

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

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

DEATH OF SIR ROBERT GEORGE

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

That the House of Assembly express its profound regret at the untimely death of Air Vice-Marshal Sir Robert Allingham George, K.C.M.G., K.C.V.O., K.B.E., C.B., M.C., Governor of South Australia from 1953 to 1960, and request Mr. Speaker to convey the deepest sympathy of the House to Lady George and her family, and that, as a mark of respect, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

The late Air Vice-Marshal Sir Robert George and his wife lived in this State through three of its greatest natural disasters—the 1954 earthquake, the Black Sunday bushfires on January 2, 1955, and the 1956 flood. Sir Robert was born in Scotland in 1897, saw service in the First World War with the Seaforth and Gordon Highlanders and was transferred in 1916 to the Royal Flying Corps. After the war he served in India with the newly-titled Royal Air Force from 1919 to 1924. In the 1930's he spent several years as Senior Air Staff Officer in Singapore, and in 1939 became air attache to the British embassy at Ankara with the rank of Group Captain. He remained in the Turkish capital—an important "listening post" for the Allies—during most of the Second World War, but in 1944 became Air Officer Commanding in Iraq and Persia.

He was promoted Air Vice-Marshal in 1949, was knighted in 1952, and spent his last years before retirement from the Royal Air Force as British air attache in Paris. In 1927, Sir Robert George married Sybil Elizabeth Baldwin, a granddaughter of the co-founder of the famous wool firm of Paton and Baldwin. They had a daughter and three sons, two of whom also served in the R.A.F. He revisited Adelaide for five days in December, 1965, when he renewed many friendships. His work as Governor of this State, and the work of Lady George as well, will be long remembered with gratitude and with regard by many people in this State. I am sure that all members will wish to join in the expression of sympathy contained in this motion.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I join with the Premier in expressing my regret at the untimely passing of Air Vice-Marshal Sir Robert George. As the Premier said, Sir

Robert served in many parts of the British Commonwealth, and during his term in South Australia witnessed the severe setbacks referred to. However, during Sir Robert's term in this State he also saw evidence of and noted the wide advances being made. A conscientious administrator, Sir Robert travelled widely throughout South Australia, observing the rapid rate of the State's growth as well as the problems confronting us. He was a good mixer and at his best at informal functions, a quality that was appreciated by the South Australian public in the many districts he visited. On returning to England, having completed his duties in South Australia, Sir Robert served on the boards of various business and financial concerns in Great Britain, this illustrating his ability and the regard in which he was held in his home country. I support the motion.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members will signify their approval of the motion by standing in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.7 to 2.17 p.m.]

QUESTIONS

INDUSTRIAL COSTS

Mr. HALL: Reports in this morning's *Advertiser* indicate a gratifying uplift in the employment figures for this State and show a reduction of just under 500 in the number of unemployed. However, South Australia is still in the unenviable position of having 1.8 per cent of its work force unemployed, that being the highest percentage of unemployed for any of the Australian States. The result is that this State has 18 per cent of the Australian total of those receiving unemployment benefits. In view of the importance of employment to the individual citizens concerned as well as to the economy of the State, will the Premier reconsider his Government's intention to proceed with the Long Service Leave Bill beyond the present stage, so that industrial conditions in this State can be maintained on a par with those in the other States, which are our competitors in industrial promotion?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I certainly do not intend to reconsider the Long Service Leave Bill, which is something for which the overwhelming majority of employees in South Australia voted at the last election. However, I point out that South Australia's decrease in the number of recipients of unemployment benefits is 16 per cent of the Australian total, and that South Australia's increase in registered employment vacancies is 11 per cent of the

Australian total. True, we are starting from a figure behind that of the other States for reasons that I have previously outlined to this House. Any investigations of the reason for the unemployment figures show that, in fact, in areas of secondary industry employment outside consumer durables and the building industry, South Australia's employment is at an all-time high.

Mr. Heaslip: No, it isn't.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it is.

Mr. Heaslip: You can't say that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certain members in this House do not want to see the good things about South Australia because they want to run down the State's economy the whole time for their own purposes. However, regarding agricultural implements and ship-building, for instance, the employment position in South Australia has never been better. What is happening now is what was forecast by this Government: there is some return of the markets throughout Australia for consumer durables that is immediately having its effect in South Australia, the State which has the largest proportion of its secondary industry economy engaged in consumer durable production or in supply industries for consumer durable production. As this recovery is taking place, so it has its effects in South Australia. Our only complaint (and this complaint has been echoed by Premiers of other States and was echoed by Sir Henry Bolte last Wednesday) is that the Commonwealth Government has refused to give a stimulus to the kind of employment in regard to which we have been affected.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Premier satisfied that South Australian industry at present enjoys a cost advantage over its competitors in the Eastern States? If he is, will he give an undertaking that the Government will not take any action that would reduce that advantage? If the Premier is not satisfied with the present cost advantage of South Australian industry, can he say what action the Government intends to take to improve it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In some directions South Australian industry does possess a cost advantage as compared with that of industry in other States. Particularly is this so in relation to payments made on the basis of the cost of living, which has been kept down by the price control system to which the honourable member has been so constantly opposed. I have often given members details of the cost advantages held by this

State as a result of price control. Through that control, it is possible to have real wages at the same level as that of other States, without the monetary payment being as great in some instances. A further factor to be considered is that the work force in South Australia is satisfied and that we have fewer disputes here. It is necessary to ensure that the work force remains satisfied and that its members are not made to feel that the whole of the cost advantage in South Australia is enjoyed at their expense.

Members of the South Australian work force have demanded that certain marginal increases and improvements in their conditions be made. They voted for those marginal improvements, and the Government believes that the improvements can be made without their adversely affecting the cost advantage that South Australia holds in relation to industry in Australia generally. In addition, the Government is currently undertaking studies concerning the cost structure of South Australian industries, because it is clear that in order to attract industries here we must have not only low establishment costs but also low running costs.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I understand the Premier's reply, it is to the effect that he is satisfied with the present position but that certain studies are being undertaken. In view of his rather surprising reply, can the Premier say what is the precise nature of the studies being undertaken, by whom they are being undertaken, and when they are expected to be completed? When they are completed, will he announce the plans that the Government will adopt as a result of the studies?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although a course of studies is being examined by the Industrial Development Branch, I cannot tell the honourable member any more about it at this stage.

PORT WAKEFIELD CROSSING

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Social Welfare, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to my recent question about the Port Wakefield railway crossing?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The police officer at Port Wakefield has been instructed to pay special attention to the railway level crossing at Princes Highway, Port Wakefield, to ensure that any children selling fruit in the area comply with section 87 of the Road Traffic Act. This section requires that "a person shall not walk without due care or attention or without reasonable consideration

for other persons using the road." The proprietors of the Mobilgas roadhouse and the Caltex roadhouse erected stands of empty fruit cases on either side of the roadway and approximately 75ft. north of the crossing. Their children, aged between 11 years and 14 years, look after the stands during the school holidays and at weekends. No doubt competition between them increased during the recent holidays and they decided to extend operations to the road itself and to the railway crossing where motorists were required to stop. The stands were originally erected adjacent to the side of the roadway but have now been moved a distance of 18ft. from the western and eastern edges of the bitumen.

GRAPES

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I understand that early last week four grape varieties previously unknown in South Australia were made available to the wine industry in this State. The varieties were gamay beaujolais and pinot Noir (two French varieties used for the production of red wine), and gewuerztraminer and sylvaner (two varieties from the Rhine Valley used for the production of white wines). I understand that 224 cuttings have been made available to the wine industry and that the Director of Agriculture stated at the time that, although these varieties were light-bearing varieties, not heavy bearing, they would enable the South Australian wine industry to produce new varieties of table wines. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the department's experimental orchard at Blackwood intends to continue the propagation of these varieties at the orchard and, if it does, whether these varieties will be made available in future to other viticulturists who may wish to obtain them?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: First, I compliment the honourable member on his pronunciation of the names of the varieties. He did a far better job than I did when I referred to them some time ago. That is probably because he gets his tongue around foreign names more easily than I do. What the honourable member has stated is perfectly true. Much time elapses between the performing of the quarantine work at the Waite Institute and the conducting of the experiments at Blackwood. These experiments are continuing and the glasshouses and plots there are being used extensively for this purpose. It is hoped that eventually the work will be transferred to Northfield and there consolidated. I

am confident that the progress we make will enable these varieties to be made available to those people interested.

ELECTRICITY

Mrs. BYRNE: At Sheoak Log two businesses are being conducted: namely W. Ahrens and Son (agricultural engineers) employing three full-time employees as well as the two owners; and L. R. & M. P. Ahrens (agricultural manufacturers) employing eight full-time employees as well as the owner. Both of these businesses are hampered because Sheoak Log is supplied only with single-phase electricity. Although the owners would like to expand their businesses so as to be able to produce the output required, they cannot do so because their loading is at the maximum capacity for single-phase electric power. Because both businesses were repeatedly blowing fuses, the Electricity Trust of South Australia surveyed the position about three months ago and effected certain improvements to the power supply. Although this action was appreciated, it still did not enable the businesses to expand. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether the trust would consider replacing the existing supply with a three-phase system, without additional charge to the consumers?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although certain difficulties are associated with the honourable member's request, the Government appreciates the necessity to encourage industries, particularly in such country areas as Sheoak Log, so I will inquire of the trust to see whether the request can be acceded to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question relates to the unfortunate occurrence at the Torrens Island power station some weeks ago, when one of the pieces of equipment was damaged severely. I remind the Minister that from time to time members have asked him for a report, which he has undertaken to obtain. Only last week the member for Torrens asked, as I had, whether the Minister had a report. Late last week I was informed that, in fact, a report had been prepared by the Electricity Trust. I therefore ask the Minister of Works whether he has that report in his possession and, if he has, will he now give it to the House? If he has not, will he inquire immediately?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I should be delighted to know whence the honourable member gets his information, because having spoken only just before lunch-time today with the General Manager of the trust, I know that no report was available then.

LOAN COUNCIL

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have noticed in the press recently that the Australian Loan Council is trying to float a loan on the London market. Can the Treasurer say whether any part of that loan is to be made available to South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although the sums raised at Loan Council have been variously allocated, I will inquire and obtain a report for the honourable member.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Treasurer say what is the effective rate of interest that will be paid on the loan at present being raised in London and whether the South Australian Government, as a party to the Loan Council, voted in favour of that rate?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot answer offhand about the interest rate. Several propositions have been put to me recently about loan raisings overseas and I shall have to get the information on this matter. However, I think it highly unlikely that the Australian Loan Council is raising a loan at an interest rate that has been voted against. I have certainly not voted against any proposition that would cover the position about which the honourable member is speaking. I shall get a full report on the matter.

PORT ADELAIDE TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. HURST: I ask this question on behalf of the member for Port Adelaide, who is absent overseas. I understand that the Headmistress and the Council of the Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School desire to have a fifth-year non-matriculation course established at the school in 1968. I have been informed by the Headmistress that a survey of the parents indicates that sufficient pupils are interested in such a course, which would benefit the district. Will the Minister of Education favourably consider this request?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to have the matter investigated and, if it is possible to provide staff for such a course, the department will go ahead with the proposition.

CRAYFISHING

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yesterday, at the request of representatives of the tuna fishing industry at Port Lincoln, I spent 2½ hours discussing with them their suggestion that the number of boats used in the industry should be regulated during the coming season. The fishermen suggested methods of implementing restrictions and of avoiding the problems involved in co-operation with other States

or the Commonwealth, a matter on which the Select Committee on the Fishing Industry reported recently and to which the member for Glenelg has referred in a letter in this morning's newspaper, in which he stated that it should also be noted that the committee recognized that any limitations on the size of the tuna fleet could be introduced only by agreement with the Commonwealth and New South Wales Governments. As an alternative means of control, the fishermen suggested that licences be granted to take bait inshore, and that only vessels licensed by the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department be entitled to take bait around the islands and inshore bays, which are, without question, South Australian waters. The fishermen outlined a firm case for some restriction in the industry. I have the names and owners of boats that operated last year, and although the fishermen suggested that those boats should be licensed this year, they have received firm advice that several additional outside boats intend to operate this year. The fishermen considered that this action would result in over-fishing the grounds and that, in all fairness to intending newcomers, the Government should make known its intentions as early as possible. In view of the facts that were recited to me by the fishermen and because of the suggestions made to control the number of boats in the industry, on behalf of those fishermen I ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider this as an urgent matter and to publish a report of the Government's intentions as soon as possible.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall certainly accede to the honourable member's request to consider this matter as urgent. It was intended that legislation concerning only crayfish should be introduced this session. Further, it was intended not to allow those not already engaged in the industry to operate, unless they could prove that a boat was being built to be used for fishing this season. A difficulty arises about licensing of fishermen because of the time element. Under the Act, although the season starts from December 1 a person can apply for a licence from October 1 and it may be issued to him. Because licences have already been sent to people dealing with applications, such as police officers, and such licences are to be issued from October 1, the Government intends that persons engaged in the crayfishing industry should have their licence stamped "Crayfishing". After obtaining the licences fishermen would have to return them to be over-stamped. This would be relatively simple, but as I do not know whether the

honourable member's suggestion could operate quite so easily, I shall give the matter urgent attention and inform the honourable member of the result as soon as possible.

BEEF ROAD

Mr. CASEY: People in the North are concerned about whether a road constructed adjacent to the proposed pipeline from the Gidgealpa-Moomba area to Adelaide might serve not only for the purpose of carrying out inspection work on the pipeline but also as a beef road. Although I have certain reservations about such a proposal, that is, concerning the quantity of stock that can be transported on such a road from the Gidgealpa-Moomba area, I ask the Minister representing the Minister of Roads whether he will ascertain his colleague's views on the matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to confer with my colleague, obtain the information concerned, and bring down a report as soon as possible.

PASTURE PESTS

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on August 30 last about pasture pests?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Considerable areas of oncopera damage have occurred during the autumn and early winter, especially in the Wattle Range area. Considerable areas were sprayed this year with a new insecticide, chlorfenvinphos, a replacement treatment for the older D.D.T. treatment, following two seasons' experiments carried out by the department in conjunction with the chemical company concerned. Results were very satisfactory except in a few cases where the unseasonably dry autumn weather resulted in caterpillar inactivity at the time of spraying. Heavy infestations of adoryphorus (red-headed cockchafer or curl grub) occurred in the Kongorong, Mount Schank and Penola to Joanna areas, as anticipated this year. Farmers in the Kongorong area especially undertook recommended control measures in April-May, and were able to produce good feed by the winter. In other areas control measures were delayed and generally less satisfactory and, because of the unseasonable weather conditions this autumn and winter, the grubs continued to feed during the winter months, adding further stress to that of dryness already experienced by the pastures.

Reports of serious damage in the Kybybolite area were investigated and found to be due to a combination of pasture degeneration and

adverse seasonal conditions and not due to adoryphorus. The green caterpillars reported from Struan have not been resubmitted in reasonable condition for identification, nor have any other reports been received which would give a clue to their identity. However, in a season such as the State is experiencing, many native insects normally of little or no consequence are expected to occur in unusually large numbers and in some cases to cause significant damage. Where this is seen, the department appreciates receiving specimens to enable identification to be made wherever possible.

CHOWILLA DAM

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Because people living near the Chowilla dam site are seriously concerned about the deferment of work on the dam, as many, having made plans for future expansion in the area, are now completely up in the air over the whole matter, will the Premier say whether the Government intends to take legal action to ensure that work on the dam is resumed as early as possible? Will the matter be referred for arbitration to the Tasmanian Chief Justice? What reasons were given for the South Australian representative on the River Murray Commission voting in favour of a deferment? Was he instructed by the responsible Minister in South Australia to do so? Finally, does the Premier believe that South Australia would succeed in any such litigation, in view of this State's representative having voted to defer the scheme?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I regret that the honourable member could not have been in the House when I answered a question in almost precisely the same terms last week. I suggest that he look at that reply.

Mr. McANANEY: Some months ago the Commissioner of the Snowy Mountains Authority reported that five of his engineers were working on the Chowilla dam project. Can the Minister of Works say who is employing those men (whether the South Australian Government or the River Murray Commission) and what is the nature of their work?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will call for a report and let the honourable member know when it is to hand.

KEITH WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Last Thursday I indicated to the Minister of Works that I would today ask him the following questions about the Keith water scheme: Why did the Mines Department drill on the present site at Emu Flat? Why did it not drill at a site near Sugar Loaf Hill, near Keith,

as requested in a resolution passed at the meeting held recently at Keith? Is it intended to drill on a site near Sugar Loaf Hill in the future? Can residents still expect the discovery of a suitable water supply in time to supply the township of Keith this summer?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have obtained the following replies from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department:

- (1) The Engineering and Water Supply Department accepted the Mines Department's recommendation to bore at the Emu Flat site as drilled. This area was selected on account of favourable geological indications, suggesting similar aquifers to known bores.
- (2) Sugar Loaf Hill was recommended by some voices at the public meeting in Keith, but is considerably further away and does not appear to be backed with satisfactory drilling record.
- (3) The Engineering and Water Supply Department has conferred with the geologists of the Mines Department and is prepared to accept their recommendation to extend the search.
- (4) A supply to Keith by this summer depends on success in drilling and partly on the location of the source.

The Emu Flat bore has been abandoned and I have asked the Mines Department to recover the casing. Investigation funds approved will allow, first, one or more rotary drill holes to the north of the Emu Flat site; and, secondly, a deep bore in Keith township for investigation purposes.

BORE WATER

Mr. BROOMHILL: Following the recent announcement that Adelaide bore water is now being used to augment the metropolitan water supply, I have had some inquiries regarding the standard of the water to be used. Can the Minister of Works give information about the quality of the water and say how it compares with Murray River water?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: So far five bores are operating in the north-western districts and, by the end of the week, we hope to have 10 bores operating. However, I should make it clear that, before the bores are used extensively to augment the supply of the Adelaide Water District, they are tested thoroughly. Up to the present the water has been considered satisfactory, although we admit that it is harder than the water normally pumped from the Murray River. We do not expect that appliances will be affected greatly. However, as some heaters may be affected and so that consumers, with the aid of an electrician, may make the necessary adjust-

ments, we are doing our best to notify people in the areas concerned before the bores are used. Members will recall that last week the Engineer-in-Chief indicated the areas in which bores would operate this week, and we hope that a similar procedure will be followed in future.

EGGS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the number of poultry farmers in South Australia who are liable to pay the levy of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities of Australia and who are not paying it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have received the following letter from the Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board:

At the meeting of producers held at Murray Bridge on July 24, 1967, in the absence of official statistics, I estimated that 150 producers were not paying the Commonwealth hen levy. The official figures as at July 25, 1967, were 123 producers not paying the levy, of whom 67 had stated in writing that they did not intend to pay, pending the result of the Commonwealth appeal to the High Court against the decision of the magistrate in the Victorian litigation case. An additional nine producers had claimed inability to pay owing to hardship conditions. As at August 24, 1967 (period 4 of the 1967-68 year), there were 77 producers not paying the levy, of whom 57 have refused pending the clarification of the legal situation, and a further 20 producers claim to be unable to pay owing to economic reasons.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last week regarding a management survey that was conducted by officers of his department into the egg industry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Last week the honourable member said that he asked me a question on March 14 and that he had not received the reply I had promised to get for him. However, I notice in the records that, in a letter dated March 30, I told him it was intended that a report should be brought down later in the year; but I have not received it yet.

Mr. HALL: When I was in Mount Gambier last weekend I was told that difficulty was being experienced with locally marketed eggs selling with the permission of the authority under the Egg Board's administration. I was also told that there was a prejudice in Mount Gambier against buying eggs in cartons and that it had become almost impossible to sell eggs to retailers in the main street of Mount Gambier because they preferred to buy from Victoria where they could obtain

eggs not packed in cartons. As this is a difficult situation for South Australian producers in that area, can the Minister of Agriculture make some dispensation for producers in this area (or any other area where producers are threatened by an interstate influx of eggs) and arrange for the retailers themselves to choose whether to pack eggs in cartons if customers require them packed, so that producers may sell eggs to retailers under conditions agreeable to those retailers?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: A few weeks ago, in answer to a question by another member, I read a report from the Egg Board stating that it was realized that anomalies could occur and that they would be considered. I shall again take up this matter with the board now that the honourable member has mentioned a specific case. However, the board is completely autonomous and, provided it acts within reason, I do not see why I should interfere with its operations in this regard.

BEER

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that beer prices in South Australia are higher than they are in any other State. My local publican has approached me regarding the conditions under which he purchases beer from the breweries. He obtains a rebate of 40c a dozen on reputed quarts if he carries out certain conditions: namely, that he does not at any time directly or indirectly sell, dispose of, or supply liquor or beverages at prices less than, or upon terms contrary to, respective prices and terms set out in the schedule of retail prices issued from time to time by the Australian Hotels Association. Although I have supported restrictive trade practices legislation, I oppose price control, which has proved so ineffective in this State. The publican has to comply with many conditions other than those I have read and he has to declare that he has so complied. In view of this section in the Prices Act, which perhaps is one of the few good sections in the Act—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. McANANEY: The Prices Act provides:

A retail trader shall not by any threat promise or intimidation, induce or procure or attempt to induce or procure a manufacturer or wholesale trader to sell to him for sale by retail any amount number or quantity of goods (whether such goods are declared goods or not) of a particular class grade and quality upon terms or conditions (including conditions as to price and the allowance of discounts) more favourable than those upon which that manufacturer or wholesale trader is selling or

offering for sale a like amount, number or quantity of goods of like class grade and quality to other retail traders.

Can the Premier say whether the brewery is able to refuse to grant these rebates to my constituent if he does not comply with the conditions set out?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is now asking me for a legal opinion, which I certainly do not intend to give off the cuff. I shall consider the matter.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Premier obtain from the Prices Commissioner a report on the restrictive trade practice that I reported to him on behalf of one of my constituents?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether the honourable member is referring to a matter he referred to earlier or to some other matter.

Mr. McANANEY: I am referring to the price of beer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: With the new Licensing Act coming into operation, I will get a report on the whole structure of beer and wine prices from the Prices Commissioner, and I will certainly examine the matter then. I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that, so far as this is a restrictive trade practice, it is an intrastate one.

Mr. McANANEY: It is in your Act.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is an intrastate restrictive trade practice so far as it is one, and the honourable member, in common with most of the honourable members in another place, voted to see that there would be no effective restrictive trade practices legislation in force in South Australia.

LOTTERIES

Mr. LANGLEY: As No. 38 lottery was drawn today and as the innovation of lotteries has caught the imagination of the public and helped this State, will the Premier bring down a report setting out the organizations that have benefited from lotteries and the amounts by which they have benefited?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Earlier this year I gave a list of those who had benefited from trading during the last financial year. In relation to this year, the amounts of benefit to the Hospitals Fund, to which payments are made from lotteries, and from the Totalizator Agency Board to a smaller extent, are disclosed in the Budget papers. The Estimates of Expenditure now before the House show the amounts by which each organization has benefited from the fund.

NURSES

Mr. HALL: I have been told that the Registrar of the Nurses Board of South Australia has informed private hospitals that the board will discontinue the appointment of medical practitioners to give lectures to trainee nurses and that all training schools will be responsible for arranging their own programme of lectures. I understand that nurses being trained at these hospitals at present receive lectures in five subjects during the four-year course at a cost to each nurse of \$1.75 a subject, and that the new system will be much more costly, resulting in hundreds of dollars being paid by the hospitals concerned in additional fees. In view of the importance of the private hospitals in training nurses and in providing beds in training hospitals, will the Minister of Social Welfare obtain from the Chief Secretary a report setting out the change in policy and the effect this change will have financially and practically on the hospitals concerned?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall take the matter up with my colleague and bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, a reply to my recent question about the training of nurses?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no provision in the Nurses Registration Act setting out the maximum age for commencement of training. However, it has been the past policy of many training schools not to accept an applicant for training who is over 35 years of age. This is because the student of more mature age may find it extremely difficult to mix with the younger students in their late teens or early 20's. Occasions have arisen where an applicant over the age of 35 years has appeared to be an outstanding person and has been appointed as a trainee nurse. The honourable member's question makes particular reference to geriatric nursing. Although the Nurses Board does not have a separate register or roll for geriatric nurses, these persons could undertake a 12 months' course for enrolment as a nurse aide. An increasing number of enrolled nurse aides is being employed in the geriatric field. It is understood that the Canberra scheme mentioned by the honourable member relates mainly to the training of nurse aides.

The Nurses Board would welcome persons of mature age undertaking training in the nurse aide field. There would also be no objection to their undertaking general nurse training,

but it may prove difficult for the mature-age student to complete the full course of training of not less than three years and three months, involving intensive lecture programmes and examinations. For the information of the honourable member, the following are the approved training schools for nurse aide training: Adelaide Children's Hospital; Hindmarsh Memorial Community Hospital; Home for Incurables; Repatriation General Hospital; and Royal Adelaide Hospital (Northfield Wards).

Mr. McANANEY: I have received several letters, particularly from third-year trainee nurses who consider that they have been unfairly treated in the recent award, because the cost of their board has been increased to an amount equivalent to the increase in pay, and because, as additional income tax has to be paid, they are no better off. Although the Public Service Association seems to be satisfied with the award, the nurses are not. Will the Minister of Social Welfare obtain a report from the Minister of Health about this award, so that I can satisfy, in some way, those who have complained to me?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It would help my colleague if detailed information was available from the nurses who have protested. If the honourable member has any correspondence I shall be pleased to present it to my colleague, and ask him to examine the position.

IRRIGATION

Mr. CURREN: The Minister of Works said on August 2, when replying to a question I had asked, that the inter-departmental committee dealing with water diversion licences was to visit the Upper Murray to interview applicants about whose applications further information was required. Can the Minister say whether any further water diversion licences have been issued and, if they have been, what area is involved?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The committee has commenced inquiries. However, up to the present no further licences have been issued and, therefore, I cannot say what area is involved. I expect to receive a report soon.

WHEAT

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of September 12 about the supplies of wheat in the Adelaide Division for milling and other industrial purposes?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Manager for South Australia of the Australian Wheat

Board, in a letter to me, gives the following figures:

Port Adelaide Division:

	Bushels
Requirements for home consumption, export flour and wheat products for period December 1, 1967, to November 30, 1968	7,500
Estimated deliveries for 1967-68 season	5,500,000
Carryover from 1966-67 season	1,000,000
Estimated movement of wheat of selected quality into division at mills' request	1,000,000

The letter also states that millers, to meet market requirements, select wheats of high quality for blending purposes from outside the division and pay the additional freight costs themselves. During the past three years they have purchased the following quantities of wheat from outside the Port Adelaide Division:

<i>Season</i>	<i>Bushels</i>
1964-65	1,470,000
1965-66	950,000
1966-67	1,360,000

The letter states that the figure of 1,000,000 bushels used in the above estimate is, therefore, reasonably conservative.

SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 29 about the need for public toilet facilities at the South Para reservoir?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief states that a final working drawing is now available and I am pleased to say that it should be possible to make a start on the construction of the public conveniences in about one month.

NARACOORTE HOUSING

Mr. RODDA: People in the Upper South-East heard with great pleasure the Minister of Education's announcement that a matriculation course was to be set up at Naracoorte next year. As the Minister said last week that this would necessitate an increase in staff at that school, as I imagine that such staff will be married teachers, and as there is already a demand (strange as it may seem) for houses in Naracoorte, has the Minister of Education provided for additional housing that may be required?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: After obtaining a report, I shall inform the honourable member.

HORTICULTURAL ADVISER

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether any applications have been received for the position of Horticultural Adviser in the Barossa Valley following the transfer of Mr. Spurling and, if there have been, whether an appointment has yet been made?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Only yesterday Cabinet recommended that an officer be appointed. If His Excellency's approval is given in Executive Council on Thursday, I will tell the honourable member who is the appointee, and I am sure he will be pleased with the appointment.

PICCADILLY SCHOOL

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Education comment on the suggestion I made last week that a survey be made of the Piccadilly area to ascertain whether a primary school could be established there?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Negotiations are in hand with a view to obtaining a site for the establishment of a primary school at Piccadilly. In the meantime, a survey will be made by the District Inspector in conjunction with the headmasters of Uraidla and Crafers schools to determine the number of children living within one mile of Piccadilly who attend either of these schools. The minimum requirements for the establishment of a school bus service stipulate that all of the children involved must reside three or more miles from the nearest school with the majority residing over five miles away. Piccadilly is approximately midway between Uraidla and Crafers, which are about four miles apart, and consequently does not qualify for a school bus service.

ANLABY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns the reported intention of the Dutton family to sell the property known as Anlaby, in the District of Light. One of my friends on the land has suggested to me that the Anlaby property would be most suitable for another agricultural teaching institution in this State, perhaps with a lower entry requirement than that set by Roseworthy Agricultural College, and that we would never get another opportunity as good as that presented by the sale of Anlaby to acquire such a property for this purpose. I know the Government is hard up but, in view of this outstanding opportunity, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether this suggestion has been considered? If it has been, does the Government intend

to purchase this property? If it has not been considered, will the Minister consider it and perhaps discuss it with the Minister of Lands?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The answers are "No" and "Yes".

TROTTING

Mr. McANANEY: The Chief Secretary, I understand supported by Cabinet, refused to allow the Victor Harbour Trotting Club to hold day trotting meetings on Saturday, although the Lottery and Gaming Act provides for meetings to be conducted in places other than in the metropolitan area on this day. In view of the Government's announced intention to encourage tourism in this State (and a trotting meeting at Victor Harbour would be an attraction), and because workers at Victor Harbour have to take a day off to attend weekday meetings but could attend them with ease on Saturday afternoon, will the Premier ask his colleague to reconsider the decision to refuse a permit to this club, particularly when the South Australian Trotting League supports the move? I understand that no official effort has been made by the South Australian Jockey Club to stop trotting clubs operating outside the metropolitan area, which is defined as 20 miles from the city. This excludes major trotting clubs within the immediate vicinity of Adelaide perhaps competing with racing clubs.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although the matter has been reviewed by Cabinet, I shall obtain a considered reply for the honourable member.

HILLS STATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Many times I have raised the question of the erection of a railway station on the line between Coromandel and Eden Hills but, although this station was originally promised in 1927, it has not yet been established. I have received a letter from the Secretary of the Mitcham Hills Community Swimming Centre Committee (Mr. Martin), including a copy of a letter dated August 26 forwarded to the Traffic Manager of the Railways Department, part of which states:

One of the main considerations in fixing a site is its proximity to public transport, and in this connection the committee would appreciate your advice regarding the proposed establishment of a station between Coromandel and Eden Hills. Any information regarding location and possible date of opening would be helpful.

The letter sent to me by the Secretary of the committee states that no reply has been received to the letter to the Railways Department, and asks whether I can obtain information. There-

fore, in view of the questions I have asked before on this topic, will the Minister of Social Welfare consult his colleague with a view to obtaining information that I hope will be favourable?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall ask my colleague for that information.

WATER SUPPLIES

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Works say what quantity of water is held in our reservoirs, what the expected pumping programme will yield, and what is the expected overall requirement of the State?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As I do not have the answers to those questions with me, I shall obtain the information tomorrow.

POLICE FORCE

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In the Estimates debate the Treasurer said that he would obtain a report on the present strength of the Police Force, the number of recruits proposed this year, and the present establishment of the force. Has he that information?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

TIMBER STOCKS

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Forests say whether his department has yet been able to sell timber at least at the rate of the milling that is being undertaken, or whether mill stocks are still accumulating?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

ARTERIOSCLEROSIS

Mr. LAWN (on notice): What have been the results of the investigational project at the Royal Adelaide Hospital to assess the intra-arterial oxygen method of treating arteriosclerosis?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Fifty-eight patients have been studied with various degrees of arterial disease in the legs. Intra-arterial oxygen has been given as laid down by Dr. Moler, but not via apparatus as used by him. However, a set of the apparatus is on order. No difference exists between those treated with intra-arterial oxygen and others in a control group, as estimated by (a) clinical assessment, and (b) physiological tests including intra-muscular Zenon blood flows. A paper containing this information which was presented at the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, Melbourne, in May, 1967, will be shortly submitted for publication. We are, at the moment,

assessing the results of deep cutaneous massage, but will resume our studies with intra-arterial oxygen when Dr. Moler's apparatus arrives from Germany within the next two months.

BANKING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What studies have been made since March, 1965, concerning the integration of the State banking system?

2. By whom have such studies been made?

3. What have they revealed?

4. What action is it proposed to take as a result of these studies, and when?

5. What additional banking facilities are to be provided, and when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Studies have been made during the past two years of ways and means of co-ordinating or integrating the operations of the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia, so as to eliminate duplication, increase mutual co-operation, ensure co-ordination of policy and planning, arrange, where practicable, common use of facilities and staff, give preference each to the other in banking and other arrangements, and ensure that both the public and the public undertakings receive efficient and economical service. These studies have extended to the financial relationships between the State banking services and other governmental undertakings.

2. The studies have been made mainly by the Treasury under the direction of my predecessor and, latterly, under my own direction, but also by the two banks concerned and by the public utilities into features immediately concerning them. The Treasury has acted informally to co-ordinate the matter.

3. They are still proceeding, but they have indicated significant scope for securing, by administrative co-ordination, the economies, co-operation, and development which it is the Government's policy to promote. They have indicated, at least tentatively, the desirability of some widening of the functioning of the State banking system which may require legislative authority.

4. Administrative action has already been taken in a number of matters which were shown to be desirable, particularly to ensure mutual consultation, avoid duplication, and to increase common use of existing resources. As the studies are not complete, no legislative measures are proposed this session. However, I hope to be in a position during the latter

part of this year to detail the administrative actions and arrangements taken and proposed by the Government.

5. As the studies, particularly those relating to additional banking facilities, are not complete, I am not in a position to give a specific answer. A policy statement will be made when the studies are complete and Cabinet has been able to give the matter detailed consideration.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The amendments to the Planning and Development Act proposed by this Bill are mainly consequential on the provisions of the Real Property Act Amendment (Strata Titles) Bill which was introduced into this House earlier in this session. These amendments have become necessary because of the provisions of sections 44 and 59 of the principal Act. Section 44 (1) provides, *inter alia*, that a person shall not sell, etc., any land, other than an allotment, or an undivided share of an allotment, to any person without the approval in writing of the Director. (An allotment is defined in section 5 as meaning, *inter alia*, the whole of the land comprised in a certificate of title.) Section 44 (4), however, is intended to exempt from the operation of subsection (1) of that section any home unit that is within a home-unit scheme comprising not less than three home units if they are erected on an allotment and the building scheme has been approved by the local council.

Under the Real Property Act Amendment (Strata Titles) Bill it would be possible to obtain a certificate of title to a unit within a scheme comprising two or more units so long as the building was approved under the Building Act on or after the date prescribed in that Bill, namely, January 1, 1940. It is considered that subsection (4) should be brought into line with the provisions of that Bill and that the definition of "allotment" should expressly catch up a unit in respect of which a certificate of title is in force under the Real Property Act. Clause 3 of the Bill amends that definition accordingly. Clause 4 (a) repeals and

re-enacts section 44 (4) to bring it into line with the proposed new provisions of the Real Property Act. It will be noted that the exemption contained in the new subsection (4) is limited to building-unit schemes the plans and specifications for which have been approved by the appropriate council not earlier than January 1, 1940, and not later than the commencement of the Real Property Act Amendment (Strata Titles) Act, 1967. This is designed to prevent promoters of land subdivision from virtually subdividing their land by converting it into home units without a properly approved plan of subdivision or plan of resubdivision or strata plan.

Clause 4 (b) clarifies the provisions of section 44 (5) which excludes any piece of land over 20 acres in extent from the operation of subsection (1) of that section. However, there is a weakness in subsection (5) as originally enacted which would enable the owner of a 35-acre allotment to sell 21 acres of it, leaving a balance of 14 acres in his own name. This was not the intention of subsection (5): the intention was to allow a person to sell off a piece of over 20 acres in extent if the remaining land was also over 20 acres in extent. Section 59 (1) of the principal Act prohibits the division of an allotment: (a) shown on a deposited plan of subdivision or (b) shown on an approved plan of resubdivision, except in accordance with a recognized plan of subdivision or plan of resubdivision.

This principle should be applicable to any allotment at all (whether or not it is shown on a deposited plan of subdivision or on an approved plan of resubdivision). Accordingly, clause 5 (a) of the Bill deletes the qualifying paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 59 (1). Subsection (2) of that section provides that a person shall be deemed to divide an allotment if, being the owner of the allotment, he sells, etc., or otherwise disposes of a part only of that allotment (any home unit designed for separate occupation within a building-unit scheme comprising not less than three units not being regarded as a part of an allotment). Clause 5 (b) repeals and re-enacts subsection (2) so as to bring it into line with the proposed new provisions of the Real Property Act and paragraph (c) of that clause brings subsection (4) of that section into line with the new subsection (2) as re-enacted by clause 5 (b).

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONTROL OF WATERS ACT.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. C. D. Hutchens:

That this House approve of the making of a proclamation under section 3 of the Control of Waters Act, 1919-1925, in the following form:

Control of Waters Act, 1919-1925: Application to Portion of River Murray and Other Watercourses.

South Australia { Proclamation by His Excellency the Governor of the State of South Australia.
to wit }

By virtue of the provisions of the Control of Waters Act, 1919-1925, and all other enabling powers, I, the said Governor, after the passing of a resolution of both Houses of Parliament of the said State approving of the making of this proclamation, and with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, do hereby declare that the provisions of the said Act shall apply to the watercourses specified in the schedule hereto.

THE SCHEDULE

- (a) That portion of the River Murray which is situate between Mannum and the Barrages at Goolwa, Mundoo, Boundary Creek, Ewe Island and Tauwitchere, including the waters of Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert.
- (b) That portion of Currency Creek extending upstream from Goolwa or Lower Murray to the Railway Bridge adjacent to allotment 596 in the town of Currency Creek, Hundred of Goolwa, County of Hindmarsh.
- (c) That portion of the River Finniss extending upstream from the River Murray to the Railway Bridge adjacent to the south-eastern corner of section 2445, Hundred of Nangkita, County of Hindmarsh.
- (d) That portion of the River Angas extending upstream from Lake Alexandrina to Bagley Bridge situate adjacent to section 8, Hundred of Bremer, County of Hindmarsh.
- (e) That portion of the River Bremer extending upstream from Lake Alexandrina to the north-eastern corner of section 2818, Hundred of Bremer, County of Hindmarsh.

Given under my hand and the public seal of South Australia, at Adelaide this day of , 1967.

By command,
Chief Secretary.

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN!

(Continued from September 14. Page 1965.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I move:

After "Queen" to insert "and is of the opinion that no restrictions should be enforced at any time when surplus water is being discharged over or through the barrages at Goolwa."

In South Australia generally at present there is concern at the lack of water and at the significance of this lack. The Opposition believes that water restrictions should be

imposed only if they are necessary. My amendment provides that, when the quantity of water in the Murray River is such that large volumes flow over the barrage at Goolwa, the restrictions envisaged in the proclamation for the area south of Mannum should not apply. As the Leader pointed out, we have seen fairly quick action on this matter. The Minister of Works underlined the reasons for this action and intimated that he would answer questions raised by Opposition members. The last thing I like to see are restrictions.

I am particularly interested in the first-class water that is being drained away to the sea in the South-East. This matter was referred to by the members for Albert and Stirling. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) has often pointed out in the House that the surplus water in the South-East causes much embarrassment to landholders; hence, we have the costly drainage system that has been provided there. The productivity of that drainage system by way of increased stocking in that part of South Australia proves that it is worth while. Because of the low ranges or sand dunes on the western side of the Flat Back Plains, there is slow movement of water from Salt Creek to the Coorong. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) said that when he first heard the ideas of the member for Albert he thought that they were crackpot ideas.

Mr. McKee: Is the member for Stirling an authority?

Mr. RODDA: I do not think he sets himself up as an authority on this matter. However, the situation in the South-East is that millions of acre feet of water runs into the sea. When a Royal Commission examined this matter in 1924, it was concerned principally with getting rid of the surplus water as quickly as possible to help the landholders and it found that the quickest way to do this was to cut through the low ranges to get the water to the sea. However, some people now wonder whether that was the best thing to do.

The member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) has suggested that an expert committee examine all matters connected with water supply, and the matter to which I have referred could be examined by such a committee. I have already suggested that the Land Settlement Committee could take more evidence about this matter. We should see whether this water can be dammed; we should find ways and means of getting it to Lake Alexandrina, so that it can supplement the volume of water held in that area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Irrigation): It seems, in the brief period we have had to examine the amendment, that what the honourable member is trying to achieve is that, if there is a surplus of water in the river—

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Is the honourable member closing the debate, Mr. Speaker?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not closing the debate.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Is the honourable member closing the debate, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: No, he is not.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I did not move the motion. Therefore, how can I close the debate? I am simply participating in the debate, as is my right. I take the intention of the amendment to be that any surplus of water in the river should be used rather than allowed to flow out to sea. The intention of the restriction is to enable control in years such as this, when there is a 50 per cent restriction, but there is no intention of preventing people from using surplus water if it is available. Indeed, it is intended to issue licences on a seasonal basis, if necessary. I think what I have said covers the points that the honourable member has raised in his amendment.

The amendment is dangerous, because if one considers the word "restriction" and the effect of the amendment (and I do not know whether the words proposed to be inserted can correctly be placed after "God Save the Queen!") one will find that the amendment completely nullifies the effect of the proclamation. I think all the questions that have been raised by members opposite can be answered adequately by the Minister when he replies. The Leader of the Opposition, speaking on the motion, said:

Perhaps the Minister will give further information about the Government's intention to extend control south of Mannum. This aspect is important to people who live adjacent to the river and who, at present, have full riparian rights. I should like to know when control is to be extended to this area. How will the people, who will obviously have to have a licence to divert water, stand in relation to those with existing rights? Will they be equal in times of restriction? Is there to be an automatic granting of licences to those already diverting water? Will those already diverting water be restricted? Will there be restrictions on the number of acres that can be irrigated? How much will a licence cost?

The extension of the control of the river from Mannum to the mouth of the river will bring water users in these areas on to the same basis as those on the upper river. The question of the degree of restriction on licences in any area of the river has not been the subject of consideration. To date there has not been any need to apply restrictions to water users on the river, even those on the upper reaches who hold licences.

Mr. Hall: What about new licences?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They are not held at this stage. There is another reason. The proclamation of the lower river will give authority to examine the lower river and determine actual present use. It can be assumed that all present users will be granted licences adequate to protect their development work. Any restriction on the issue of licences will be able to be applied to the whole river. The present situation where control is exercised above Mannum can be completely ineffective with uncontrolled water use downstream. It seems necessary to require licences for the diversion of water throughout the length of the river. The probable issue of licences for the lower river assures some restriction on the acres to be irrigated. Licences would have to cover all existing established irrigations. Licences will be on the same basis as used in the upper river, and these are available free of all charge. Those replies answer the Leader's queries.

Regarding the matters that have been raised by the member for Albert, the inclusion of the lower river under the Act will provide no added control of water level in the lakes. These will still be subject to wind variation. The long-term advantage will lie in avoiding over-use of water in the lower river with excessive draw-down of lake levels in summer under controlled flow.

The member for Stirling commented on the control of lake levels, also mentioned by the member for Albert. This is not directly relevant to the proclamation and there are several areas of concern there, sometimes with conflicting interests. While considerable concern exists to control diversion water in years of regulated flow, it must be remembered that surplus flows will occur in the river quite frequently.

In these years, arrangements will need to be made to let special cropping arrangements proceed. These decisions will have to be prompt and adequate information given as early as possible. This will be forthcoming. The first departmental action following the

proclamation will be a complete survey of irrigation practice on the lower river. This assessment is urgently required. South Australia has a strictly defined allocation of water and the Murray River should and will be made available to serve the State to its capacity. Permanent development beyond this level could be disastrous to all concerned. I give these replies merely to help members who intend to participate in the debate and who are still in some doubt about what is to happen.

I think it is also relevant to say something about the diversion of water from the Murray River and about the contents of the agreement. The agreement defines the allocation to South Australia as a quantity of 1,254,000 acre feet, the supply of which is the joint responsibility of the two upper States. The normal interpretation of the South Australian allocation is that 564,000 acre feet should be available as a base flow throughout the year to give some degree of continuous flow and to make up evaporation and other losses. The agreement sets out the monthly quotas by which the allocation is to reach South Australia and allows for maximum flow in the period November through to February grading down to minimum flows in June and July. The above arrangement provides South Australia with 690,000 acre feet of divertible water and this component under the allocation is subject to restriction in years such as the present. This year restriction is 50 per cent, providing 291,000 acre feet for diversion between September and April. This amount of water equals the present diversion rate.

Present commitments for development obviously indicate a much increased demand without any increase in licence for irrigation. This fact led to the veto on the issue of further licences and an investigation by an inter-departmental committee. This committee attempted to examine the irrigation situation and if possible to limit the diversion demand for this purpose to 360,000 acre feet per annum. It is doubtful if this target can be quite achieved but it is felt that licence commitments have been determined in the area between 380,000 and 400,000 acre feet per annum. Considering the commitments made on Murray River resources for supply to Whyalla and Adelaide and other areas away from the river means that the total allocation is probably required. Imposed in this is the recurring threat of the restrictions which even at a level considerably lower than applied this year could mean disaster if further land is opened for irrigation.

Of course, this points to the urgent need for this control, and I think that members realize this. If this amendment were carried, it would mean that all restrictions that could be applied by bringing the river from Mannum to Goolwa under control would automatically cease immediately the water flooded over the Goolwa barrages. I am sure that such is not the intention of the mover, but that he intends that where there is surplus flow in some areas such water should be used and not be allowed to flow out to sea.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I thank the Minister for the information he gave to the House, but I believe that this matter should be examined more thoroughly. Many years ago it was considered unnecessary to control water in the lower reaches because the bulk of it would probably flow out to sea anyway. Although I do not object to placing the whole of the river under control, I object to the foolish type of control provided for in the motion, as people prepared to use the water effectively for the benefit of this State will be prohibited from doing so while water runs over the barrages.

When I raised this matter in the House some time ago, the Minister supplied me with a copy of a letter he had sent to the applicant for a licence. He said in the letter that, because that person had not applied before March 9, a licence could not be issued. However, since then water has been flowing almost continually over the Murray barrages. This problem has been dealt with in another State by the introduction of two forms of licence. I believe that a licence (which, for the sake of argument, I will call an A class licence) is effective in time of restriction and it will be honoured in proportion to the quantity of water available. However, when there are no restrictions why cannot a person install a plant and pump water to his heart's content? What earthly reason is there to stop the effective use of water that would run to the sea anyway?

During the last 20 years an average of about 9,000,000 acre feet of water has come into South Australia, or eight times the quantity of water necessary to supply South Australia's requirements. During the next 20 years, with all the diversions that are taking place in the upper river, the River Murray Commission expects that 6,000,000 acre feet will come into this State. That is more than four times the quantity necessary for the requirements of this State. By controlling the use of river water by the issue of licences, it is restricted first to those who hold a licence and, secondly, to

acreages. To limit the use of water on the basis of a year of restriction does not make sense. High costs have been incurred in establishing orchards, vineyards, irrigation settlements, and reclaiming land, and people in those areas should be granted an A class licence, which would enable the landholders to take water on a *pro rata* basis during a period of restriction.

Why should a person not be able to obtain what I call a B class licence to allow him to use water whilst there is a surplus? He should understand that during a period of restriction he may not be able to obtain water. The Minister will realize that this matter requires much more consideration than merely making a proclamation to prevent the issue of more licences. A person living adjacent to the river and prepared to put in a plant to irrigate land should realize that water may not always be available to him.

Mr. Coumbe: It is a calculated risk.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Of course. The Minister said that a departmental committee would consider the past use of water, and would grant licences that it considered necessary. I know that the committee will be impartial and will do its best, but its control will be limited to 360,000 or 380,000 acre feet a year. The last report of the River Murray Commission states:

On November 4, 1965, the commission, after reviewing its probable resources for the season, decided pursuant to clause 51 of the River Murray Waters Agreement to declare a period of restriction from November 1, and this was the first period of restriction in the commission's history.

The commission was established in 1923 or 1924, but it was not until 1966 that the first restriction was imposed. True, there is another period of restriction this year and one that has more problems for this State. The main conditions of the Murray River is that there is a large surplus: for the next 20 years it will be an average of 6,000,000 acre feet a year. Surely that water will not be allowed to go to waste. I understand that, under the present legislation, we cannot issue the type of licences I suggest but, if it were possible, it is the Minister's duty to ensure that the water is shared fairly during periods of restriction by people with A class licences. During periods of no restrictions B class licences would be issued to anyone wanting to use water, on the understanding that they were taking a calculated risk, and in future shortages the holders of B class licenses would be affected. After

a period of restriction last year, the Government announced that it would grant a large allocation of water to one set of people: not for one living area or for two, but enough water for 50 living areas. There was a new irrigation this year. I cannot believe that that is the proper way to proceed. Everyone along the Murray River has had riparian rights in the past. Why should we give an exorbitantly wide riparian right to one section and then proceed through this measure to take it away from another section?

I accept the position that in a year such as this we must curtail the use of water in order to enable everyone to receive a fair deal. However, when millions of acre feet of water is, in some years, running to waste people should be allowed freely to use that water not only to their own advantage but to the immense advantage of this State's production. Limitations are not imposed in the other States when plenty of water is available. I have in my possession a letter over the Minister's signature stating that a person, who did not apply before March 9, could not pump water. The person concerned wished to establish a small irrigation area; being badly affected by the drought, he wished to conserve feed and had actually made arrangements before the advertised date. However, he had not made any arrangements with the department and, at the same time as he was refused on this basis, surplus water was running to waste. That does not make sense to me.

I suggest that the Minister, having had this motion carried in its amended form, should introduce a new Bill dealing with the control of Murray River waters, in order to meet the present circumstances. I believe that such a measure should provide that existing licences be honoured and that new licences be issued freely subject to a curtailment or even a cessation in time of restriction. In most of the areas concerned irrigation is devoted to growing fodder plants, particularly lucerne, and this is the backbone of the development taking place around the lakes and adjacent to the Murray River. The area is producing fodder which is urgently required and for which a ready market is available; it provides a high protein feed which, under modern manufacturing processes, is of immense value to the poultry industry and other industries in the State.

The costs of installing a plant are small and the land is easily irrigated in the main. The type of crop produced in the area does not really suffer if for a period irrigation has to

cease; lucerne will subsist in the area without receiving any irrigation at all but, of course, the area's productivity is 10-fold if the land can be irrigated. I hope that the Government will examine the whole question much more carefully than it apparently has and that provision will be made for two types of licence—one type to be effective in time of restriction and the other type to be effective at any time when ample water is available.

I was instrumental in freeing people in the upper river area from the charges that had previously been imposed. Licensing up to the present has been maintained more particularly for the purpose of enabling the South Australian authority to furnish the River Murray Commission with accurate figures concerning the diversions from the river that have taken place. Although we abolished the fees, we did not abolish licences *in toto*, because of the necessity to provide this statistical information. I hope that the Minister will examine my suggestion because, as I pointed out, more than three-quarters of the water that comes into South Australia in the next 20 years will run over the barrages at Goolwa and into the sea, a waste that this State cannot afford. That water can be used effectively in the lower river area and around the lakes. Why can we not use it, always remembering that those who apply for licences must clearly understand that their licences will not operate in time of restriction and that they will either have to go without water at such a time or receive a much smaller allocation of water than they normally receive? That would protect the larger established irrigation areas where tree and vine planting has been taking place and would enable the purposes of the Government to be effectively achieved. I hope a system will not be introduced that will prohibit the issuing of licences. I have a copy of a letter, over the Minister's signature, which was sent to an applicant for a licence whose application was refused.

Mr. Curren: To what area does the application refer?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The person concerned wanted to install a small irrigation pump to enable him to grow supplementary fodder for his starving stock. However, he did not apply before March 9, and the Minister's reply stated firmly (and fairly), "It is regretted that no licence can be issued to you under these circumstances." I see no reason on earth why the Minister could not have said that a licence could be granted on the distinct

understanding that it would not cover any period when water restrictions applied. The person concerned could then have taken the calculated risk of installing a pump knowing that, perhaps, once in 10 years he would not be able to use it. In the lakes area, many landholders now appreciate how valuable is water with regard to fodder production: they realize that this is a profitable undertaking. Incidentally, one of the rare exceptions made by the Minister of Irrigation regarding the free-holding of land was to enable an American firm to have about 600 acres on which this type of irrigation was to be carried out. I should like the Minister of Works to assure me that licences to operate when ample water is available will be issued and that there will be no suggestion that we should stop development merely to allow water to flow over the barrages at Goolwa.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the motion. Once again the member for Gumeracha has set up an Aunt Sally and proceeded to throw bricks at it. At no time has any member on this side said that irrigation will be limited to the 360,000 acre feet referred to in the River Murray Waters Agreement.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I have here a refusal of an application.

Mr. CURREN: That is just one case and it was refused in the circumstances that have existed in the last few months. In the past, a landholder could apply for water rights and, without thought to the ultimate benefit of all the water users along the river, an assurance was given to him. Under the previous Government, that system drifted along and no thought was given to the long-term needs of water users on the river.

Mr. Quirke: What is the reason for refusing the one case that has been referred to?

Mr. CURREN: The reason is that, in the circumstances that have operated over the last few months, consideration has been given to the need for further control in issuing water licences and to the total water that can be permanently allocated.

Mr. Quirke: Water is still going out to sea.

Mr. CURREN: I do not dispute that for a moment. However, if firm action is not taken to bring the whole river under control, considering the commitments that have been entered into by departmental officers (commitments made under the previous Government), no water will go to waste in a few years' time in a period of restriction.

Mr. Quirke: I am not interested in that: I am interested in why the one lone application was refused.

Mr. CURREN: Licences for extremely large areas have been applied for but, unless those applying have had written assurances from the department that water will be made available, the applications for a licence have not been granted. This afternoon, on asking the Minister what further licences had been issued, I was told that the matter was still being considered. As a former Minister of Irrigation, the member for Burra must realize that the granting of a permanent water right to any landholder guarantees that landholder a supply of water to cover the area dealt with in the licence. Before any types of licence can be issued, it is necessary that the area defined in the motion should be brought within the provisions of the Control of Waters Act.

The Government envisages that, when surplus water is available, permission will be given for it to be used. At no time has the Government said that the total area under irrigation will be limited to 360,000 acre feet, which is the guaranteed minimum flow under the River Murray Waters Agreement in a period of restriction. The system operating in Victoria regarding water in excess of the allocation under the agreement is known as the water sales system. In July last year there was a suggestion that restrictions would apply to those water users who were on areas that had been permitted to use more than the quantity that could be supplied as the minimum quota under the agreement. That system has operated effectively in the past and, as the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford) has said, water that would otherwise go to waste has been used. In times of restrictions, those areas have been put on a reduced quota or cut out altogether. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): First, I thank members for their interest in the motion and their readiness to debate it at short notice. Particularly I appreciate the co-operation of the Leader of the Opposition. Because of that co-operation, I told him today that the Minister of Irrigation would answer his queries, and this has been done. I am surprised and somewhat disappointed that, apparently, the explanations were not fully understood, because the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford) mentioned the possibility of having two types of licence, an A licence and a B licence. I

submit that provision is already made for such licences, although they are not so designated. The Minister of Irrigation said:

The probable issue of licences for the lower river assures some restriction on the acres to be irrigated. Licences would have to cover all existing established irrigation.

That meant that everyone irrigating in the area now would automatically be granted a licence. That is the kind of licence described as licence A by the member for Gumeracha. Regarding the provisions dealing with what the honourable member described as a B licence, the Minister of Irrigation said:

While considerable concern exists to control diversion water in years of regulated flow it must be remembered that surplus flows will occur in the river quite frequently. In these years, arrangements will need to be made to let special cropping arrangements proceed.

That means, of course, that the water will be used if it is available and cropping can be provided for. However, the users must understand that they proceed at their own risk and that they may not get water in a year of restriction.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They cannot pump water from the river unless they have licences.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That is provided for. They will get a temporary licence, which may be called a special cropping permit. The honourable member referred to the upper reaches of the river and showed that a licence was restricted. It became obvious to the Government and to the department that, if we did not take stock of the position on the river, in future years those who had spent much money in establishing plant and irrigation, planting trees, or as the case might be, would be in trouble. We did not want to put people in that kind of trouble. When we give a person a licence to irrigate, we want to be sure that, if an A class licence is given, the person will have that water available in the worst possible year. We also say that, in a year when there is a good flow of water and water is running over the barrages, we will issue special or temporary licences. I submit that what the honourable member has asked for is already covered by the present provisions.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It is not provided for in the proclamation.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That it is provided for has been recorded many times. No Government, irrespective of its politics, would be silly enough to tell people that they were not to use water that was available. The only time people would be told that they

could not use certain quantities of water would be when that water was not available. That approach is sound economically and it is sound as far as users are concerned. The amendment would make what is intended by the motion impossible to administer. The motion is sound and protects those who have invested money and it will give assistance to those who are prepared to take a risk in relation to restrictions. In view of what my colleague has said about the necessity for control, I urge the House to accept the motion and reject the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Motion carried.

INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

THE ESTIMATES

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 14. Page 1974.)

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH
Hospitals Department, \$22,150,233.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Although the Treasurer said that the Hospitals Fund would greatly assist the finances of the State, no more is provided this year than would have been provided had we not had a fund at all. The proportionate increase in the sum to be spent on hospitals this year is not as great as it has been in the past few years. It is illusory for the Treasurer to say that this fund will assist hospitals: it is merely to assist the general budgetary situation. In 1961-62 the actual expenditure on hospitals was \$12,554,062; in 1962-63 the increase was \$1,333,202; in 1963-64 it was \$1,852,492; in 1965-66 it was \$1,654,858; and in 1966-67 it was \$2,210,034. An increase was made year by year in the actual payments.

However, this year we have an increase that has declined by about \$700,000 to \$1,642,111. The Treasurer said that the sum to be voted from general funds for hospitals was not decreased this financial year and that the extra would come from the Hospitals Fund, but even if we had not had such a fund the present increase would have been necessary.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Unless hospitals are to be starved and not given a proportionate increase.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No-one said that; the increases in the past few years have been to bring us up to the level of other State's spending.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Treasurer satisfied that he has now done this?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Close to it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me make certain that the Treasurer is satisfied that he has brought our standards close to those of other States. As I understand him, if it had not been for the Hospitals Fund he would have pegged the expenditure on hospitals at about the same level as it was last year. Is that the position?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No. You are putting words into my mouth.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I find it difficult to follow the Treasurer, and invite him to explain the position.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I don't mind telling the honourable member a thing or two. I should like to get clear from him whether he thinks we should spend more on hospitals this year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The point I am making—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Do you or don't you think we should spend more on hospitals?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We are not spending any more on hospitals this year than if we had not had a Hospitals Fund, and it is wrong for the Government to suggest that moneys going into that fund are for hospital purposes. They are in aid of the general revenue of the State. Otherwise, it would be neither desirable nor possible to increase the line less than it has been increased now. Figures show that although we have a Hospitals Fund our increase in expenditure this year is substantially less than it was when the Treasurer's predecessor was in office last year. The Treasurer says that he is satisfied that he has brought the standard of hospitals in this State up to about those in other States.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I did not say that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think we will find that *Hansard* shows that you did say that.

Mr. McKee: I think he said "pretty close".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If they are pretty close, I pity hospitals elsewhere. I have a memorandum signed by the Administrator of the Royal Adelaide Hospital dated November 21, 1966, and addressed to many addressees. It had a long distribution list.

Mr. McKee: It is out of date, isn't it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was something put out in the last financial year, the year in which the Treasurer is satisfied that the Labor Government brought the standard of our hospitals pretty close to the standard of those in other States. Although the Treasurer makes a claim like that, let us consider what the Administrator said.

Mr. McKee: That was 12 months ago. Have you heard what he has said recently?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The memo states:

Because of restrictions in the amount of funds made available to the Royal Adelaide Hospital for running expenses during the financial year 1966-67—

and I hope the honourable gentleman has noted that clause—

the board of management has no alternative but to adopt the undermentioned restrictive measures:

- (a) No additional staff will be provided in the current financial year unless the Government makes additional funds available specifically for that purpose.
- (b) No major items of equipment apart from those already on order will be purchased.
- (c) Financial assistance to staff desiring to attend conferences, etc., will be restricted.
- (d) All staff are requested to make every endeavour to reduce the level of expenditure of normal running expenses.

Do the Treasurer and the member for Port Pirie now say, in the light of this memorandum, that we have a satisfactory standard for our hospitals? The memorandum continues:

It is desired that in particular attention be drawn to the following items:

I will not read it all, but I will give the headings of the matters in which it is desired to make some economies, namely, "telephones, postages, and lighting". Under "lighting" we see the following:

Unnecessary lights to be switched off at all times; particular attention to be given to rooms where natural light is available and to corridors during the daytime—

Mr. Langley: What's wrong with that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The memorandum also refers to "foodstuffs, printing and stationery, plant and equipment, linen usage, drugs, disposable paper items, and staff". The following appears under the heading "staff":

Heads of sections and departments to carefully consider the necessity for requesting staff replacements to fill vacancies which may occur. Staff replacements should not be sought merely because there are vacancies in staff establishment. Overtime must not be worked unless the appropriate prior approval is obtained.

The final paragraph is as follows:

The attention of all staff is drawn to the fact that expenditure on new requirements will only be possible if equivalent savings are made in other directions. (Signed) C. J. Rankin, Administrator.

That is a lamentable state of affairs and I believe that a similar memorandum was put out by the Administrator of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We find in a letter appearing in this morning's *Advertiser* a complaint from Geoffrey D. Williamson of Rose Park to the effect that, while the Government has given with one hand (because there have been increases in salary), it has taken away with the other, through increasing the deductions made for allowances (board, etc.). Even though we now have revenue from the Lotteries Commission and the Totalizator Agency Board, the Government is not able to give any more money to this line than it would have given without those additions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): In the first place, the honourable member contested my suggestion that this Government had brought the general spending on hospitals in South Australia up to something close to the level of other States. We have done so. The extra expenditure on hospitals has taken us from the position under the Playford Government consistently of being that State which spent the least per capita on health and hospitals in Australia to something close to the average.

Mr. Coumbe: Oh, no!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the member for Torrens cavils at that statement, I suggest that he look at the Grants Commission's report, which sets out the matter clearly.

Mr. Coumbe: What about community hospitals?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member examines the total sum spent on hospitals, he will find that the sum spent by the Playford Government on health and hospitals per capita since the war was the lowest in Australia and produced the worst ratio of hospital beds to population of any State, as well as the worst ratio of trained medical and nursing staff to population. When this Government took office there was not a piece of land bought or a line on the drawing boards for a teaching hospital.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you satisfied with the action that has been taken since?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am satisfied that, with the planning for general hospitals that has gone on under this Government, compared with the time it took the previous

Government to carry through the planning and erection of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the redevelopment of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, we are producing "instant" hospitals in South Australia. We will not have to wait now for as long as people had to wait under the previous Government. If the Public Works Committee gets on with its job, we will have a new major general hospital under way shortly; what is more, we will have the new teaching hospital erected at the stage when the medical school of the Flinders University is able to provide people for the clinical years.

Mr. Millhouse: They are waiting to know about this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The university has been told that plans for the hospital are being submitted to the Universities Commission along with plans for the erection of a medical school, and erection will proceed at the earliest stage that approval of the commission can be given. I do not know how the honourable member would propose to put up a hospital earlier than that; that is the earliest possible time it can be provided.

Mr. Millhouse: Your predecessor said in his policy speech that it had to be done immediately.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So he did, and this is immediately.

Mr. Millhouse: It is two and a half years later.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member is really intending to be as absurd as he is making himself to the public, I hope he will go on doing it. I hope he will tell his friend (who is standing for the Liberal Party in the Norwood District at the next election) something about the financing of hospitals, because a little letter has gone out in my district suggesting that we should not use money out of trust funds to finance the Budget but that trust funds should be used to provide for the erection of a teaching hospital. Quite obviously, as that person does not know anything about the finances of the State, the member for Mitcham could give him a little instruction. The honourable member has delivered himself of a furious attack on the subject of moneys provided for work on the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I suggest to the honourable member that he turn to page 112 of the Auditor-General's Report (which he obviously has not bothered to read), where he will find the following remarks:

The net cost to Consolidated Revenue for this hospital in 1966-67 was \$6,696,000 (\$6,096,000 in 1965-66).

Therefore, there has been an increase of \$600,000.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you like to say anything about the memorandum to which I referred?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is not the first time a memorandum of that type has gone out in the Hospitals Department or in any other department to simply point out to people within that department that rigid economies must be exercised and extravagances must not be indulged in. May I take the honourable member back to the times when year in and year out in this place we pointed to the inadequate finances provided for this hospital by the previous Government which produced the most antediluvian conditions, things which were an absolute disgrace to the State. Now that we are getting reasonable conditions at the hospital, the honourable member complains.

He said that we were getting no benefit whatever from the lotteries which he said were merely relieving the revenue of the State. What we said at the time of the creation of the Lotteries Commission was that these moneys would be additional to the sums normally provided by the State. We have provided the normal amount of moneys. True, the Hospitals Department from year to year has had some increases in some directions and some decreases in others. However, if the honourable member looks at the sums that are specifically given to the various hospitals under this line, he will see that they are getting decided increases and, in most cases, increases well beyond what was ever previously provided to them. The honourable member said that that was doing nothing for the hospitals: he is welcome to make a political statement like that if he wants to but he will not convince anybody.

Mr. Millhouse: The figures speak for themselves.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The figures are speaking for themselves at present to the people of the State, who know perfectly well the benefits they are getting at this time. We have signally increased the money available for hospitals in South Australia over the period of this Government's term in office. The increases given to hospitals, through "Chief Secretary—Miscellaneous", and in assistance generally have been considerably more than the increases made by the previous Government. We have gradually brought planning and assistance to hospitals and health services in South Australia up towards the levels that obtain in the other

States. What is now being provided from the Hospitals Fund will provide an extra increase, and I am not sorry to see that increase. Apparently the honourable member had to find something to cavil at; he then put on an antic in this place. It is strange that, in the time the honourable member was sitting behind the previous Government (at a time when the spending on hospitals in this State per head of population was the lowest in Australia), not a word did he utter about the matter.

Mr. Millhouse: That is not true.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: How many times did the honourable member protest? When did the honourable member back up the former member for Glenelg in what he said about the building of a hospital in the south-western suburbs?

Mr. Millhouse: I refer the honourable gentleman to the debate on the Estimates in 1956. Go back and look at that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly do that for the honourable member, because I am sorry if my memory is insufficient. If the honourable member did say something then I applaud his doing so.

Mr. Millhouse: Check your facts before you make comments.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's remarks on the subject were so utterly infrequent that I must confess that in the relevant time I cannot remember anything of them. However, the honourable member cannot say that the Opposition at that time did not refer to this matter: we were constantly raising it. Now that we are in Government, we have done something about it.

Mr. COUMBE: It may well be that more moneys are being spent on hospitals and, if that is so, it is welcome. The Treasurer said that it was agreed that the money from lotteries and the Totalizator Agency Board would augment the sums normally available for hospitals. However, the Estimates show that, when the amount provided from the Hospitals Fund is put aside, the normal revenue increase is only \$3,000 out of a total expenditure of \$24,683,000. That sum would not cover even the normal increase in office expenses in a year. We know that wages last year increased by an average of 6 per cent. The total allocation for wage increases in the Hospitals Department, leaving aside any other increases, was \$1,095,000. This poses the important question whether in future years we will require that this amount be maintained or whether we can expect that the amount allocated from general revenue will increase each year. I

expect that the Hospitals Fund will be paying more and more but is the Consolidated Revenue Account also to be called on for a similar amount? I suggest that the statement by the Government that not 1c less from Consolidated Revenue would be spent in one year compared with the previous year is not being carried out, because the amount of \$3,000 **does not take into account** depreciation or the normal increases in running expenses, or wage increases.

I should like the Treasurer to say whether this amount is to be taken as a base rate or whether reasonable payments will be made from Consolidated Revenue in addition to amounts paid from the Hospitals Fund. The extra amount received from the Hospitals Fund is set out. I agree with that payment, but last year \$3,559,000 came from Consolidated Revenue, whereas this year the amount has increased to \$3,563,000, an increase of only \$4,000. This infinitesimal increase does not cover the normal increases that occur each year, let alone additions. It is important to appreciate what the position next year will be. Will the Consolidated Revenue Account provide a greater amount or are we to take this as a base amount?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No specific base amount has been fixed, nor can that be done in connection with the normal increase from Consolidated Revenue, because there has not been such an increase on the various lines.

Mr. Coumbe: Wages increased 6 per cent last year, for a start.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have said that we would not decrease the amount, that we would try to maintain the normal Consolidated Revenue obligation. I cannot bind myself to a formula that is incapable of fixation. The Government aims to provide the moneys from the Hospitals Fund to swell the spending, not simply to take that money into the normal spending on hospitals.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I was interested in the Treasurer's outline of the Government's policy for three years in regard to providing for hospitals. On a *per capita* basis, which basis the Treasurer has been referring to, less is being provided this year from revenue than was provided last year. He says that from all revenue sources the Government has provided less this year.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What do you mean by "all revenue sources"?

Mr. HALL: The budgetary sources, such as the Totalizator Agency Board and the others.

The Government is happy to have the South Australian public believe that they will receive additional hospital benefits from the Hospitals Fund, and it has deliberately so misled them. I and other members said in the debate on the Bill to set up the lotteries that the lotteries would provide the normal increase that the Government should provide for hospitals. I am not too critical about their doing that, but the Government should not make false claims about it. The people of South Australia ought to know that the proceeds of lottery tickets they buy are relieving the Government from its obligation to make payments for hospitals. Regardless of how the Treasurer presents the matter, a hospital at Tea Tree Gully would have been built and in operation today but for the interference of the present Government. The people of the area would have had a complete service, additional to the present facilities.

Mr. Langley: How do you prove that?

Mr. HALL: The honourable member ought to read the relevant communications. He can get in touch with the chairman of the council, if he wishes and study the position. Apparently, he has not done that yet.

Mr. Burdon: You tell us how you prove it.

Mr. Langley: After all the years in which you did nothing about it, and now you tell us that!

Mr. HALL: One reason behind the Government's inactivity is that it has been pushing expansion through the Budget into areas of finance that do not give growth. It has pushed down the subsidies to non-government buildings by about \$5,000,000 last year and \$7,000,000 this year. The Government cannot do that again. It cannot afford to push the State further into deficit in another financial year. The Loan Fund will stabilize at \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 each year. The Government cannot take another \$5,000,000 from that fund and load the trust funds with any significant debt. An important feature of the Budget is the hospitals that are not being built by the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader and the members for Gumeracha and Mitcham know that they are presenting to the people of this State an impossible piece of arithmetic. This Government has increased taxation to a lesser extent than have their Liberal colleagues, but the Opposition does not believe that we should grant additional moneys to hospitals, and issues pamphlets stating that the State taxation is too high. It has become impossible for each State to balance its Budget, because of

the things done by the Commonwealth Government. But the Leader states that the Treasurer of this State is always blaming the Commonwealth Government. I should like to read the following instructive passage:

It is at this very point, and in these simple terms, that the Governments of the States in Australia, maybe in varying degree, come up against the greatest problem faced by practically any Government anywhere in the world. This is no matter of theory. It is a simple and straightforward cold hard fact of life. It is a fact of life which has been distorted and camouflaged by the enemies of State Government for a long time. Because it springs from the crushing way in which the Commonwealth Government has chosen to use its dominant financial powers under the Constitution, it was long regarded not as a problem, but as an inevitable and irrational protest by the States against the Commonwealth Government. I am greatly heartened by the fact that more and more people, particularly men in business and industry, have come to realize that the States have very real and acute financial difficulties. Ever since we have been in Government I have spoken of these problems, and have warned of the inevitable consequences of allowing things to continue as they are. For a long time—too long—the powerful propaganda forces of the Commonwealth Government were able to create the impression that we were crying wolf, but I am encouraged to find a general realization of the truth of what we have been saying. Wherever I go today I find that there is a widespread recognition of the financial problems of the States and a realization of the need for change. That is to say, wherever I go except in Canberra. There I and my colleagues, the Premiers of the other States, still find an ostrich-like attitude which seeks to deny the problem.

They are the words of Sir Henry Bolte, and it is about time that the Opposition learned arithmetic from him. He has increased taxation in Victoria by about 20 per cent during the life of this Government, but the increase in this State is about 3.2 per cent. Opposition members require us to reduce taxation, spend more money, and yet balance the Budget.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer knows that he has delayed increases in taxation by measures that cannot be repeated.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have not funded my Loan moneys as others have done.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer knows that he has loaded the responsibility from the Budget to Loan Account: he has used trust funds, and funds available from lotteries and T.A.B. These funds will not be available in the future at the present rate, and all he is doing is putting off the day when this Government must meet its responsibilities. The Treasurer criticizes the Commonwealth Government but continually asks it for more money. He has

granted an additional week's leave to public servants at an estimated cost of about \$1,750,000 a year, but is not in favour of the Commonwealth Government granting the same privilege.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As I understand the Treasurer, the new teaching hospital is to be considered when the Australian Universities Commission is able to make appropriate payments to pay for it, but the hospital will not be available until the payment is approved by this commission. If that position had applied in the past there would not be one teaching hospital in Australia, because every teaching hospital was established before the commission operated.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You are wrong about that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Queen Elizabeth Hospital was established before the commission operated. The statement made by the former Treasurer (Hon. Frank Walsh) at the last elections, namely, that a Labor Government would proceed to build two new general hospitals, was purely and simply a political promise. In fact, had one such hospital miraculously come into operation on the day after it was promised, we would have had a hospital the funds, staff and occupants for which did not exist.

Referring to the "monthly average of staff employed by the Hospitals Department during the past five years", the Auditor-General did not give the increased figure for 1963 (I presume it was nil), but in 1964 (under the previous Liberal Government) there was an increase of 386; in 1965 (again, under the previous Government), an increase of 360; and in 1966, under the new Government, it had dropped to 124. In 1967, some lost ground apparently having been regained, the figure had risen to 203. The monetary increases referred to by the Treasurer probably arise from inefficient management.

The Public Works Committee referred in its original report on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to the fact that the matter had first been referred to the committee on October 31, 1946. That report was dated June 23, 1948, and in the intervening period the Public Buildings Department was preparing plans for submission to the medical authorities, trying to obtain their approval. It will be a sorry day indeed for the hospitalization of people in this State if we have to depend, before commencing a scheme, on the recommendation of the Universities Commission, which has never been responsible for hospitalization: it has merely

said that it will assist in regard to special teaching facilities that are required by the universities. The contribution from the Lotteries Commission is an advantage in establishing hospitals. However, the Government promised to erect two hospitals and it has not kept that promise.

Mr. COURCEL: I wish to refer to the erection of chapels at mental hospitals, particularly those at Hillcrest and Glenside. Most other Government hospitals of any size have chapels. Patients and welfare workers have spoken to me about this matter, apparently having raised it in the past with the Government. In 1964, the then Minister of Health announced that tenders would be called for chapels at Hillcrest and Glenside. However, since then nothing has been done. As these chapels would be of great benefit to people in these hospitals and as the Labor Party policy speech stated that the Labor Party would carry out everything promised by the previous Government, can the Treasurer say when these chapels will be built and why they have not been built yet?

Mrs. STEELE: I want to refer to a vagueness of nomenclature. The Estimates refer to physiotherapists at some hospitals, for instance, at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, (Northfield wards) and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but to therapists in the case of the Morris Hospital, the Glenside Hospital, the Hillcrest Hospital, the Enfield Receiving House, and the St. Corantyn Psychiatric Day Hospital. Of course, therapists could cover many disciplines. What does the term "therapist" embrace? In this State we do not have a school for occupational or speech therapists, a lack that is badly felt. The reference to "therapists" is vague and could give the wrong impression. Only with regard to the Community Mental Health Centres at Parkside and Woodville are occupational therapists so named; both those places are after-care centres for intellectually retarded people. This term is exceedingly vague: I know that the Glenside Hospital has at least one occupational therapist. I should like to know what therapists are employed in the hospitals to which I have referred. Although I cannot believe there are only two occupational therapists employed in South Australia, if that is a fact the position is even worse than I expected.

Occupational therapists play a vital part in the rehabilitation of patients of all kinds, whether patients of mental hospitals or general hospitals. What they do to help patients regain their health and the use of their limbs is known to anybody who knows anything

about rehabilitation. In South Australia there is a lamentable lack of training for this type of discipline. With Dr. Donald Dowie, who is the head of the Commonwealth establishment at St. Marys, I introduced a deputation to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Health. We put to the Ministers the need for a school for occupational therapy in South Australia. They were sympathetic to our deputation and promised to call for a report on the matter, saying that they would advise us in due course. At present the question of these particular disciplines is being investigated at the Institute of Technology. The Martin Report recommended that these types of discipline were viable at institutes of technology, since the universities were not able to cater for them, as they were only under-graduate courses. As they were under-graduate courses, they could not attract Commonwealth funds but, if they were established within the ambit of an institute of technology, they qualified for those funds. Many people are interested in what is to be the outcome of the case presented for a school of occupational therapy in South Australia. We are far behind the other States, and I have previously given particulars of the numbers of occupational therapists employed and trained in the other States at this moment. We need many more than 50 occupational therapists if we are to have our full quota. However, if we take the document before us literally, we have only two, both of whom are at hospitals or community centres that provide for former mental patients. We must remedy this lack if we are to play our part in rehabilitating patients in both general and mental hospitals.

We cannot expect the other States to continue to generously make available places in their schools of occupational therapy for our students. This is the only State that at present has not such a school and it is time we followed the lead of the other States by establishing one. I urge the Government to do what has been done in Victoria, where the Government has provided a modern school, lecturers and facilities. I understand that this school was provided much more cheaply than had been thought. The school caters for the three therapies, physiotherapy, occupational therapy and speech therapy. There is also need in South Australia for a school for speech therapists, because we need more of these people to meet the requirements of those who suffer from speech defects. I draw the Government's attention to the vagueness of the nomenclature

and the fact that we woefully lack skilled people of this kind.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: There are speech therapists in the Education Department.

Mrs. STEELE: There are so few that they cannot cater for the needs of our people. For instance, people who suffer strokes may need the services of speech therapists. All these therapists form a team that is recognized in the other States as playing an important part in the rehabilitation of patients.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The erection of the teaching hospital is important, and it is notorious that the authorities at the Flinders University are waiting to know when they can go ahead to establish a medical school. They have been waiting on the Government for some time, but the Government has taken no action. The Government cannot escape the responsibility for the fact that this project is lagging. It was common ground when this Government assumed office that a teaching hospital was required.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is a flat, plain untruth and you know it. You are talking through the back of your neck and you know you are talking nonsense. Nothing was done by the Playford Government, and it refused to do anything.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The former Secretary of Actors' Equity should reserve his histrionics for other places. Apparently he needs to do this to bolster his weak position.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: If you spoke with a basis of principle and truth people would listen to you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is what I have said correct or not?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is untrue, and you know it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is perfectly true, and is recognized and accepted throughout the community, particularly amongst members of the medical profession. The Government cannot escape the fact that if we had won the election in 1965 there would be a hospital at Modbury today. It is strange that the member for the district does not ask about its progress now. The last questions she asked have never been answered nor has she pursued them. I wonder how she explains the situation to her constituents. I remind the Treasurer that in his predecessor's policy speech much attention was given to mental health.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: To what line are you speaking?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Treasurer trying to avoid answering me by asking for a specific line. Referring to the general topic of mental health, I ask the Treasurer to say whether his Government's plans are still the same as those announced in the policy speech of his predecessor, who said:

Labour will—

i. Immediately increase Government infirm-ary accommodation, and

ii. subsidize the erection and running of small cottage district infirmaries in co-operation with voluntary organizations which have already indicated their willingness—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: How does this come under "Mental Health"?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Treasurer trying to avoid answering?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Then let me finish. The quotation continues:

—to help in such projects.

iii. Immediately speed up the re-housing of mental hospital patients in modern buildings adequate for their needs.

There is no point in the Treasurer's searching diligently for the lines to cover this, because there aren't any. Does the Government intend to honour its promises: if it does, when does it intend to take action on these lines?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Playford Government proposed a community hospital that was completely inadequate for the needs of the Modbury area as revealed in the report of the Town Planning Committee. That Government did not intend to pay any attention to the recommendations of that committee. It had the report for three years and did nothing, and it was left to this Government to take action. We planned a hospital at Modbury in accordance with the needs of the population in that area. The initial plans for the area were shown to be inadequate because of the expected population development. The modified plan will be seen by the member for Mitcham shortly. At the last election we promised that something would be done about a teaching hospital. The Playford Government had realized that something should be done to develop teaching hospital facilities. Why did the previous Liberal Government do absolutely nothing at all?

Mr. Millhouse: Why haven't you done something about it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether the honourable member thinks that the acquisition of the land, the preparation of the plans and a submission to the Universities

Commission constitute nothing. All I can say is that it is vastly more than the previous Government ever did.

Mr. Millhouse: Has it gone to the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course not. If this Government had planned to proceed with a teaching hospital without getting the support of the Commonwealth Government, honourable members opposite would have got up in screaming fury and said, "We're missing out on Commonwealth finance to support our propositions!"

Mrs. Steele: We really did miss out.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have not missed out.

Mrs. Steele: You nearly did.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What absolute nonsense! I do not know what the honourable member is muttering in her beard about, or what her Government ever did; it did not acquire any land, and it had no line on the drawing board or a proposal for any teaching hospital facilities at all. Honourable members get up here in utter hypocrisy; they are desperate for something about which they can tell the public but which they do not want. How many untruths have they told about this! The Government has done something in this area, and it has prepared plans for a general hospital at Modbury to go to the Public Works Committee; it has bought the land and prepared the plans to go to the Universities Commission for a teaching hospital at Flinders Park and it will have that hospital ready at the time that the Flinders University has its teaching facilities developed and can provide students for the clinical years in the hospital.

Mr. Millhouse: When will that be?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The hospital will be built by the time students can be provided for the clinical years of their school.

Mr. Nankivell: A teaching hospital needs to be well established before it is ready to train students.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Albert obviously has not examined the hospital facilities available in the metropolitan area and what will be provided to relieve the Royal Adelaide and the Queen Elizabeth Hospitals. We need to have the hospital at the Flinders University developed by the time we are proposing, and we have said that that hospital will be there. The previous Government had no proposals whatever for a medical school at the Flinders University; the only thing that was ever proposed by the previous Liberal Treasurer was the development of a teaching hospital

and a teaching school in the third university institution which at some time, on land unacquired, was to be developed in the Tea Tree Gully area. Indeed, the former Liberal Treasurer made that statement in this Chamber. How can members, with any sort of sincerity, truth or honour, say the kind of things they are saying at the moment? Theirs is just the Goebbels technique and nothing more.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot allow the Treasurer to speak like that and to go unchallenged. I regret that he did not see fit to tell the Committee when the hospital will be ready for the medical students who are to be prepared by the Flinders University. He will not get up now to give an answer to what I asked, because he does not know the answer, nor does any member of the Government know the answer.

Mr. Curren: Do you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course I do not: I am not in the Government. In reply to the member from up the river, I point out that the Government has had two and a half years now to do something and to fix a date at which this hospital will be ready and at which it can start to train medical students from the Flinders University. It is recognized throughout Australia that of all the newly-established universities in Australia in the last few years the Flinders University is by far and away the best planned, and its plan the best executed of any, and that is because of the work and foresight of the previous Liberal Government.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Who put through the legislation setting it up?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Treasurer believe that anybody will accept that? Who did all the planning work?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am not sure whether I heard the honourable member correctly. He is discussing planning. To which institution is he referring?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am referring to the Flinders University of South Australia, which we are discussing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member cannot discuss the Flinders University on this line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think we were discussing the medical school.

The CHAIRMAN: When I asked the honourable member what he was discussing, he said that it was the Flinders University. He says now that it is the medical school. I am ruling on the basis of his answer to my first question: the Flinders University is not included on the line and cannot be discussed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I have made the point, anyway. The point I make is that Flinders University—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Flinders University cannot be discussed by the Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would not dream of going against your ruling. I think I have made the two points I wished to make: first, the Treasurer will not, because he cannot, give us a date for the establishment of the medical school and the coming into operation of the teaching hospital; secondly, great credit is due to the previous Government for its planning and the way the Flinders University was established.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assure the honourable member that I will not tonight—

Mr. Millhouse: I knew you wouldn't.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —make an announcement about the date of the development of the medical school or the development of the teaching hospital at Flinders University. I will make that announcement in due course this year, and the announcement will be in accordance with the Government's plans. The honourable member may protest like the fabled lady—

Mr. Millhouse: Do stop acting!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He may protest as much as he likes but what he cannot get over is the fact that there was no plan by the previous Government whatever for the development of the medical school at Flinders University or the development of further teaching hospital facilities in South Australia even though under the previous Government more than half the applicants for the existing medical school were turned away every year because of inadequate teaching facilities. Under the previous Government, this included even people who had Commonwealth scholarships for medicine.

Mr. Millhouse: You said "more than half"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. Millhouse: There was not even a quota.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member seems to have forgotten that there most certainly was a quota applying to medicine under the previous Government. The honourable member seems to have forgotten also that numbers of people were being turned away from medical school.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: You said "more than half"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. Millhouse: When was that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the last year the Playford Government was in office.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Only one member will address the Committee from now on. The honourable the Treasurer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member and his Leader at that time knew perfectly well what the limitations were on the medical school and how they would develop. They have developed to a stage where very much more than half of those who apply these days to take the course of medicine are turned away. It is a serious position indeed.

Mr. Coumbe: Only because of the quota.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it is because of the quota. The difficulty we are facing here is that there has been no forward planning of additional medical school facilities in South Australia. Under the previous Government, there was no proposal for an additional medical school or for additional medical staff apart from what was to be developed at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; this was in a situation where we had the worst ratio of trained medical staff to population of any State in the Commonwealth. The previous Government knew that and did nothing. The honourable member for Mitcham tries to claim credit for the Flinders University. There was no plan under the previous Government at Bedford Park (as it was then known, as a department of the Adelaide University) for development of medical schools; I challenge the honourable member to produce one. It is only under this Government that it has been developed.

Mr. Coumbe: Wasn't an area set aside for future planning?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No area was set aside for the development of a teaching hospital there.

Mr. Coumbe: For a medical school?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Various possibilities were taken into account for medical schools but no decision had been taken for their development. The only announcement made by Sir Thomas Playford in this place about the development of further teaching hospital facilities was that they would be associated with the development of a third tertiary institution in the Tea Tree Gully area.

Mr. Millhouse: Why has the Modbury project priority over the Flinders University project?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Modbury project does not need to have support from the Commonwealth Government, nor does it

need its planning to be integrated with the development of a medical school. However, I assure the honourable member that when the Modbury project is presented to the Public Works Committee it will be so planned that it will be possible for additional teaching facilities to be developed there for the provision of the number of registrars (who, at the moment, cannot get hospital appointments and, in the projected future, will not be able to get hospital appointments) who are coming from the Adelaide medical school. The Modbury hospital can be proceeded with reasonably soon: it is a much simpler project than the one at Flinders University.

This afternoon we heard the member for Gumeracha eloquently orating about the lack of necessity for our getting Commonwealth assistance for teaching hospital facilities and saying that we should proceed with them without the agreement of the Commonwealth. I am amazed at that, in view of the things said by honourable members opposite about the development of teaching hospital facilities and about the necessity of our getting Commonwealth support for our projects. In view of what has happened under the Australian Universities Commission, if we were now to refuse to take into account the money that we could get from the Commonwealth for the development of teaching hospital facilities we would be grossly negligent. The member for Gumeracha challenged me this afternoon about the development of teaching hospital facilities elsewhere. Apparently he has not been in on the development of teaching hospital facilities in association with the University of New South Wales. If he had read the Universities Commission's reports, he would know something about this. In fact, it was proposed to develop a teaching hospital at some distance from the University of New South Wales, and the Universities Commission refused its support for the project: that support was not negligible; it was considerable. We cannot afford to develop a teaching hospital, which requires much more expensive accommodation than an ordinary general hospital, without getting the support of the Commonwealth for the project: it would be absurd for the State to proceed in that way. What we have done is to get the land and develop the plans so that we are in a position to get support from the Commonwealth to have the teaching hospital there at a time when those who come out of the university to do their clinical years at the

hospital will be in a position to take part in the work at the hospital.

As compared with the development of hospitals by the previous Government, this is vastly quicker development. The member for Gumeracha knows that perfectly well. I know that he spoke this afternoon (no doubt he will speak again this evening) in his usual mischievous fashion in order to get a political point across; he ignored what he knew were the facts in this matter. However, we are all used to that. The honourable member knows, when he is hiding his smile behind his hand, that what I am saying is correct and is perfectly just. The development of teaching hospitals now requires the support of the Commonwealth, and I feel sure we are going to get that support. We will have the hospital and the medical school (none of these things were planned by the previous Government), so that we will have an addition to the trained medical staff in South Australia, as a result of the actions of this Government, far ahead of what would have been developed from any of the plans that were even propounded by the previous Government, for indeed nothing was on the drawing board at all.

Mr. COUMBE: This afternoon the Treasurer referred to moneys being spent on hospitals by the present Government. He said that the previous Government had neglected the hospital services of the State to such an extent that we had one of the lowest ratios of beds to population in Australia. He then said that the standard of hospitals in this State had been raised to somewhere about the average. In view of this, I set to work to see where the money had been spent on improving these services. As one of the principal ways in which a Government can improve services is by providing more beds, I examined those figures for Government hospitals, especially those in the metropolitan area. That is because I assume that that is where the greatest development will take place and that this money will take effect in this direction. The Auditor-General's Report shows that at June 30 last 1,867 beds were available in all Government metropolitan area hospitals, excluding mental hospitals. At June 30, 1965, after the so-called wicked Liberal and Country League Government that had neglected conditions in this State had gone out of office, the number was 1892. There are now 25 fewer beds in the hospitals I have referred to than there were at June 30, 1965. There is an increase in the country, mainly because of the completion of the Port Lincoln Hospital.

Mr. Quirke: And the Mount Gambier Hospital.

Mr. COUMBE: I think the Mount Gambier Hospital was completed at about the time of the last election, but the Port Lincoln Hospital was completed last year.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No, before the last election.

Mr. COUMBE: Well, that makes the position worse.

Mr. Casey: I think it makes it sound better.

Mr. COUMBE: In one financial statement the Treasurer has provided money for the completion of work at the Port Lincoln Hospital. Because I thought that increased standards might have been effected by the sudden employment of additional staff, I checked the employment figures for Government hospitals in the Auditor-General's Report. In 1964 there was an increase over the previous year of 386. In 1965 there was an increase of 360. In 1966, the first year of the new Administration's term, the increase had slumped markedly to 124, or about one-third of the figure for the previous year. In 1967 it recovered somewhat to 203 but was still a little more than half the figure for the previous year. Therefore, much of the additional expenditure has not gone into increased staff.

Another possibility is equipment. Naturally, each year we have to provide additional and more sophisticated equipment. The Treasurer's statement that all of a sudden his Government changed a parlous position was not true. I should like the Treasurer to give the Committee his figures. The figures I have given relate to Government hospitals other than mental hospitals and do not include subsidized hospitals.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has misquoted me. What I said was that we had improved the expenditure per capita on hospitals in South Australia to about the Australian level. The honourable member has cited the number of beds provided. He is a member of the Public Works Committee and he must have been talking with tongue in cheek, because he knows perfectly well that, in the redevelopment of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, necessarily there was a reduction in the number of beds at one stage so that the redevelopment could take place. He also knows that, with the development of the other general hospitals which have been mooted by the Government and which the Public Works Committee will be considering soon, the ratio of beds to population will be boosted enor-

mously. In the meantime, the actual expenditure on hospital services has been increased markedly.

Mr. Coumbe: In what way?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The tables show that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer said that, because of the inadequacy of the medical school, fewer than half the students who wanted to attend were able to get in. A quota for the medical school was established in the last year of my Government's term, in opposition to my Government's special request to the university. In the previous year 132 students (all who had applied) had been taken in. However, the University Council decided to introduce a quota of 120 students. In that year there were 124 applicants and I pointed out to the Chancellor that if the university could have taken 132 in the previous year, surely it could take 124 in that year. This statement will be supported by correspondence from the university. The university assured me that the four students eliminated were not up to the required standard. The Treasurer's statement that more than half the students applying to enter the medical school were admitted is untrue. After the first year that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was erected the Australian Universities Commission did not give this State the same grant that it had given to universities in other States, because it stated that the facilities at that hospital were not being used.

A teaching hospital in the southern district was planned by the Playford Government and land was purchased at Oaklands, but the Highways Department wanted part of the land to be used for the new freeway. Apparently, in trying to escape from the serious position in which the Government is now in because of its specific promises, the Treasurer is making wild statements that are completely untrue. The hospital services about which the Treasurer has spoken today were all established by the Playford Government. The Labor Government's promise of two more general hospitals in the metropolitan area has not eventuated, because they are not yet off the drawing board. Also, the erection of the teaching hospital has to await the will of the Australian Universities Commission. I know that people in the Modbury area are concerned that the promise was made of a hospital in that area, but the provision for it was stopped and, except for the Treasurer's words, nothing has happened.

Mr. HUDSON: In 1964-65, \$5,000,000 was provided for hospital buildings, but \$9,060,000 is provided this year. Much of this expenditure

is involved at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in demolishing wards to build new ones, thus reducing the number of beds available at present. There will be a period during which there will not be an increase in the number of beds at that hospital. During the three years from 1958-59 to 1961-62, provision for the Hospitals Department for current expenditure increased from \$9,144,000 to \$12,617,000. During the next three years the figure changed from \$12,617,000 to \$16,716,000 in 1964-65. For the coming financial year the allocation is \$22,150,000, an increase of about \$5,500,000. On account of the budgetary action of the current Government, there has been over the last three years a bigger rate of increase than occurred over the previous six years. On account also of the Government hospital building programme, comparing 1967-68 with 1964-65, there has been an 80 per cent increase in the financial provision (from \$5,000,000 to \$9,000,000). I suggest that these facts speak for themselves.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The facts do speak for themselves: not one single hospital project has been planned or commenced during the life of this Government. It is well known that the member for the district concerned, who now occupies a high office in this Chamber, made the strongest representations to the previous Government for work on the Port Augusta Hospital to be commenced. Some disappointment having been expressed in Port Augusta when the previous Government decided to build a hospital at Port Lincoln, a firm undertaking was given that the next hospital built by the previous Government would be at Port Augusta. That has not eventuated. For reasons probably best known to itself, the present Government did not seem to think it necessary to canvass a hospital project in the district represented by the Speaker, because that was not politically necessary. But it was politically necessary to canvass hospitals in some other districts, and statements were made accordingly. In my opinion, expenditure standing in its own account does not mean anything. One does not necessarily gauge the results of or improvements to hospital accommodation by merely examining an increase in the total money expended.

According to the Auditor-General, at pages 120-121 of his report, the Group Laundry has advanced to a point where its initial difficulties (if any existed) have been overcome. The plant is apparently working smoothly and effectively and the quantity of linen treated is growing annually. It is indeed pleasing

to see that this project is functioning as well as the optimists forecast that it would. As the laundry has increased its activities, so has the cost of treating a pound of linen decreased, and we have arrived at the time again when, according to the Auditor-General, the rate can be reduced even further. I believe that the charges should again be reviewed and any savings passed on to the institutions concerned. The progress that has been made reflects much credit on the manager (Mr. Spencer), if he is still the officer concerned (he was at least responsible for selecting the plant that was installed). Will the Treasurer say whether charges will be reviewed? Is the laundry nearing its capacity or will it be able to take in linen from other institutions? If additional Government or semi-government institutions do not require the laundry's service, will the service be prepared to accept laundry from other institutions, including hospitals, in the city?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am gratified that the honourable member is so gratified himself about the development of the Group Laundry and Central Linen Service. I understand that at the moment the service is working to capacity. A suggestion that some additional laundry facilities be provided is at present being investigated and it is not intended at the moment to revise the present charges, until we know what additional equipment might be required and where it might be located.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Will you check on the capacity, because I have reason to believe that the service is working to capacity now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. I had understood that it was working to capacity and that a possibility existed of additional capacity being provided either on the premises or elsewhere. I will obtain a reply for the honourable member on this score. However, I remind him that, concerning the Port Augusta Hospital, he seems to have overlooked the considerable sum spent in developing the Whyalla Hospital in the region. A revised plan has been prepared for the Port Augusta Hospital, a model made and a date set for the rebuilding of that hospital. All is in train for an effective reorganization of the hospital in the general Loan programme. The overall expenditure on the development of hospitals has been considerable under this Government, and it will be stepped up with the development of the Port Augusta Hospital and with the two new major general hospitals in the metropolitan area.

Line passed.

Department of Public Health, \$1,006,654.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer under this line to drugs, a matter that has come to some considerable prominence in South Australia in the last few weeks, I am thankful to say not because there are allegations of widespread drugging in this State but because fears have been expressed that what is apparently developing in other places, even in Australia, is likely to happen here too. On August 30 the Treasurer was asked a question by the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip). Frankly, I was extremely disappointed in the reply given by the Treasurer. Quite frankly, I consider that in his reply he brushed off the member for Rocky River.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's a shame!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is a matter on which I am very perturbed, and I should have thought the Minister of Lands would be perturbed, too. He, like me, has young children growing up, and this is a great danger that is facing this community, particularly the children of this community. I think this question is something that should be taken seriously, and I hope that the Minister will take it seriously and not try to inject any Party politics into it.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: They are acting in New South Wales.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently this Government is not going to act here, because this is what the Treasurer said, and this is what disappointed me:

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.

Then he said he would get a report from his colleague, the Minister of Health, and bring down a considered reply. We have heard nothing more about this, although that was nearly three weeks ago. The problem here, as I understand it, is that this new drug lysergic acid diethylamide (L.S.D., as it is called) is a drug which is fraught with very great dangers both physical and, as I understand it, moral.

The problem is that it is a drug which can easily be made. It is not like drugs such as opium or heroin or marijuana, which are imported. As it has been explained to me by one medical man, a matriculation chemistry student may make up this drug if he or she wants to, and this is where the danger lies. It is so easy to make and, therefore, so easy to procure. Personally I find drugging one

of the most repellent malpractices that can be imagined, far worse than many other things. I am afraid that it could get a hold in this community (and there is a real danger, as we have seen from the experience of other communities) if something is not done about it.

It is all very well to say that. What are we going to do about it? First, the law should be made crystal clear that it is illegal not only to take this stuff but to traffic in it and to manufacture it. This should be done immediately, and we should do our very best to see that this drugging does not start happening in our schools because this is where we are likely to have the most serious trouble. That is what we should do to try to see that it does not happen here. However, we should also do rather more than that, because that is merely negative. I believe we should take positive action to warn people in this community, especially schoolchildren, of the dangers of drugging and particularly of this specific drug.

This is something that I believe should be done through the schools by definite instruction. I am sorry the Minister of Education is not here, because I suggest to him that instruction should be given in our secondary schools on the risks the children are running if they indulge in this practice: once they are hooked (I think that is the word) they find it extremely hard to get free of the drug. I hope that both lines of action will be pursued in South Australia: that we will, as in New South Wales, prohibit this drug; and that we will warn the community of the dreadful danger this can be to us.

Mr. HEASLIP: I support the member for Mitcham's remarks regarding drug addiction in South Australia. On August 30 I asked whether the Treasurer would introduce legislation to control the trade in drugs, and he said he had not heard of any misuse of the drug L.S.D. in South Australia. Because I regarded the matter as urgent, I asked another question on the following day, and the Treasurer replied that he could not understand why I had asked another question when I had not given him time to inquire.

What prompted me to ask my question was a report in the *Advertiser* of August 30. A newspaper police reporter, who is an ex-policeman and an ex-drug addict, stated in a report that this drug was manufactured and sold in Adelaide. He said also that a supply of locally manufactured L.S.D. was sold by six young men who, for \$7, made sufficient of the drug to give the user a seven-hour "trip".

A person using this drug could end his life in a mental hospital. Of course, the effects of the drug may not be seen immediately: they could be delayed for 12 months. However, L.S.D. is not included in the list of dangerous drugs. I asked the Treasurer to see that young people in South Australia were protected from the drug as far as we could protect them. In reply, the Minister of Social Welfare concluded his report by saying that the importation and sales of L.S.D. were fully controlled, but that the best means of prohibiting the unauthorized manufacture or possession of L.S.D. and related drugs were being examined. All I asked originally was that the Government consider introducing legislation to make use of the drug illegal. However, the Government has done nothing. I believe action should be taken to make the drug more difficult to obtain.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I believe that the report I gave on behalf of the Minister of Health on September 12 (as reported on page 1816 of *Hansard*) is sufficient to answer the questions raised by the honourable member. However, I cannot find any reference in this part of the Estimates to the matter we are now discussing.

Mr. Heaslip: It is concerned with mental health.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have had some experience in debates on the Estimates and my impression is that general discussion is supposed to take place during the debate on the first line. We are now at the stage where the Estimates must be debated line by line, with discussion being confined to the line before the Committee. I have gone to much trouble (as have other Ministers) to secure information. However, it now appears to me (and I ask for your opinion on this, Mr. Chairman) that we have passed over page 27 to discuss page 28.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister should know that page 28 is now before the Committee.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Well, what has happened to page 27?

The CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with pages 27 and 28 and the matter to which the member for Rocky River referred is included on page 28.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: What is the particular reference?

The CHAIRMAN: It is referred to in the fourth line on the page and in about 12 other lines. I have been asked for my opinion and I

have given it. The specific reference is after the word "insurance" on the fourth line of page 28.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The information I have here deals with other matters.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I support the member for Rocky River. Anybody who has travelled overseas, particularly in the United Kingdom and in the western cities of the United States of America, will agree that this matter should not be dismissed lightly. I was disturbed at the rather tolerant attitude that the Minister seemed to adopt in the reply, towards this nefarious and malicious practice. L.S.D. is one of the newer drugs and has appealed to younger people. It is capable of causing, and apparently all too frequently does cause, permanent mental damage. It does not just bring about an hallucinatory "trip" (as it is called so lightly) into the world of make-believe for five or six hours: it can have a deadly dangerous effect. If one spends a few minutes in Trafalgar Square or in some of the less salubrious parts of San Francisco, one will see unmistakable evidence of this. This drug is particularly dangerous because it is so easily manufactured. I shall not elaborate on that, because it may only encourage someone to have a go at it.

Mr. Broomhill: Tell us a little more about it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, I will not, for the reason I have just given.

Mr. Broomhill: You said that a third-year high school student could make it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I did not say that but, if the honourable member believes that, he may not be far from the truth. This drug can easily be made. This is one of the dangers of it, one of the difficulties of controlling it and legislating to prevent its use, sale or manufacture. Although we are practically free of it in this State, we should make a special effort to ensure that we remain free of it, because I am sure that, if anybody had ever seen a person afflicted by this sort of thing, he would not wish it on anyone's child. I ask the Government to take this matter seriously now.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: There is an international convention on drugs, and we are a party to it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: There may be a hundred conventions, but the Government can make regulations to prohibit the trafficking in and sale and manufacture of this drug. We need not worry about some obscure legal provision: let us go

straight at it. That is what I am asking the Government to do.

Mrs. STEELE: The levity with which members opposite have treated this subject is both regrettable and amazing.

Mr. Hughes: I take exception to that remark. I have been sitting here listening all the time.

Mrs. STEELE: A Minister was laughing when the members for Mitcham and Rocky River were speaking.

Mr. Hughes: Don't include me in that.

Mrs. STEELE: I am saying what members on this side think of the way in which members opposite are treating this serious matter. I agree with the remarks of my colleagues on this problem confronting practically all the Governments of the world, which treat it with the greatest gravity. When in London recently, I was confronted in Hyde Park by many odd-looking young women and men going under the name of "flower people", who, when we were walking by, looked at us with dull, leaden eyes. It was perfectly obvious to anyone that they were drugged. They were there in this listless fashion with bunches of wilted flowers looking like wilted people, handing flowers to passers-by. I saw them in Trafalgar Square and in many places on the Continent. I thanked heaven we did not have them here, although on my return I realized that it was right here in our midst. According to newspaper articles, young people can get the materials from which they can easily manufacture this ghastly and dreadful drug that saps their mentalities and leads them into all kinds of vice. I cannot speak too strongly on this. It is a great pity the Government has regarded it, as the member for Flinders has said, in the tolerant manner in which the Treasurer and the Minister of Social Welfare have treated it so far. If the authorities are taking steps in other States to combat this evil, is it not just as necessary that we take them in South Australia? I appeal to the Government to do something and get cracking on this real and serious danger.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I support my colleagues in this matter. It has assumed grave proportions in Australia, but perhaps not so much in South Australia as in some other States. However, cases have been reported in South Australia, too. That the matter is urgent and grave should be patent to the Government when I say that in New South Wales last month the Labor Opposition moved a motion of urgency, realizing no doubt the gravity of the matter, and suggested that action

be taken in New South Wales to deal with drugs, and particularly L.S.D. A Minister in New South Wales stated then that the matter would be dealt with. Only last week the New South Wales Cabinet agreed to introduce the legislation necessary to deal with this problem. I trust that, because of what has been taking place more so in other States than in South Australia, urgent action will be taken by this Government to deal with the matter before it is too late. I suggest that the legislation introduced in New South Wales be the basis for similar legislation in South Australia.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It appears I have no option now but to refer to my reply to a question by the member for Rocky River at page 1816 of *Hansard*. I said:

In summary, the importation and sale of L.S.D. are fully controlled, but the best means of prohibiting the unauthorized manufacture or possession of L.S.D. and related drugs are at present being examined.

That is for the one purpose of seeing what the Government can do to have some control over it. The Minister of Health and his staff are doing everything possible to control this drug. A report has recently been made of a happening in North Adelaide, but it is probably something that has crept in from some person with a knowledge of the ingredients of this drug. The Government is vitally concerned about the health of the people of South Australia. We are trying to see what can be done through the Public Health Department and we shall continue to work on this matter in the interests of the people. I ask the Committee to recognize that obstacles must be overcome before action can be taken. The Government will do what is necessary.

Mr. McANANEY: I am not satisfied with the Minister's reply. Other States have prepared legislation.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: How do you know?

Mr. McANANEY: I read the newspapers but apparently the Minister does not. I understand that legislation in other States makes it illegal to possess this drug. Can the Minister give an assurance that legislation will be introduced during this session making it an offence for people to have in their possession L.S.D. or the means of making it? What is happening now has been going on for too long, without action being taken to stop it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry that I overlooked that the Minister had given an answer to the first question asked by the member for Rocky River. The urgency of dealing with this matter need not be repeated. The drug

does not need to be administered by a hypodermic needle: it can be sucked from blotting paper, and that is what makes it so dangerous. As this session will end about the end of October and probably Parliament will not meet again for about six months, I consider that that will be too long to delay dealing with the matter. Opposition members particularly the member for Rocky River, have raised the matter, and the New South Wales Government has taken action. Although the Government may have other legislation to introduce—

Mr. Shannon: This would get a speedy passage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and legislation ought to be introduced this session. I am sorry that the Minister has not commented on my suggestion that lectures (and perhaps they could be open to anyone interested) be held in the secondary schools to warn of the danger. We cannot do much about it during this school year but it ought to be organized for the 1968 school year. I hope the moral and physical dangers of the drug will be pointed out.

Line passed.

Public Service Commissioner's Department, \$441,392—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$7,255,083.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I refer to the item "Less charged to the Hospital Fund as set out in Appendix II (page 107)" involving \$1,065,000. Some weeks ago I asked the Treasurer whether some of the money paid into the Hospitals Fund would be made available to community hospitals. I pointed out that many hospitals in South Australia were not public hospitals under the Act but were non-profit-making hospitals, usually managed by committees which did much work and which were supported by the people in the respective communities. The Treasurer said that hospitals other than public hospitals would benefit from the Hospitals Fund and that the hospitals benefiting would be shown in the schedule to the Estimates.

The schedule in Appendix II gives the names of the hospitals and it seems to me that almost all of them receive the usual annual Government subsidy for maintenance, and sometimes capital expenditure requirements. I am concerned that many community hospitals are not included. In future, will the community hospitals to which I have referred receive benefits from the Hospitals Fund?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): It does not appear that any grant is made to community hospitals from this fund,

but I shall inquire and let the honourable member know.

Mr. McANANEY: Regarding the item "Victor Harbour (South Coast District)", the increase of \$300 in the maintenance grant is much lower than that in the grant for other hospitals of comparable size. Can the Minister inform me how this amount is worked out?

Mr. LANGLEY: I refer to the Home for Incurables, which is really in the District of Mitcham, but is close to my district. This Government has allocated much money to this institution, and I am sure everyone appreciates it; I am sure the member for Mitcham does so. I know that the patients there and the people of South Australia look on that hospital as one of the best of its type in Australia. At the official opening of the new block I am sure that the people of South Australia will see what this Government has done for the Home for Incurables. I think that Telethon and this Government's subsidies have greatly assisted the development of this institution, which will also be helped by allocations from the Hospitals Fund.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Regarding the Victor Harbour (South Coast District) hospital grant, the maintenance grant is a conditional subsidy toward maintenance costs and is based on the submissions made by the hospital. The capital grant is a conditional subsidy on a \$2 for \$1 basis toward exhaust fans for the laundry and kitchen; a five-bed ward; curtains and screens for windows, the Matron's flat, and the duty room; and bathroom and toilet facilities.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the item "The Murrie Royal Commission, \$1,000". This is the first opportunity that members in this Chamber have had to debate the Murrie Royal Commission and the lamentable circumstances out of which it arose. The Government has been attacked from time to time by the Opposition for its financial ineptitude and bungling since it came into office. However, the Murrie case shows that it is not only in financial matters that this Government is guilty of bungling and ineptitude, because I believe that this case is one of the most lamentable incidents that have occurred since the Labor Government came into office in 1965.

From start to finish the Murrie case was badly handled by the Minister of Education particularly, and by his colleagues generally. The Minister has shown himself to be an expert in the gentle art of making enemies. How the Minister could in so short a time so antagonize a professional body, with which one

would have expected him to be working in the closest harmony, is beyond my comprehension. Yet that is precisely what happened in the Murrie case between the Minister and the South Australian Institute of Teachers.

At this stage I shall not canvass the facts out of which this lamentable incident arose; I suggest that they are fairly wellknown to all members and to the South Australian community. At first, the Minister, apparently on the advice of his officers, imposed on Mr. John Murrie a penalty that was out of all proportion to the seriousness of any offence of which he may have been guilty. The Minister grossly exaggerated the culpability of Mr. Murrie. In referring to what Mr. Murrie had done the Minister said (on March 14):

Thus he condemned not only his own school but all other schools except the two with infants schools attached. To justify his action, Mr. Murrie made statements which, he has since admitted, were untrue or misleading. I referred to some of them in my press statement.

Public confidence in the education system in the Northern Territory has been so undermined that the Legislative Council in the Northern Territory has resolved to request the Commonwealth Government to investigate thoroughly the education system there. In my opinion, which is supported by the Director-General of Education and his senior officers, Mr. Murrie is at present unfitted to hold the responsible position of headmaster or deputy headmaster.

He went on to say:

As I have said, Mr. Murrie's actions call for his removal from a position of responsibility, for which he has clearly shown himself to be unfitted at present. If an *Advertiser* employee behaved as Mr. Murrie behaved, I believe he would be instantly dismissed.

That was the Minister's attitude on March 14. If the senior officers considered that action was called for they could have imposed a fine, as I understand that there are powers under the regulations to impose a fine of \$10 or \$20. If this were not considered to meet the requirements of the case Mr. Murrie could have been brought to Adelaide by aircraft and dressed down by the Director-General. I have no doubt that the previous Director-General (Mr. Evan Mander-Jones) could have done that effectively, and there the incident could have begun and ended. Instead, we had a sorry spectacle indeed. When the Minister found what opposition and outrage he had stirred up amongst the teaching profession and the general public by his comments, his action, and his attitude, the Government, within a few days, went to the opposite extreme and appointed a Royal

Commission. I have a press release dated Friday, March 10, issued by the Institute of Teachers which states (in part):

The executive of the South Australian Institute of Teachers today called for the re-instatement of the Darwin teacher, Mr. J. D. Murrie, as headmaster at Larrakeyah Primary School. In a resolution the executive stated that it was appalled at the extreme penalty imposed by the Minister of Education.

We remember that that penalty was removal from his post and his demotion, which caused him, I think, to lose \$1,000 a year in salary. The press release continues:

Members of the executive had stated that they believed Mr. Murrie had acted with the highest moral and professional motives in the interests of the children under his control. It was obvious that teachers and parents in Darwin fully supported Mr. Murrie.

The release continues in that vein. That was issued on March 10, but four days later the Minister said what I referred to earlier. I have a second press release, dated March 14, from the Institute of Teachers, which states:

Teachers in the Northern Territory and South Australia believe that the Minister of Education, Mr. Loveday, has been grossly misinformed, misled, and ill advised by senior officers of his department in the Murrie case. Until the Minister's statement in the present case, he has enjoyed the confidence of the South Australian and Northern Territory teachers generally, and we trust that he will take the opportunity to redress this obvious injustice and restore the confidence of his teachers, said Mr. Woithe.

That opposition and outrage was echoed in the community. On March 21, after a series of questions and further comment in the community to the same effect, the Minister announced the appointment of a Royal Commission, immediately after he had answered a series of questions that I put on notice, when it was too late to question him on that day about his decision. We went from one extreme to the other. First, we had the extreme harshness of the treatment of a headmaster of a school; that was followed by the Minister's inviting Mr. Murrie to appeal if he thought he had been wrongly treated; and then followed the announcement of a Royal Commission, with Mr. Justice Walters as the Royal Commissioner.

This was a step of panic, because no sooner had the announcement been made than it was realized that there were substantial difficulties in the way of the Royal Commission. First, it was realized that all the incidents to be discussed had occurred outside the jurisdiction of this State and in the Northern Territory,

which is under the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Government. We had the spectacle of the Attorney-General prevaricating during Question Time when he was asked about this.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Boloney!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney-General should look at the replies he gave me when I asked him whether a Royal Commission had jurisdiction in Darwin and whether it had the power to compel witnesses to attend. The fact is that it had no power. Yet the Attorney-General would not admit this in the Chamber, and prevaricated. This was the first and great difficulty that confronted the Government after its precipitate decision to have a Royal Commission on this matter. We then had the difficulty that arose, when the Royal Commission began to sit, as to the whole question of the arrangement between the South Australian Government and the Commonwealth Government to staff the schools in the Northern Territory. This most important matter is, so far as I am aware, still unresolved.

The loose arrangement, which had been made some years ago in the time of the L.C.L. Government and which had worked well, so far as I know, until it was challenged and its legal validity had to be examined, is now in the melting pot. No-one knows, so far as I am aware, just where this arrangement is set out. This was one of the difficulties that immediately confronted the Royal Commission when it started its sittings in Darwin. Then, on top of that (undoubtedly the result of over-work and anxiety) we had the lamented illness of Mr. Justice Walters. This, of course, was a misfortune over which the Government had no control but it meant that the Royal Commission had to be suspended, and we had the spectacle of Mr. Murrie, who had been suspended from duty by the Government, cooling his heels in Darwin, being paid, but having no work to do.

Even when he asked to be given clerical duties to perform, his request was refused by the Government. He was given nothing whatsoever to do and it looked as though this matter was to go on indefinitely. We then had the final anti-climax when the announcement was made of the termination of the Royal Commission, and even that was botched, if I may say: we found when we questioned the announcement in the Chamber that, in fact, the Royal Commission had not been terminated and could not be terminated without a report from the Royal Commissioner. This may be merely a technical matter but even more important is the fact that we now know

that this was done without consulting the senior officers of the department, because this was one of the matters disclosed by Mr. Mander-Jones on his retirement as Director-General of Education.

The announcement was made by the Government on its own initiative. I welcomed the ending of this farcical business in that way, but the Government should never have gotten itself into this mess, which caused so much heartache and so much wrong to many people. However, there is a little more than this to be said about the affair: when the terms of reference were drawn up, a number of them referred not directly to the matter concerning Mr. John Murrice but to important matters of principle on which it was hoped that the Royal Commissioner would bring in a report and on which Parliament presumably could act. This simply went by the board. Members may recall that I quoted a little while ago from the first answer given by the Minister of Education in the Chamber that showed his utterly antagonistic attitude to Mr. Murrice. Perhaps they will carry that in their minds and contrast it with what the Minister said a few months later when he announced the "termination" (to use the Minister's own word) of the Royal Commission. It was certainly what has been described to me as a big climb-down by the Minister. He said:

Because of the illness of Mr. Justice Walters and the inevitable delay in the proceedings of the Royal Commission (established at the request of the Director-General), which would be lengthy in any event, the Government has, in the interests of the public generally and of education in particular, reviewed the circumstances leading to the demotion of Mr. J. D. Murrice and the establishment of the Royal Commission. In doing so, the Government has had regard to the evidence already given, but this review has been prompted mainly by a desire that the important work of the Education Department should not be indefinitely hindered by a strained relationship with the South Australian Institute of Teachers—

a remarkable admission for the Minister to make here—

which is one of the regrettable consequences of the Murrice case. The Government supports the Director-General in his view that, however sincere Mr. Murrice may have been, his actions could not be condoned or overlooked. Mr. Murrice has admitted that to criticize the department in a newsletter to parents was irregular, and that he used inflammatory language. He also now acknowledges that some of the principal statements of fact in his newsletter of February 16, 1967, were exaggerated or to some extent inaccurate.

That is a remarkable contrast in tone with the Minister's belligerence when he first answered

questions on this matter in the Chamber. We have gained absolutely nothing out of this affair except heartache and regret. We have already spent \$10,916 on the Commission, we are to spend another \$1,000 for no tangible result, and we are merely in the position in which we should have been if the Minister had acted sensibly and temperately in the first place. The \$10,916 is, of course, only the revealed part of the costs (the actual costs to the Government) of this matter. I guess it covers the fees of Mr. Rice, who appeared for the Director-General and other officers of the department, Mr. Duffy, who appeared for Mr. Murrie, and of Mr. Legoe, who assisted the Commission. But it does not, of course, allow anything for the expenses—the fact that Mr. Justice Walters was away from his duties at the Supreme Court for a number of weeks, followed, of course, by his illness; nor does it allow for the fact that Mr. Andrew Wells, Q.C. (Assistant Crown Solicitor), was also engaged on this case for a considerable period and was therefore not available to perform his other valuable duties.

Therefore, the expense to this State is much more than is revealed here. One wonders that the Minister remains in office after the way in which this matter has been handled. From start to finish it has been, as I said in opening, a lamentable exhibition by a man who should have been working in close harmony with the professional body of teachers in this State and prepared to form an independent judgment on the matter (which he obviously did not do) when it first arose. I very much regret that this incident occurred, and I hope that there will be no recurrence of it in the future.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): The honourable member who has just spoken is well aware that an agreement was reached by the Institute of Teachers, Mr. Murrie and I and, incidentally, the Government, that this matter was closed and would not be dealt with publicly any more. No matter how much he shakes his head, the honourable member knows that I am not able to say any more on the subject, because that was made public. The honourable member professes to know so much about the matter but then pretends that he does not know something that was made public.

Last year in this place the honourable member, without any reason, called me a liar, and he has never apologized for it. He was suspended on that occasion. Tonight he is

adopting his usual despicable and insulting attitude for no real reason whatsoever. He talks about lamentable attitudes: he is an authority on lamentable attitudes.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you suggesting this matter should not be debated?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This sort of attack is, I think, the lowest I have heard in this place, because the honourable member knows that I am not in a position to answer his accusations. What is more, he has told this Chamber only part of the story; he has misrepresented it and, of course, he probably does not know the whole story. However, he sits in judgment. When it was announced in this place that a Royal Commission would be appointed both he and the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) said, "Hear, hear!" Furthermore, another very prominent member of the Opposition told me that he agreed entirely with what I had done in this matter.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I was with you when he said it.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have stood a good many insults from the member for Mitcham in the last few months. He has, of course, altered his tone lately. Even when he asks questions he endeavours, as a rule, to be as insulting as possible in the tone of his voice.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense!

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This is another example of the absolute arrogance and insulting attitude of the honourable member on most occasions.

Mrs. STEELE: For "Medical Cadetships—Living Allowances and Fees", last year \$4,000 was voted but only \$1,781 was paid out. This year, \$4,000 is again provided. Can the Treasurer say how many cadets have applied under this scheme? Is the small amount that was paid out last year an indication that this campaign to attract medical cadets was not as successful as had been hoped? Can he say how many cadets were accepted last year and how many have been accepted this year or are actually in training?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have the figures. However, the honourable member seems to be under some misapprehension as to the purpose of these medical cadetships. The cadetships are given as an assistance to medical students who have experienced financial difficulties in the latter years of their course. They are bonded after graduation and after one year as resident medical officers. The scheme is designed not for the purpose of

attracting people to a medical course but to assist those who experience financial difficulties in the latter years of the course.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A few moments ago the Minister of Education made a statement that was not in accordance with fact. I have always been opposed in principle to Royal Commissions of the type of the Murrie Royal Commission. I was opposed to the Royal Commissions on the Licensing Act and on State Transport Services, because I believe that Commissions spend a great deal of money without ever arriving at a conclusion of much value to the State. The recommendations of these Commissions are never accepted. I cannot imagine in any circumstances my making the remark attributed to me, and *Hansard* does not substantiate the Minister's statement. Had I been associated with the Government I certainly would not have appointed the Murrie Royal Commission. I have no recollection of making such a remark, which would have been completely contrary to my line of thinking.

The Minister said tonight that he had made an agreement with the Institute of Teachers and Mr. Murrie that the matter would be closed and that there would be no further public comment on it. It would be outrageous if we could not debate this matter. The Estimates contain a vote of about \$1,000 for the Murrie Royal Commission. Are we to be told that because the Minister has made some agreement with the Institute of Teachers and Mr. Murrie the incident is closed and we cannot comment on it? The Minister should look at this matter more closely: he cannot just close a controversy by making an agreement outside this place.

Last year \$300 was voted for the maintenance of the Andamooka Hospital, but this year nothing is provided. A hospital problem exists at Andamooka and Coober Pedy. This year, \$700 is provided for capital expenditure for the Coober Pedy hospital but nothing is provided for maintenance. Coober Pedy is isolated and has a population of 3,000 to 3,500. It has particular health hazards because of its unusual sanitary conditions. Last year, \$9,600 was provided for maintenance at the Great Northern War Memorial Hospital at Hawker and a similar subsidy will be provided this year. However, this is one of the few hospitals that will not benefit from the proceeds of the lotteries. The Leigh Creek hospital is not included but I believe the canteen there actively supports the hospital, where a fair service is given. Has there been

some policy decision regarding allocations to hospitals, and why has no increase in the provision for maintenance been made to the hospitals to which I have referred?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As far as I am aware, there is no particular policy regarding this matter: it depends on the application made by the hospital. No reason is given in the explanations I have for the reduction in the provision for the Andamooka hospital; I can assume only that this is as a result of the accounting in that hospital. It is on the basis of the submissions made that the grants are proposed.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has there been a change of policy regarding the sums provided as subsidies for hospitals? Previously hospitals did not directly apply for subsidies; a member of the hospital associations was a member of the committee in the Chief Secretary's Department that looked into the affairs of the hospitals concerned and made a recommendation to the Minister regarding subsidies. The Minister took account of that and of any special representation that may have been made to him by an isolated hospital during the year. Is the unchanged provision for the Great Northern War Memorial Hospital at Hawker a result of its not applying for more?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All these hospitals provide information to the Hospitals Department, and it is upon the assessment of that information that the recommendation is made to the Minister. If any additional recommendations are made by the hospital they are also taken into account. There has been no change in policy.

Mr. CASEY: The grant made to the Great Northern War Memorial Hospital last year was sufficient to provide for the completion of renovations. The hospital board at Hawker is competent, and I have no doubt that if it wanted something it would definitely apply for it.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I refer to the Tatiara Soldiers' Memorial Hospital at Bordertown. I realize that the payment of \$3,519 made to the hospital in 1966-67, out of a total voted of \$152,834, does not mean that the hospital did not get the money, because I realize that \$140,000 was allocated in the Loan Estimates. However, as the hospital is now nearly completed and has been carried out ahead of schedule, how is it that the full sum estimated for 1966-67 has not been used in either the combined sums allocated under Consolidated Revenue or the Loan allocation for this year? Has the hospital been completed more cheaply

than expected or is money provided somewhere else? Do the sums of \$140,000 under Loan, \$3,519 for last year, and \$3,744 proposed for this year constitute the total necessary to complete this project?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The general capital cost of the hospital has, I understand, been met from Loan Account.

Mr. Nankivell: There is \$9,000 less than the sum voted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that. As far as I am aware; the Government has covered its payments towards the general capital improvements to the hospital. The sum of \$3,744 is a subsidy on a \$2 for \$1 basis towards a P.A.B.X. system, X-ray unit and minor equipment, so it does not cover the general capital cost of the additions to the hospital.

Mr. Nankivell: It is \$9,000 less.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that. I do not have the information available concerning the payments towards the actual cost. As I cannot say offhand whether there has been some alteration in what was intended, I will make inquiries.

Mrs. STEELE: I have checked on medical cadetships. I remember that the Minister of Health in reply to a question said that amending legislation would be introduced to make possible the establishment of medical cadetships; he added that there was already one cadet. This had come about because a medical student had got into financial difficulties and the Government had come to his aid and paid him this money. The medical cadetship is a good idea, but this line refers to "medical cadetships". How many such cadets are there at present and was last year's expenditure of \$1,781 on this one cadet?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give the honourable member that information at the moment but I will inquire.

Mrs. BYRNE: I notice under "Other miscellaneous payments" a payment of \$600 to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. This subsidy is deserved. There is also a similar organization known as the Animal Welfare League of South Australia Incorporated which does valuable work in this field. It is too late for a subsidy to be granted to that organization this year, but I understand that the officers of that league will ask the Chief Secretary that a subsidy be provided in future. I want the Treasurer to be aware of the valuable work done by that league.

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Treasurer tell me for what purpose a grant of \$2,000 was made to the Diabetic Association of South Australia last year, since there seems to be no financial provision this year for that association?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was only to establish a city diabetic centre, for that one year only.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I appreciate the Government's continuing the previous year's subsidy of \$900 for the Nuriootpa school band competition, held annually, but I am disappointed that the grant to the South Australian Band Association has not been increased: it is again \$6,200, as it was last year and in the previous year. I know that the Treasurer appreciates band music: he attended last year's Tanunda band competitions and presented the prizes and trophies. A similar competition will be held at the end of next month. Ever since a grant has been made to the South Australian Band Association a keen interest has been taken in banding. The association has done much since then to promote banding in South Australia. It appreciated the work of the Playford Government in initiating this grant, because this year it awarded Sir Thomas Playford the highest possible award in this State for anybody who has given great service to banding—the Medal of Merit. Two years ago I urged in this Chamber that the grant of \$6,200 be increased. Again I urged the then Treasurer (the present Minister of Social Welfare) last year that this grant be increased because I knew that representations had been made by the South Australian Band Association for an increase. The then Treasurer told me on each of those two occasions that my request would be considered and it was hoped that this year it would be possible to increase the grant beyond \$6,200. I regret it has not been increased.

Since these grants became available to the association, many junior bands have been formed in South Australia, and they are on the increase. That is a good thing, particularly these days when so many teenagers have too much time on their hands and do not know how to spend some of it. It is gratifying to note that the association and senior bands in various parts of the State are taking an interest in youth and in promoting junior bands. I understand that at this year's band competitions at Tanunda 16 senior and 13 junior bands (the greatest number of junior bands ever) will compete. Because of the excellent work being done by the association and to enable it to further its work,

particularly in promoting junior bands, can the Treasurer say whether favourable consideration can be given to a greater grant being made to the association?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: While the Government would like to make a greater grant to this association, it is under considerable pressure to make greater grants to many worthy associations in South Australia. This can be done only if we have additional revenues; we simply cannot take the money from nowhere. We should like to be able to help. If we have additional revenues in the future, we shall certainly consider this matter.

Mr. BURDON: I support any move to help the South Australian Band Association. Three or four years ago I was privileged to be at a meeting where the junior bands were formed, and since that time great strides have been made in the formation of junior bands. Although I realize only too well there are many other fields in which more money is needed, I trust that funds will be made available by the Treasurer in subsequent years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I assure the Committee, as the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford) has done, that when the Minister announced the appointment of the Royal Commission I did not give my assent by saying "Hear, hear!", or anything else. I was absolutely stunned by the announcement. As the member for Gumeracha has said, *Hansard* does not show any ejaculation by me or any other honourable member.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: You know very well that it does not show interjections unless they are replied to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I regret the Minister's attitude and am afraid that it is typical of his attitude throughout the whole affair: that he should be above criticism and that there should be no discussion of the matter. Because he and the Government have entered into a settlement of the matter, this Committee should be denied the opportunity to debate it; but it is an item on the Estimates and it is my right to discuss it at the proper time, as I have done. Further, this matter was of outstanding public interest and it is most regrettable that the Minister has tried to stifle discussion of it on the only occasion there has been to discuss it in this Chamber.

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Treasurer say what the grants to about 13 aged persons' homes referred to on pages 35 and 36 are for?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: These are grants on a \$1 for \$1 basis towards furnishings and equipment. Usually there is an investigation of the amounts to be provided by the particular home for furnishings and equipment, the matter is considered by the Auditor-General, and the subsidy I have mentioned is granted if it is found that proper equipment is to be provided.

Mr. BURDON: I thank the Government for making available the grant of \$5,000 to Heritage Industries which is a voluntary organization, and I also thank the Education Department for making available a building for this work. Heritage Industries, which has been established in Mount Gambier recently, provides work on three days a week for the physically handicapped and it is hoped to extend this work. The grant this year, which I hope will be a continuing one, is for the salary of a manager. This body is doing extremely good work and I pay a tribute to Mrs. Helen Pitt, Dr. Shaw, and all others associated with this important work.

Mrs. BYRNE: Provision is made for \$1,000, which is an increase of \$558, in respect of artificial limbs for thalidomide children. As I understood that only the Commonwealth Government entered the field of providing artificial limbs for these children, can the Treasurer say why the State Government finds it necessary to assist in this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not only the Commonwealth Government that assists in this: the Commonwealth and the State share the cost of providing artificial limbs for these children.

Mr. LANGLEY: This year the grant to the aged citizens clubs has been increased. Will money be made available this year to the Unley Senior Citizens Club, and what grant will be made to the Australian Lutheran Aid Society at Fullarton? I am also interested in the Dunbar Presbyterian Home for the Aged, which is in my district.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The grants to aged citizens clubs are a financial provision to subsidize corporations, etc., on a \$1 for \$1 basis towards the establishment of the clubs. The maximum subsidy is \$6,000 and the amount provided is an estimate of the requirements for the current year. The Australian Lutheran Aid Society is an aged person's home and grants on a \$1 for \$1 basis are made to these homes towards furnishings and equipment, each application being reported on by the Auditor-General.

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Treasurer say how many thalidomide children in this State were provided with artificial limbs during the last financial year and, further, who decides whether children are eligible to receive these limbs? I recently dealt with a case that was not approved by the Commonwealth Government and I should like to know whether the State Government may make decisions on these applicants.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have that information at present but I shall obtain it for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 20, at 2 p.m.