous. However, I have to report that there was no agreement between the managers. I assume in consequence that a certain course will be followed in the Legislative Council. We have to wait until we see what occurs there, but the alternatives for the Legislative Council are to accept the measure as agreed so far between us or to lay it aside. The responsibility of laying aside the Bill is the Legislative Council's. I think the people of South Australia will, in due course, have something further to say about the matter.

GAS

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall:

(For wording of motion, see page 844.)

(Continued from August 16. Page 1546.)

Mr. CASEY (Frome): Last Wednesday, before another announcement was made, I had said that, if natural gas was not available to South Australia, nuclear power supply for this State would be considered. That source of power is uppermost in the minds of industrialists in the more highly industrialized countries today and we shall be able to take our cue from them in future. Nuclear power will soon be used throughout the world, and in conjunction with desalting plants.

The Leader's motion is amusing, and I agree with the suggestion of the member for Glenelg that the Leader should withdraw his motion because of what has now happened to benefit South Australia. Speculation should not have been indulged in about this project. At the time, no specific contracts were available on the western route at Port Augusta, Port Pirie, and Wallaroo, and it was feasible and economical to use the eastern route. The Electricity Trust, the major consumer, will benefit because of the saving in cost.

Many reports were published in country newspapers, particularly in the *Transcontinental* at Port Augusta, without any basis of truth. I understood that some sort of journalistic ethics governed what was published in these newspapers and that facts had to be true and substantiated. I was disgusted with some of the articles I read, because of the contents and the attitude expressed. People who publish this rubbish should realize that they have a

duty to the public to publish relevant facts that can be substantiated. The Liberal members of the Commonwealth Parliament have had some ridiculous ideas. I know that it is the duty of a member of Parliament to place his district foremost and to do everything he can for it, but it was suggested that the Port Augusta power station should be converted to burn natural gas. How ridiculous!

This power station was specifically built to use Leigh Creek coal: it would be costly to convert it to burn natural gas. If natural gas were to be used in the power station at Port Augusta a new station would have to be built, and it would cost as much to convert the present station to burn natural gas as it would to build a new station. The same number of people would not be employed in a gas-burning power station as would be employed in a fuel-burning station, and this would cause unemployment in Port Augusta. What would happen to the Leigh Creek coalfield? Obviously, it would have to close down, and another 400 men would be out of work. Apparently, these consequences do not mean anything to the Liberal Party; it wants gas to be used in a new power station at Port Augusta. I wonder how much the Electricity Trust would have available to spend on a new power station! Obviously, it would not be an economical proposition.

Mr. Hall: You have not found anything about this in my motion?

Mr. CASEY: That is what the Commonwealth member for Grey said at Port Augusta. In considering this gas pipeline, the Government did everything that the previous Government did prior to constructing water mains. I recall that it was once intended to supply a reticulated water scheme to Radium Hill by means of a spur line from Hanson that would run through Terowie, Peterborough and along the north-east track, but the Government of the day decided instead to obtain water from Umberumberka in New South Wales.

Mr. Quirke: Is that pipeline still in use?

Mr. CASEY: No.

Mr. Quirke: Is it still there?

Mr. CASEY: No. Strangely enough, when the pipeline from Umberumberka to Radium Hill was first mooted it was intended that the system would be a completely new one and that only new pipes and other materials would be used to ensure that the system would have a certain life. However, the Government in its wisdom saw some advantage to be gained by using secondhand pipes which, in fact, were used. As a result, when Radium Hill

was closed down it was found that the pipes, particularly those that had been laid at Cockburn over the alkaline type of soil there, had rusted and were completely useless. They were removed and sold for scrap. It was eventually proved that the cost of obtaining water from Umberumberka (which, incidentally, was high) was no less than the cost that would have been involved in bringing a pipeline from Hanson. Had the Hanson pipeline been implemented, the people in areas between Hanson and Radium Hill would today have been receiving a reticulated water supply.

Mr. Quirke: Peterborough got water the other way.

Mr. CASEY: Unfortunately, it did not receive a sufficiently large supply; it had only an 8in. pipeline instead of a 12in. pipeline, supplying a shandy instead of a better type of water. Nobody will be left out on a limb when the gas pipeline is completed. If the member for Wallaroo requires gas in his district, bearing in mind that a certain industry has decided to establish there, gas will, in fact, be supplied to Wallaroo. Indeed, the Premier has already said that.

Mr. Rodda: Will it be supplied simultaneously?

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member knows that when he employs shearers the sheep are in the shed on the agreed day, and that also applies to gas. The Leader was given all the information on this matter.

Mr. Hall: That's not so.

Mr. CASEY: It is. Indeed, I think it was the Minister of Education who pointed out that all relevant information had been given by the former Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh). Members opposite expect to have everything served up to them on a plate, without having to do any fossicking for themselves. I have been surprised at the many questions asked by members opposite, the answers to which could have been ascertained simply by writing a letter to the department concerned. We on this side are prepared to do that, but members opposite, if they have any initiative, do not use it. I suggest that the Leader should bow out now before he really has his head chopped off. I oppose the motion.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): It gives me much pleasure this afternoon to oppose the motion. I do not know that I would have taken the trouble to speak on this motion had it not been for the fact that the name "Wallaroo" appears in it.

Mr. Rodda: Is it a worthy name?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, it is far more worthy than the motion moved by the Leader. The Leader would have members of this House and the public generally believe that his heart is bleeding for the people in the Spencer Gulf ports. However, I remind the Leader that he belongs to a Party that took little interest indeed in a Spencer Gulf port for over 30 years. The Leader would have his work cut out to find in *Hansard* any reference to the former Liberal Premier's advocating any industrialization for Wallaroo, which is in the district I represent. Not only did the Leader's Party do little to try to have industries established in Wallaroo, but it paid for certain industries to be removed.

Mr. Rodda: Is that right? They are strong words.

Mr. HUGHES: It is true. I brought forward this matter on the opening day of Parliament in 1961, because the then Premier had undertaken that a certain industry at Wallaroo would not be affected if part of it was shifted to Elizabeth. To add insult to injury, on the day that the Industries Development Special Committee (which had been appointed to take evidence in country areas regarding the decentralization of industry) came to take evidence at Wallaroo, I received a letter stating that within the next fortnight the industry concerned was to be closed. This happened despite the undertaking given to the House by the Premier at that time that it would not happen. I told the committee about this and it was not happy at the news. For the benefit of those who have not long been members of the House (such as the member for Victoria), I will read the following question that I asked on May 12, 1960, in relation to this matter:

In view of strong rumours circulating among prominent businessmen in the Wallaroo district that the Wallaroo Clothing Company will cease to operate in that town towards the end of the year, and because of a letter which I understand has been received by all employees attached to the factory at Wallaroo asking whether they would be prepared to transfer to Elizabeth, will the Premier say whether an undertaking has been given to the Government by the company referred to that the establishment of the factory at Elizabeth will not affect the continued operation of its Wallaroo factory?

The following reply was given by the then Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford):

Representatives of the company interviewed me some time ago with a view to establishing a factory at Elizabeth. I informed them that the Government was not interested in moving an already established company in the country to another location, but said that it would give

further assistance to enable the company to extend its activities at Wallaroo. The company said that a number of things prevented its undertaking such an expansion and asked, as an alternative, that it be allowed to establish a portion of its business at Elizabeth, provided it maintained the present business at Wallaroo, and that matter went before the Industries Development Committee. I have not spoken to the chairman of the committee but I have no doubt that the same assurance was given to it. I know the committee would be most anxious for that to be the case. I have no hesitation in saying that the Government would assist in establishing the industry at Elizabeth only on the distinct understanding that it was not in any way at the expense of the Wallaroo factory.

That is the assurance that was given to me, as a member of the Opposition, and it is the assurance that I took back to the people of Wallaroo. The people in my district do not have short memories and they remember what happened on that occasion; that is one of the reasons I continue to represent them in this House. They could not trust the word of the then Premier.

Mr. Quirke: What has this got to do with the motion?

Mr. HUGHES: Apparently the honourable member was not in the Chamber when I commenced my remarks. The point is that the Leader of the Opposition, for political reasons, is taking a great interest in Wallaroo as are, for the first time, some other members opposite. If they are so interested in Wallaroo now, why did they not show more interest when they were in Government?

Mr. Quirke: You're not getting windy, are you?

Mr. HUGHES: No, make no mistake about that. I am putting these facts before the House to show that members opposite who are interested in Wallaroo now did not show much interest previously.

Mr. Jennings: This will be to your benefit.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, it will remind people in Wallaroo that they could not trust the previous Government. In moving his motion, the Leader said that costs of an alternative route for the pipeline had not been investigated. He also said that members representing districts along Spencer Gulf had not done their homework. However, if he had done his homework as well as had the members to whom he referred and if he had done as much to get this pipeline established instead of trying to hinder it (as he has been doing), the project would be much further advanced today. In addition, the Leader would be held in higher regard by the people. In my district

he is being ridiculed because of his statement that the Government had turned its back on industries in regard to the supply of natural gas.

Mr. McAnaney: Is industry expanding anywhere?

Mr. HUGHES: Apparently the member for Stirling has not seen this afternoon's *News*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members know that interjections are out of order at any time, but they are doubly out of order when members making them are not in their places in the House.

Mr. HUGHES: The Leader of the Opposition made an insinuation by way of interjection when the member for Gumeracha was trying to cover up for him. I think that happened on the day the Leader moved his motion. Up to the present the Leader has been nothing but a hindrance in regard to the gas pipeline. He made one statement that caused me and the people I represent much concern, because we are hoping to have a nitrogenous fertilizer plant established at Wallaroo. That plant could function, it is hoped, by using natural gas.

The Leader may be interested to know that members representing districts that include the Spencer Gulf ports went to much trouble, at their own expense, to obtain expert advice about the pipeline routes from Gidgealpa. That shows that the Leader was definitely wrong in saying that we were not doing anything about the matter. He said, as reported in *Hansard*, that I was not doing anything in connection with it, and I take it that he also meant that other members representing Spencer Gulf ports were not doing anything.

Mr. Clark: Perhaps he was talking about members of another place who represent that district.

Mr. HUGHES: Perhaps he was, but I think he meant me. We are grateful to the Bechtel Pacific Corporation for the information that was given to us privately. Also, we are extremely grateful for the assistance given by the Mines Department.

Mr. Millhouse: It's a pity—

Mr. HUGHES: We have gone out of our way to obtain this assistance and, if the member for Mitcham spent more time in the House instead of being absent, he would know what had happened.

Mr. Millhouse: It's a pity you went to all this trouble.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order! The member for Wallaroo has the floor.

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Mitcham does not know what has been going on in this debate. We obtained this information at our own expense, and went to the Mines Department many times seeking information. If Opposition members had done the same they would have received much information, but apparently they did not do this. All they have done is criticize the Government for trying to use natural gas in South Australia. There was no need to move this motion. Obviously, most people in the State realized that the Government had the investigations of the eastern and western routes well in hand many months ago. You, Mr. Speaker, representing a Spencer Gulf port, would know that I possess much detail showing that a proper survey was made by the Government. Opposition members had emphatically denied that this information was available to the House.

Attempts have been made by Opposition members to discredit the Government in its endeavour to bring a pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide. One member of the Liberal and Country League was reported, when speaking at a meeting in the South-East, as saying that the Government was considering buying gas from Victoria's offshore wells. It was never intended, however, that this Government should buy gas from Victoria. The Premier's reply to the Leader's motion has convinced everyone (with the exception of a few people who don't want to know)—

Mr. Hudson: A prejudiced minority.

Mr. HUGHES: —that every avenue has been explored to provide gas for those who require it, keeping in mind that, unless this gas can be brought to Adelaide at the cheapest possible rate, the piping of natural gas from Gidgealpa would never commence.

However, because of the preparatory work performed by the former Premier (the Hon. Frank Walsh), and carried on by the present Premier, worthwhile contracts have been or are being signed, without which the natural gas project in this State would never have got off the ground. The Leader is well aware of what this Government has done in an endeavour to have natural gas from Gidgealpa used in this State. The discussions and negotiations that have taken place are required for such a large venture, and yet the Leader has done, and said, several things that have made interested parties in this natural gas venture wary and, by so doing, he has delayed the supply of this valuable fuel to industry and domestic users in this State.

The longer the delay in bringing natural gas to Adelaide the longer the delay will be in

having a spur line into Wallaroo. The member for Yorke Peninsula asked the Minister of Agriculture a question last week concerning nitrogenous fertilizer and how it could be used economically in the agricultural districts near Wallaroo. It was a good question and showed that the honourable member was interested as a representative of a primary-producing area. I do not know what the Minister's reply will be but, for the information of the member for Yorke Peninsula who showed an intelligent interest in this matter, I inform him that following my discussions with Mr. Bridges we can safely leave the marketing of this product to his company.

Mr. Ferguson: Locally or for export?

Mr. HUGHES: Both. I cannot tell the House the full context of my conversation with Mr. Bridges, but the marketing of this product can be left in the hands of his company. In last week's *South Australian Farmer* appears an article that adds strength to the question of the member for Yorke Peninsula, and strengthens my argument concerning the nitrogenous fertilizer company. The article states:

Increased yields of pasture for hay or silage could be obtained this season in the higher rainfall districts by applying nitrogenous fertilizer to pastures after paddocks had been closed to stock, Central District Agricultural Adviser (Mr. F. C. Gross) said when commenting today on the need to replenish stock feed reserves.

Every member who represents a country district is aware of the need to replenish reserves of stock feed for next year, if it is at all possible. The article continues:

More especially on dairy farms where roughage and hay were exceedingly important, late winter or early spring application of nitrogen was not normally recommended, but the lateness of the season and the possible shortage and high price of conserved fodder next year had made it necessary to digress from normal recommendations. Irrigated pastures composed of 50 per cent or more of perennial grasses or dry land pastures of perennial ryegrass, phalaris or cocksfoot with little clover, could definitely benefit from nitrogenous fertilizers.

Oat or barley crops grown for grazing or hay which appeared light in colour, indicating nitrogen deficiency, could also benefit from added nitrogen. Sulphate of ammonia or calcium ammonium nitrate at 1½cwt. an acre was recommended for irrigated pastures but only 1cwt. of these fertilizers or ½cwt. of urea an acre was suggested for dry land pastures. Full response to nitrogenous fertilizer could only be obtained if sufficient soil moisture were available, Mr. Gross said. Ideal time for nitrogen application for dry land pasture was before the end of August and, for irrigated pasture, early September would be suitable.

Mr. Ferguson: It wouldn't be much use to you like this, would it?

Mr. HUGHES: Perhaps not in my district although it may be in the higher rainfall district of, say, the member for Victoria. It is advocated that this be undertaken in drier areas in the hope that later rains will be received and, if it means that fodder will be obtained, I hope it will be undertaken. I recall the President of the Northern Yorke Peninsula Branch of the United Farmers and Graziers Association advocating the use of nitrogenous fertilizer. At the time, he was speaking in support of the nitrogenous fertilizer works at Wallaroo and, as a practical farmer himself, he must believe that the land he farms in the area is suitable. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the amendment made by the House of Assembly to the Legislative Council's suggested amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SAN JOSE SCALE

Adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Sir Thomas Playford:

(For wording of motion, see page 684.)

(Continued from July 26. Page 850.)

The Hon Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I seek leave further to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

LAND TAX AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 29. Page 1675.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill, which is now on the file, was introduced only yesterday. As I understand the urgency that prompts this matter being brought before the House and being proceeded with fairly swiftly, I will not in any way attempt to prolong the debate, because I believe the Bill provides for something that

is desired by all members of the House. Its provisions should soon be able to take effect, with benefits resulting to areas suffering from lack of rain. South Australia is used to natural calamity in many forms. At times we see fires and periodically we experience recurring droughts that bring hardship in their wake. Certain areas in South Australia have experienced a succession of bad years that has resulted in a particularly difficult period for agriculturalists in those areas. At a time of increasing production costs, this has resulted in a reduction in returns in some areas, and these factors combined have had a disastrous result on farmers in the areas concerned.

I have pleasure in supporting the Bill which is aimed to give relief in such cases. I am pleased to see that we are to have something of a permanent nature on the Statute Book through which relief can be provided in these circumstances. An urgency motion was moved this session to the effect that something should be done to assist farmers in drought-affected areas. All members supported another motion to approach the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance to South Australia, which showed that members were aware of the problem. Following a suggestion in the House by the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott), the Government saw fit to appoint a committee to examine the problem. From the reports we have received, the committee has been successful in gathering facts; no doubt, it has assisted the Government to present a case to the Commonwealth. The committee will continue to be of use in the future, especially regarding the administration of this legislation.

I remember saying during the debate on the urgency motion that, in other States, Commonwealth assistance had followed assistance given by the States concerned. The Governments of Queensland and New South Wales assisted farmers from State resources and were later recompensed by the Commonwealth Government. During the debate on the urgency motion, I urged that the Government should look carefully at the avenues of assistance open to it; I referred to local government, freight rebates, fodder assistance and so on. I am pleased to see that the Government has seen the wisdom of what I said and has realized that, if we are to interest the Commonwealth in this drought situation, we must make a determined effort to show the way.

The provisions of the Bill are backed by two funds that are already established. I have not had time during this busy session

to study properly the source of these funds and to examine in detail from where they emanate. However, obviously the money to be made available under the Bill will be from funds that already exist and will not be a new expenditure. I do not know whether the fact that this money has not come from Loan or Budget expenditure will affect the attitude of the Commonwealth Government; I hope it will not. I expect that the Commonwealth Government will eventually see fit to reimburse the State in this regard.

The Act is to be backed by accumulated funds and I assume that they are funds that have been held in trust in the Treasury. I am pleased to see that they are available despite the deprecations the Government has made on the State's trust funds. Although about \$500,000 is available to be used for drought assistance, there will be some difficulties in administering applications, and probably not all of them will be successful. A standard will have to be imposed because of the resources available, and some applications may not be met at all. If the money is properly allocated many people will benefit, and they will be able to continue in the industry and overcome a run of bad seasons. We expect that next year should be an average season in the present drought-affected areas.

I am pleased that the Government has taken the initiative, and I am sure that this action will attract Commonwealth funds that the State is seeking to assist drought relief. Applications for assistance will be received from the drought-affected areas, but applications will also be received from other areas. I have not had much time to study the Bill, but I do not criticize the Government, because I realize how urgent it is. I am pleased to co-operate with the Government, but in Committee I shall comment on several clauses after studying the Bill in detail. With these provisos I support the Bill and urge that it be speedily considered by the House.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): Nothing gives me greater pleasure than to support this Bill, introduced by the Minister of Lands, who has been assisted by the Minister of Agriculture. For many years Government members, when in Opposition, advocated that this type of legislation should be introduced to assist the man on the land. I have said many times that there were people on the land in dire straits and who needed assistance, but my pleas fell on deaf ears. It was not until the Labor Party assumed Government—

Members interjecting:

Mr. CASEY: Apparently, Opposition members are telling me to keep politics out of this. The Leader was pleased that the money to be used was available in trust funds but, at the same time, he insinuated that the Government had been using trust funds to the detriment of this State.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CASEY: Opposition members speak about politics in this matter. When I was in Opposition I moved several times that assistance be given to certain people on the land. When we came into Government we were not afraid to visit certain areas of this State to ascertain how badly some primary producers needed assistance, and we immediately gave them help.

Mr. McAnaney: How much?

Mr. CASEY: The member for Stirling is a great man behind the man on the land!

Mr. McAnaney: You didn't give them much help.

Mr. CASEY: Opposition members have always said that the Labor Party was not interested in the man on the land. That is nonsense. As a Government, we showed the people that we meant business. Opposition members have always said that, first and foremost, they acted on behalf of the primary producer and I give them full marks for that. However, they do not give this Government any marks for doing something that was warranted by the present situation.

Mr. Quirke: When we co-operate you stand up and attempt to break it down.

Mr. CASEY: I give credit where credit is due.

Mr. Quirke: Then for God's sake do it.

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order, and I ask the member for Frome to address the Chair.

Mr. CASEY: I am pleased to support the Bill, because Government members have always been accused by the Opposition of not caring one iota about the man on the land. We have proved conclusively that we have always favoured supporting anyone in need.

Mr. Lawn: No discrimination.

Mr. CASEY: None whatever. When anyone is in need we will help him, and this Bill clearly sets out that principle. For the first time I agreed with the Leader when he said that we did not wait until we had received money from the Commonwealth Government but had acted on our initiative to give help where it was needed. No member would begrudge help to farmers at this time. This State is having one of its most unusual years:

it is a patchy season with certain sections of the State experiencing a good year. Parts of the West Coast are more fortunate than other parts of the State, except for some areas of the South-East. Nevertheless, parts of the South-East have experienced an abnormally dry period, although I, speaking from a northerner's point of view, consider that the South-East would not really know what a dry season was.

The member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) is vitally concerned about parts of his district in which most of the cereal-growing farmers are experiencing one of the driest seasons ever. A dry period tends to strike particularly hard at cereal growing, because holdings are small and the farmers have not a secondary income to enable them to meet their everyday commitments. In past years farmers kept a few cows and a few fowls, but that is not done now. I have pleasure in wholeheartedly supporting the Bill.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): I have been a member of this House for a long period and in 1933 Parliament considered a measure similar to this. The debates of that time remind one not only of the disasters suffered by farmers because of drought but also of the disastrous effect of drought on State finances. The three years from 1927 were disastrous and many farmers were driven to the wall, with terrific effect on the State. When the good seasons returned in 1930, the farmers got into difficulty because they had good crops but poor prices. They were receiving the equivalent of 10c or 12c a bushel for crops of 10 bags to the acre.

Because the farmers suffered as a result of low prices in the depression period and because they also suffered because of the drought, this Parliament dealt with a most outstanding measure known as the debt adjustment legislation. However, those circumstances are not likely to arise again. The energy and dynamic force of the wheatgrowers' organizations throughout Australia were instrumental in having passed in the Commonwealth and all State Parliaments the wheat stabilization legislation that gave growers a guaranteed price.

If we get through this drought and are given a good year next year in which farmers can produce a large quantity of wheat, the wheat price will enable farmers to repay any loans made under this measure much more quickly than farmers were able to repay loans made under the 1933 legislation. This Bill is commendable first because the legislation is of a

permanent nature. I applaud that. To proclaim certain areas of the State as drought-affected areas is difficult. The whole State has not suffered from lack of rainfall.

The West Coast has had fairly good rains during the season and prospects there are good, apart from the top end around Buckleboo and Cowell. The areas around Port Wakefield and Balaklava are not too rosy. The northern Murray Mallee has had hardly any rain at all during this period and, consequently, that part of the State has had three bad seasons. The farmers, who are wonderful people and great citizens, are down to their last 10c as a result of this, and something must be done urgently.

That prompted me to move on July 27, as a matter of urgency, that in the opinion of the House the Government should approach the Commonwealth for a grant of financial relief to help farmers suffering from this hardship. That motion received unanimous support. The Government then approached the Commonwealth Government, acquainting it of the motion. I do not know the contents of the letter but, apparently, the Commonwealth has had it for some time and the Premier has said in reply to questions that I have asked that there has been no immediate or urgent response by the Commonwealth. I am not unduly concerned about that at this stage, but it is about time the Commonwealth took action. New South Wales applied to the Commonwealth for financial relief in the 1965 drought but the Bill authorizing the expenditure was not passed by the Commonwealth Parliament until May, 1966.

This Bill provides for any financial assistance made available to be administered by the State authority. We must put all our weight behind representations to the Commonwealth to provide this grant-in-aid. I am disappointed that we have not had an earlier response from the Commonwealth. Of course, the Commonwealth Treasury officials must consider how much of the State has been affected. They must also consider how much money is required, and it will be difficult to set an exact sum. If we do not get good spring rains, the crop will be considerably below present estimates. Today, when we were considering the position throughout the State with the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited authorities, we decided that we would be fortunate to get 25,000,000 bushels. Without rain in September or October, we shall get much less than that.

If those rains do not come, the income received by the farmers will be reduced and, consequently, many more applications for finance to buy feed and superphosphate will be made next year. The amount of that could not be estimated. Depending on the sum to be made available by the Commonwealth Government, I point out that we may have to apply for a supplementary grant. I believe that the Government deserves some commendation in this matter, because it has agreed to my suggestion of appointing a committee to examine what assistance may be provided. When I raised the matter early in July, the Leader said that something should have been done about this matter in May last, but surely I would not have been so foolish as to broach the subject in May, when the Government and the Treasury officers might well have said, "It may rain next week; you're too premature." The farmers in my district could well have been in a worse plight, had I jumped the gun by seeking assistance in May. I considered that I raised the matter at the appropriate time, for no rains had been received and assistance was urgently required.

The Railways Commissioner's report, which was tabled in the House yesterday, reveals that the Railways Department has a \$3,000,000 debt. The Treasurer says that he will balance his Budget but I believe that is impossible with the further drop in railway receipts from the transport of grain which is bound to occur. The State cannot afford to ignore for too long the difficulties being experienced by the farmers to whom I have referred; they must be given an opportunity to get back into production soon. Whether a person is a railway porter or a factory worker, he must do what he can to get primary producers again working to capacity. Some share farmers, who have been working under agreements for two to three years, have received hardly any income at all. Fortunately, storekeepers, knowing these men to be good types and sharefarming on a long-term agreement, have been prepared to carry them. However, with the passing of another year during which these farmers have still earned little or no income, their plight has become worse; they have no property that can be pledged to a bank or stock firm.

Until we know what the Commonwealth intends to do, we shall not know whether these men can receive a straight-out grant or whether they will have to apply for unemployment benefits, and I should like the Minister to clarify this point. If these men do receive unemployment benefits, what will happen

about the storekeepers who have been carrying them for the last few months? The committee, in considering these cases, will have to treat each application on its merits, and each applicant will have to state in his application exactly how much is owed to the storekeeper who has been good enough to carry him. According to the Bill, the advance shall "bear interest at the rate charged by the State Bank of South Australia in respect of overdraft loans made to primary producers". I point out, however, that if loans were made through the Reserve Bank at a rate of 4½ per cent or 4¼ per cent, the recipients would greatly benefit.

Mr. McAnaney: Wasn't it a nominal interest rate in New South Wales?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Some received straight-out grants in that State.

Mr. McAnaney: It involved only the costs of administration.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: That is so.

Mr. Nankivell: Farmers' assistance was at State borrowing rates.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Minister would know these answers better than I.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The Minister may make other arrangements, but I shall be referring to this later.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I am glad to have that intimation, because these matters must be clarified. As a result of experiencing drought conditions for two or three years, many farmers have probably reached the upper limit of sums raised by way of overdraft or loan from financial houses. This means, in effect, that a farmer will apply for further assistance. As he needs money for seed, superphosphate, fodder for his stock, water and so on, he will need another loan. Where it becomes necessary in the opinion of the Minister to grant a loan under those circumstances, the Government and the Minister must see (if this scheme is to be a success) that that loan is for a long term and at the lowest possible rate of interest. When a farmer receives a return from production, he will have other commitments to meet (he will have to reduce the existing overdraft) and he will not want hanging around his neck another loan that would put him back into the position from which we are now trying to extricate him. Therefore, it is essential that it is a long term loan at a low rate of interest.

Many farmers in the affected areas have found it difficult to keep their sheep. As a result of the lack of rain and the consequent food shortage, they have reduced the number

of sheep on their properties. At the recent Loxton market, one of the biggest sheep sales for some time was held. Farmers have reduced their flocks and many have kept only mating ewes so that they can breed up their stocks later.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister said that a Government committee would be responsible for the administration of the legislation. I suggest to the Government that a farmer representative should be appointed to the committee, because he would have experience and knowledge of the people who will be affected by the provisions of the Bill. I suggest that a nominee of the United Farmers and Graziers Association of South Australia Incorporated would be a suitable person to appoint to the committee; the committee would be glad to have the co-operation of such a person.

Of course, the people already appointed to this committee are excellent officers. I have met them and they are most co-operative and anxious to do a good job. When they met a committee of the organization of which I am a member, they expressed to that committee their appreciation of the help it had given them to solve the problems. I understand that a petition for a straight-out grant will be handed to me within the next day or two from certain farmers at the top end of the Murray Mallee who are having a difficult time. I pointed out to certain people this afternoon that this grant will depend on the attitude of the Commonwealth Government towards supplying additional finance for this purpose. The Bill refers to the Marginal Lands Improvements Account and the Farmers Assistance Fund as the two sources from which funds are to be obtained. However, funds from those sources will not go far in providing assistance of the type provided for in the Bill. Again, I suppose that, regarding further assistance, the Government will depend on the finance made available by the Commonwealth.

I should like the Minister to say whether any other sources are available from which money can be taken for this purpose. I point out that the fund for debt adjustments must have a surplus, although I do not know what it is at present. Perhaps the Minister could find this out. This source could be used by the Government while the Commonwealth Government decides what money it will allocate.

Mr. McKee: It might wait until the election.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I do not know about that, but I have already said that I am sorry it has not made a decision more quickly.

I do not think that the words "solely or substantially" are necessary in clause 5 (2) (b). If those words were removed, the clause would provide:

No advance shall be made unless the Minister of Lands is satisfied that the primary producer is in necessitous circumstances because of the effect of drought, fire, flood . . .

The removal of those words would not cause any difficulty, yet if they remained they could cause difficulty in the determination of whether a primary producer was eligible for relief, because they might put him on the borderline. I ask the Minister to consider that request. I suppose that other members have had the experience that I have had in regard to the words "extreme hardship" in the National Service legislation. Those words present much difficulty in the administration of that measure, and a similar difficulty could result in administering this measure if the words I have referred to were allowed to remain.

I hope that the Commonwealth Government comes to the party as quickly as it can, because in order to make the legislation a success a grant from the Commonwealth is necessary. I have already said that, unless we get spring rains, particularly in the middle of October, there will be many more applications for assistance than are expected now, with consequent increased assistance payments. I hope that the Minister notes the points I have made. We are disappointed that it is necessary to have such legislation as this, but we must have it in the interests of the whole State.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I commend the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Agriculture on the introduction of this measure, and I commend the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) for having moved the motion of urgency in an attempt to get a drought relief grant from the Commonwealth Government. It is known throughout the State that this Bill shows sympathy with those in drought-affected areas and I was pleased with the unanimous support given to the urgency motion to which I have referred. I regret that as yet the Prime Minister and his officers have not made a decision about our application, because the Commonwealth Government is able to make snap decisions on other matters.

I commend the Minister of Agriculture for the steps he took in the early stages to help alleviate the plight of the Murray Mallee farmers. Immediately the position was brought to his notice by the member for Ridley, he had discussions with his officers and

appointed a committee to investigate the position. I understand that application forms have already been forwarded to persons desiring to apply for relief. Recently my area has been fortunate in its rainfall, although we have experienced extremely dry years. I have vivid recollections of a series of dry years about 1930, when many people in the district had to seek relief. I also have vivid recollections of the disastrous fire that spread through the Wallaroo and Yorke Peninsula Districts, causing damage estimated at about \$1,000,000. Many farmers suffered heavy losses and at that time I appealed in the House to have the Government assist farmers in the matter of obtaining fencing material, but my appeal fell on deaf ears. I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill, which ought to be passed urgently so that assistance can be given to farmers who are in the greatest difficulty at present. I do not desire to impede the passage of the measure, but I shall offer some criticisms of it. I think it is 33 days since the member for Ridley moved an urgency motion about drought relief. All members supported that motion. However, until the Bill was introduced yesterday, Opposition members had not seen it. It was introduced by obtaining the suspension of Standing Orders, whereas the normal practice in introducing a Bill is to give notice for a subsequent day of sitting. There were no printed copies of the Bill, that is, except for two copies, probably only one of which the Leader of the Opposition received in order to examine the measure as the Minister explained it.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The Leader was consulted about this, and he said it was all right.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Of course he did, because he wished to see the legislation passed. Whenever the Government seeks to suspend Standing Orders to enable a Bill to be introduced without notice, it implies that it is taking some privilege from the Opposition, when the correct procedure should be first to ask Opposition members whether they approve or not. As it happens, the two Government back-benchers who have spoken to the debate thus far have made the most deplorably Party-political speeches that I have heard in a long while. I am complaining about the way the Opposition is expected to have no information whatever until the Bill is introduced.

Mr. McKee: That's not true.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If an urgent measure is to be debated and the Government

knows that the Opposition is not likely to oppose it, surely the Government might consult the Opposition before the measure is introduced.

Mr. Hudson: Did you ever do that?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Whatever our Government did was done by arrangement with the Opposition: we never asked the Opposition to put itself out more than was absolutely necessary. No-one can say that it was absolutely necessary for the Government to follow this particular procedure. This is just not good enough. Further, the Minister's explanation is not sufficient to justify the wide scope of the Bill. He should explain the meaning of the title fully, and I shall ask him in Committee for further information about this, if it is still necessary. We must know how the measure will be administered in the future. Clause 5 (1) relates to the power to make advances to primary producers. I have just been informed by the Leader that the Government intends to adjourn the debate on this Bill.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: In view of your remarks: you want more time—we'll give you more time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This is a political stunt of the worst kind. I complained that, while we were ready to facilitate the passage of the Bill, the Government with all the time at its disposal did not take the Opposition into its confidence until 24 hours ago. In spite of that, we were willing not to protest against the suspension of Standing Orders so that the Bill could be introduced—

Mr. Jennings: You know now your bluff has been called.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The member for Frome made a speech earlier this evening that I would prefer to forget because of its complete inadequacy and provocative nature. The member for Wallaroo also made a speech, much of which is difficult to remember, except that it was of a highly-charged political nature.

Mr. Hudson: You've been talking politics ever since you got to your feet.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When I rose to speak, I complained about the way the Government had failed to take the Opposition into its confidence. I know now that I have plenty of time to speak, seeing that the Government is so anxious to use a bit of dirt here and is trying to make a political sham out of this matter. The member for Wallaroo

complained that the Prime Minister had not answered the letter that had been sent in this matter on behalf of the South Australian Parliament. I point out that, although the urgency motion was debated 33 days ago, we have not as yet seen the terms of the Premier's letter. As we do not know what the Prime Minister was asked, who are we to judge? In fact, I think I am correct in saying that Queensland and New South Wales spent \$25,000,000 before the Commonwealth was even asked to pay its contribution.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: That is what we advocated 33 days ago.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes. This Government has spent nothing, yet its backbenchers complain about the Commonwealth Government's not replying to a letter when Opposition members have not even had the benefit of knowing what was in the letter. That shows what a complete sham this is. The member for Frome has spoken many times about drought relief and has always managed to praise the Government. I do not mind his loyally trying to support the Government, but I remind him that previous drought measures consisted almost entirely of remission of railway freights. Clause 5 of the Bill states that the remission of railway freights can be paid out of the fund. In other words, the Government can pay itself out of the fund for the transport of fodder to drought-affected areas. With the exception of a few hundred dollars for another type of remission, the railway freight remission is the only relief given by this Government. I believe the Government should get on with the job and stop fooling around. To try to bluff us into discussing the Bill in this House by pretending that we are holding it up shows what a lack of democratic sense the Government has. Over and over again in this place we hear Government members saying that they hope Opposition members will not hold up measures.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We will give you the information you want.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Apparently the Minister is going to give himself time to look at this matter. I object to the completely undemocratic process of introducing a Bill and trying to bulldoze it through the House by means of propaganda and rubbish of the type the Government uses. Again and again Ministers have said that we should not take up too much time. Members of this Parliament should never descend to that type of argument.

Mr. Lawn: Talk to the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I can talk to what I like and for as long as I like.

Mr. Hudson: Not under the Standing Orders.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member is not the Speaker yet. Clause 5 provides that no advance shall be made to a producer unless the Minister is satisfied that he has a reasonable prospect of being able to continue in the business of primary production. Does that mean that the more hopeless cases will get no relief and that only the best cases will get it? Obviously if people need relief to any significant extent, the amount of that relief can in itself determine whether or not they have a reasonable chance of being able to continue in the business of primary production. I hope the Minister will explain that provision. Although it was referred to in the second reading explanation, no clarification of it was given. Also, I should like to know what will happen to the estate of a person who dies after receiving drought relief. Will those estates be subject to immediate repayment of the relief? That question should also be answered.

We know that this State is subject to some severe droughts and that every few years some part of the State must suffer heavily. Fortunately, the scale of the droughts has not been so widespread in the last few years. People who can remember still say that the 1914 drought was the worst the State has known. Probably they think that because so many horses were kept on farms in those days. In 1946, the number of sheep in the State dropped alarmingly, and in 1959 (another bad year) the effect of the drought on the State's sheep flocks was severe but not as severe as we had suffered previously. Following each of these droughts, improvements have been made in many ways. For instance, farming techniques have changed; cereals have a shorter growing period and are more suited to the various farms; machinery is better; and (this is one of the most important things) killing facilities for, and the transport of, livestock are also better. Also, widespread droughts have not previously hit us all at once. At present, particular areas in the Murray Mallee are suffering, although other parts of the State are not affected drastically. We can imagine the horrible conditions on farms and the genuineness of requests for relief in those areas of the Murray Mallee that normally receive about 11 in. of rainfall annually but have had only about 5 in. so far this year. Because of that, I and other members strongly supported the motion moved by the

member for Ridley, in the hope that something would be done urgently. We have had the answers. One answer has been, "Yes, we have written to the Prime Minister. We will not tell you what was said and, although we wrote less than a month ago, we have not an answer, and we would like one."

In addition, when Parliament is unanimous, the Government has brought in a Bill in the utmost secrecy by obtaining the suspension of Standing Orders and asking us to forgo some of our rights. The Government is now prepared to say, capriciously, that the Opposition is holding it up or that I am holding it up. I am prepared to take that responsibility and shall stand up for democracy in doing so. I am not going to be bulldozed out of Parliament by those silly tactics. I shall be pleased to explain my attitude to anyone and I hope that the Government will be prepared to give a better reason than has been given tonight.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

A division on the motion was called for.

While the division bells were ringing:

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: This Bill is being bulldozed in and bulldozed out.

Mr. Lawn: We weren't allowed to speak at all on Workmen's Compensation Bills when you were in Government. You used to bring them in late in the session and we were told that there were to be no speakers or they would go up in Annie's room.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will maintain decorum while the bells are ringing.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters (teller), Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Ferguson, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, and McKee.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson (teller), Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele and Mr. Teusner.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Walsh. No—Mr. Stott.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 31, at 2 p.m.