

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

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

QUESTIONS

DANGEROUS DRUG

Mr. HALL: Much publicity has recently been given in South Australia to the effects of the drug lysergic acid diethylamide (L.S.D.). Members on this side have frequently pointed to the dangers that will exist in our community if this drug becomes readily available here. It is reported today that the Tasmanian Minister of Health has announced regulations instituting heavy fines and possible gaol sentences for those who possess L.S.D. illegally. In view of the impending closure of the Parliamentary session and the absence of an announcement about an early session next year, will the Premier take urgent action this session to implement by regulation or legislation a complete ban on the unauthorized manufacture, possession and sale of L.S.D.?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A comprehensive report on this matter will shortly be presented to the Parliament. On present instruction, in my view, the action suggested by the Leader is unnecessary because it is already covered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last evening, during the Estimates debate, the Minister of Education unfortunately was not present when the question of the use of drugs, particularly L.S.D., was being canvassed, and so he did not hear my suggestion that, quite apart from the banning or making illegal (if that should be necessary) of the trafficking in and use of these drugs, we should also take positive preventive steps to warn people in the community, especially children, of the dangers, both physical and moral, of the use of drugs, particularly L.S.D. I suggested then that lectures and lessons be organized in our schools to warn secondary schoolchildren, anyway, of these dangers. I ask the Minister whether he has considered this matter previously and, if he has, whether he has decided whether my suggestion is either desirable or practicable. If he has not had an opportunity to consider it fully, I ask now whether he will do so and let the House know his decision.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have already discussed this matter with the Director-General of Education, and we are concerned about the

possibility of L.S.D. being distributed to students in our schools. We are alerting teachers about the possibility of this danger. The matter of having lectures and so on is another matter altogether and I doubt that it would be desirable to advertise this drug to the extent of having lectures about it and so creating curiosity about its use. In fact, in our schools the teachers are always trying to lead our students towards the best form of citizenship for later life. We have given courses in social studies and throughout the whole of our curricula we try to encourage students to be honest, to consider other people, and to lead good, decent lives. I consider this the whole tenor of the function of our schools and I assure the honourable member that we are watching this matter carefully.

MOSQUITOES

Mr. CLARK: I have recently been requested by the Local Board of Health of the city of Salisbury to express to the House grave concern about the mosquito menace in the Salisbury area and areas such as Enfield and Port Adelaide. The board has pointed out to me that within its area exist many miles of mangrove swamps that provide an ideal breeding ground for mosquitoes. I am informed also that since the cessation of the former joint spraying scheme, to which the board contributed, it has carried out aerial spraying and investigations that have proved to be invaluable. However, it is financially impossible for the board to control completely the large areas of mangrove and with summer approaching there is concern about the certainty of increased mosquito infestation. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Health ask his colleague to consider financially assisting the board in order to combat the mosquito menace in the Port River estuary?

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

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I understand that a firm named Gutteridge, Haskins, and Davey has been consulted by the Commonwealth Government about the salinity of the Murray River. That firm has had experience in West Pakistan, on rivers such as the Indus, in regard to the vexed question of salinity. Can the Minister of Works say whether the State Government has been brought into the discussions being held by this firm and the Commonwealth Government about minimizing salinity? Will

the Engineering and Water Supply Department be involved in the matter? Will the firm come to South Australia to take evidence from primary producers and organizations about the effects of salinity, and will it be open to suggestions about how the problem can be solved? Finally, is this matter in any way related to the Chowilla dam project?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I should not like to say that the matter is definitely related to the Chowilla dam project. However, following discussions with the River Murray Commission, a committee has been appointed and people have been selected (as the honourable member said) to investigate the problem. Of course, investigations will be carried out in each of the three States concerned in the River Murray Waters Agreement. Undoubtedly evidence will be taken in South Australia at some future date, but exactly when that will be I cannot say. As the honourable member said, the matter is largely under the auspices of the River Murray Commission, thus being to some extent under the control of Commonwealth authorities.

Mr. CURREN: As the salinity of the Murray River is of great concern to fruitgrowers of the Murray districts as well as the public generally, can the Minister of Works say whether more publicity could be given to the salinity readings taken regularly at various points along the river?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am pleased to say that, through the courtesy of the *Advertiser*, figures in regard to salinity of the Murray River waters will be published soon. It was agreed that the publishing of figures in the *Advertiser* would be sufficient on three days a week only and it is suggested that the readings taken and compiled on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays be published in the country edition of the *Advertiser* on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays. The areas referred to will be Lock 9, Lock 5, Berri, Loxton, Cobdogla, Waikerie, Morgan, Mannum, Murray Bridge and Jervois.

MIGRANTS

Mrs. BYRNE: The Minister of Immigration and Tourism will recall informing me on August 1 that the matter I had raised regarding charter flights from Australia to the United Kingdom in order to overcome homesickness amongst English migrants had been taken up by way of correspondence with the appropriate Commonwealth Minister (only an acknowledgment having been received at that time).

I understand he now has a reply from the Commonwealth Minister. Will he give it for the benefit of the House?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have received the following reply from the Commonwealth Minister for Immigration (Hon. B. M. Snedden):

I promised to write to you again in reply to your letter of July 4, 1967, concerning the question of reduced air fares to enable migrants to visit their relatives overseas. I would like to assure you that I am sympathetic to the proposition that many migrants would settle more happily if they had a reasonable prospect of being able to revisit their families overseas. Indeed, recent investigations by the Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council into the departure of migrants has shown that some migrants return permanently to their home countries because they cannot afford merely to visit. Because of our comparative geographical isolation, the question of migrants being able to revisit their home countries is important also in relation to our efforts to attract migrants, particularly at a time when conditions in Europe and the inducements of other immigration countries are making international migration a highly competitive field.

However, in discussing this question we must not lose sight of the fact that it is already possible for migrants, and others, to obtain quite substantial concessions on air fares. Under I.A.T.A. rules it is possible for groups of people, who collectively have some common objective apart from the actual travel, to obtain reductions of up to 30 per cent on economy class air fares. This applies either to charter flights or block bookings on scheduled services. Some Dutch migrants are known to have taken advantage of this, and no doubt there have been others. Nevertheless, the cost of air fares to Britain and Europe is still beyond the reach of probably the great majority of migrant families. My colleague, the Minister for Civil Aviation, the Hon. R. W. C. Swartz, and his department are, I know, sympathetic to the special needs of migrants in respect of oversea air travel but of course must weigh them against important policy considerations. I am however currently discussing the matter with Mr. Swartz and will send to him a copy of your letter and this reply.

He will be pleased to inform me when he receives further advice from the Commonwealth Minister for Civil Aviation.

LEFEVRE SCHOOLS

Mr. HURST: Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made in the planning of the LeFevre Primary and Infants Schools?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports that the planning programme for the construction of a new classroom and ancillary buildings at these schools provides for tenders to be called at the end of December this year.

SUBURB NAMES

Mr. COURCE: Concern has been expressed to me about the suggestion that several district and suburb names may be changed by amalgamating areas and cutting out names of some of the smaller districts. I take it that this is being done by the Lands Department, through the Nomenclature Committee, the Postmaster-General's Department and councils. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain what progress has been made in this matter and also what avenues of appeal against changing the name of a district are available?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This matter dates back to 1945, when a decision was taken by the department in respect of the names of suburban areas. This decision was closely related to the P.M.G. Department's postal purposes, and it was not until recently that that department acted on the 1945 decision. As a result, although many people thought that the changes were taking place because of a recent decision, that was not so. The Nomenclature Committee examines these matters, and the only recent change that has taken place in the naming of suburbs is in the case of Bowden-on-the-Hill, which was changed to Ovingham, a satisfactory arrangement to all concerned. This matter has been considered with a view to introducing this session a Place Names Bill that will set forth all the matters in which the honourable member is interested, and will provide, no doubt, for channels of appeal, if necessary. Not having studied the details of this legislation yet, although I have seen maps associated with it, I cannot positively say whether a form of appeal is available to individual citizens, but I should imagine that this provision would be included in some form or other. However, I shall ascertain whether the legislation will be introduced this session. I hope that it will be, because I believe it is necessary in order to prevent the proliferation of names of suburbs that has continued in the last few years in new subdivisions.

STATE'S FINANCES

Mr. HUDSON: I understand that the Victorian Premier, in his recent Budget, has provided for the funding of a substantial sum of the revenue deficit from Loan funds, thus incurring the penalties of the Commonwealth-State Financial Agreement. Has the Treasurer further information on this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The action of the Victorian Premier is an interesting commentary on what has been said in this House about the course followed by this Government

concerning Loan funds. In our neighbouring State, under a Liberal Premier, the results are apparent. The Budget Papers of Victoria recently released indicate that Sir Henry Bolte's Government has had deficits in six years, as under:

	\$
1955-56	6,491,000
1956-57	8,623,000
1957-58	6,425,000
1958-59	5,096,000
1963-64	505,000
1965-66	8,135,000

During a substantial period from 1955 there have been consistent deficits in the Victorian Budgets: there have been a few years where there has not been a deficit, but one has occurred in most years. Of these deficits, \$30,213,000 has been funded by provision of Loan moneys, \$362,000 met from revenue surpluses, and \$4,700,000 is still being covered out of trust funds and other balances in the hands of the Treasurer. In addition, \$3,332,000 of revenue deficits incurred prior to the Bolte Government remain unfunded, making \$8,032,000 in all of deficits still covered out of trust funds, etc. During the year 1966-67 the Bolte Government secured a balance in Revenue Account, but diverted \$4,000,000 of Loan moneys in that year to fund about half the 1965-66 revenue deficit of \$8,135,000. As well as forgoing that \$4,000,000 from expenditure upon capital works, the Victorian Treasury will have to pay penal sinking fund contributions of 4 per cent a year toward repayment of the loan and to forgo the normal Commonwealth sinking fund assistance of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent a year on that loan. That is interesting, isn't it!

This is the course our neighbouring State has followed in dealing with revenue and Loan moneys, but it has not been followed by this Government. We have funded no moneys in this State under the Financial Agreement and we have maintained the position that our State's finances have never incurred the penal and sinking fund charges I have outlined in relation to Victoria. The contrast between the way this State has been financed by the present Government and the course followed by the Liberal Government in the neighbouring State is clear from the answer I have given.

Mr. McANANEY: On examining the Budget figures for Victoria I noticed that an accumulated funded account of \$49,000,000 over the years had been reduced by the sinking fund payments at 4 per cent. There is a penalty in regard to the loss of the $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent from the Commonwealth Government, but it means that the debt is written off over a period. Already,

half that amount has been written off and the balance has been reduced to \$25,000,000. The amount of accumulated unpaid accounts in the South Australian Budget is \$9,000,000, which is a carryover from Labor Government control between 1926 and 1934. At the end of 1966 the Victorian Government had used its trust funds to about the same extent as the South Australian Labor Government had used its funds at that date. As the population of Victoria is more than three times that of this State, does the Treasurer consider the Victorian deficits insignificant compared with the efforts of the South Australian Labor Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly not. If the honourable member wants us to fund our deficit, I should think he would be in a minority of one.

Mr. McANANEY: I suppose I am an incurable optimist in asking the Treasurer questions on finance. By using Loan funds last year to make up the deficit, the Government was funding—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nonsense.

Mr. McANANEY: It was. It had to pay so much each year into the National Redemption Fund, which means that it will be paying interest over a much longer period than—

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Question!

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. McANANEY: I thought I had finished asking it. I thought members opposite were admitting—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must ask his question now.

Mr. McANANEY: I have already asked it, but I will repeat it. When Loan funds were used last time to balance the Budget, they had to be funded at a certain rate each year. The only difference is that, rather than leaving it as a revenue deficit, the Government has—

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Question!

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is making a statement. He must ask his question.

Mr. McANANEY: I have.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has asked no question: he has made a statement which, if he had any knowledge at all of Commonwealth and State finances (and I can only assume he has not), he would know was incorrect.

Mr. McAnaney: Answer the question!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This State charged to Loan Fund sums allowed to be charged to the fund, instead of charging them to Revenue Account.

Mr. McAnaney: Loan funds have to be funded.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They do not need to be funded, except against a deficit. A deficit has to be declared and the loan funded. That happens only if a sum simply cannot be charged to Loan legitimately.

Mr. Hudson: And if there is a surplus!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. We did not have those things. We have not funded any of our moneys. If the honourable member cares to read the agreement carefully—

Mr. McAnaney: I have just read it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Then I suggest the honourable member read it again. I say categorically that we have not funded any of our Loan moneys. We are not subject to penal interest and sinking fund charges.

NEWTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. STEELE: Further to my recent question, the committee of the Newton Primary School is anxious to know when the construction of the building to house infants classes is expected to commence. Enrolments since the school opened have shown that such accommodation will be necessary soon. Although the committee realizes that some temporary classrooms will probably have to be erected, perhaps soon, its members would be grateful to know the department's intention regarding the solid construction infants school block. Will the Minister of Education obtain a report on this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

YUNTA SCHOOL

Mr. CASEY: Negotiations with the Education Department have been proceeding for some time regarding the establishment of a special rural school at Yunta in the North-East of the State. As this school, if established, will be of great benefit to the families living in that remote area, can the Minister of Education say whether negotiations have now been completed and, if they have, what his recommendations were on this important matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am pleased to be able to inform the honourable member that I have approved of the establishment of a special rural school at Yunta from the beginning of 1968. It is intended that the Mannahill Rural School will be closed and consolidated with the new Yunta school, which should give

a total enrolment of 60 students. It can reasonably be expected that the secondary enrolment will increase the same as it has increased at other rural schools. Such schools have been of great benefit to people in isolated areas and have enabled many children to obtain secondary education without their having to live away from home.

LOAN COUNCIL

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yesterday I asked the Treasurer for particulars about an oversea loan, particularly whether South Australia was to participate, as the interest rate appeared to me to be very high. Can the Treasurer now say whether South Australia is to participate in the loan; what is the effective interest rate; and whether South Australia approved of the transaction?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Concerning participation in the loan, the honourable member will know that Loan moneys to the total of the approved borrowing programme (approved at Loan Council and supported by the Commonwealth Government out of revenue) are provided to this State at current Australian interest rates. The approval of the State Treasurers, as representing their States at Loan Council, has been given to the loan raisings of the Commonwealth in circumstances that I shall outline to the honourable member. But I point out to him that the sum to be provided to South Australia from these loan raisings is at the current Australian interest rate. The approach to the London market for a £14,000,000 loan is being undertaken by the Commonwealth at a nominal rate of 7 per cent but with such conditions of issue that the effective yield is 7.11 per cent. Whilst the issue has some relevance to the refinancing of State loans maturing overseas, the Commonwealth has agreed that the loan shall be in its name only.

The Commonwealth has latterly agreed that, as the undertaking of a measure of new borrowing and of conversion of loans abroad is primarily for the maintenance of reserves of oversea funds which is a Commonwealth responsibility, it is prepared itself to meet the unavoidably high interest costs. To the extent the States may share in the Australian equivalent of new oversea loans, or be concerned in the refinancing of their loans maturing overseas, the Commonwealth has agreed to limit the State responsibilities to interest at the current Australian rates. As a consequence, the Premiers generally, although unhappy about the high rate of interest overseas, have agreed to

support the Commonwealth in Loan Council where the Commonwealth has expressed itself as satisfied about the necessity for the raising and that the terms are the best obtainable.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. CURREN: A report in this morning's *Advertiser*, headed "Chowilla—No Early Talks," refers to a statement made in the House of Representatives by the Minister for National Development (Mr. Fairbairn), namely, that he felt the South Australian Premier was "playing politics in his call for such a meeting" (a meeting for which the Premier had asked concerning the deferment of the project). Has the Premier any statement to make on the latest developments concerning his request for a meeting of the Prime Minister and the State Premiers involved in this important matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I find it extraordinary and a gross discourtesy to this State and this House that a statement should have been made in the Commonwealth Parliament of the kind reported (if the honourable Minister is accurately reported) without any communication having been made to me by the Prime Minister. Immediately the decision of the River Murray Commission was published, I communicated with the Prime Minister by telephone, asking him for an urgent meeting to assure us that, whatever decisions arose from the River Murray Commission, this State would get its water. He asked me to put that in writing, which I did immediately, and I have published that letter in the House. On the next day a debate took place in this House, and eventually it was decided unanimously that, in the opinion of the House, the State had a fundamental and legal right to the construction of the Chowilla dam without further delay. It was also unanimously decided that assurances must be given by the Governments, the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement, that pending construction of the dam South Australia would be supplied in dry years with a volume of flow of water which the dam was designed to ensure.

This is related not merely to the construction of the dam but also to the assurances to which this State is entitled as a result of its rights under the agreement. Although I had no reply from the Prime Minister concerning this, I now find that an announcement (if the Minister concerned is accurately reported) is made in the Commonwealth House, first, that it is ludicrous to hold a meeting such as this State has requested (with the support of members on both sides of this House), and that in requesting that meeting I am

doing something ludicrous on behalf of this State and playing politics. I do not know what kind of politics it is supposed to be. I understood every member of the House was in support of demanding from the Commonwealth and the other parties to the agreement the assurances for which this House had asked. The Minister apparently has not read the correspondence I sent to him conveying not only the Government's request but also the resolution of this House, and he has ignored the effect of the contents thereof, for, because I said that if we did not proceed with the project we would take action about it, I am then accused of saying that we are going to take immediate legal action before the report is made to the commissioners on the technical aspects of Chowilla. I have said no such thing: I said that if we did not get Chowilla we would take action to enforce our rights.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: In other words, if they broke part of the agreement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly. If a decision is made that is in breach of the agreement, then this State is entitled to its rights, and we will act accordingly. I would expect that every member of the House and every citizen of this State would support the action that the Government would take in those circumstances. So far as playing politics in this matter is concerned, I believe that members of this House have taken the attitude (and I expressed this as a result of things that have been said by members) that our rights to water are fixed under the River Murray Waters Agreement, and that this is not a matter of Party politics at all. We are entitled to consideration from the Commonwealth Government and from the other Governments, the parties to this agreement. If the Minister for National Development chooses to ignore the contents of the letter concerned with the development of this State and our rights to assure people they will receive water in the course of the State's development, I can only say that anybody who points a finger at someone else about playing politics is pointing three fingers at himself.

Mr. HALL: The Premier will recall that when the Government moved its motion concerning the Chowilla dam the Opposition protested strongly, and it took four hours of debate before we could strengthen the Government's attitude on its approach to the Commonwealth. Of course, the Commonwealth Government and the other parties to the River Murray Commission have noted the fact that the South Australian representative on the

commission voted for the deferment that has taken place. In view of the fact that this State's representative on the commission voted for the deferment, how can the Premier now convince the other parties to the agreement and the River Murray Commission that he did not mean this State to agree to the deferment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is apparent that more than one person is playing politics in this business.

Mr. Millhouse: You are certainly one of them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well that the reply given in Parliament last week showed the situation facing this State's commissioner. What did the honourable member want the commissioner to do? If he wants to play this kind of politics, I ask him to tell us. Has he been out talking to the television stations on this score? If he is going to sabotage South Australia's case in this matter, let him get up and say so. The situation facing the commissioner was that we could not get from the commission a vote to let the contract. The honourable member knows that there has to be a unanimous decision of this commission.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I do not think he does.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He knows it, because it has been stated here, and by members on his side. We could not get a vote of the commission to let the contract and, in consequence, three courses were open to our commissioner. One was that there would be no decision by the commissioner. I do not know whether the honourable member thinks that would have been a proper action for the commissioner to take. If he had taken that course, there would have been a complete stalemate, nothing would have happened, and the tender would have gone by the board; there would have been no resolution by the commission regarding the future of Chowilla dam.

Secondly, the commissioner could have created a dispute and then we could have gone to arbitration within the terms of the River Murray Waters Agreement. I do not know whether the honourable member has studied the River Murray Waters Agreement to see what time would be taken by an arbitration of this kind, but it would not take less than six months. The commissioner could have taken this matter to arbitration and, immediately, under the extremely difficult arbitration clauses of this agreement, we would then have been faced by all the other commissioners making a simple statement to the arbitrator

to the effect that they were not cancelling the Chowilla dam project but that they could not let a contract at the time because of the various matters that were cited in the resolution of the commission. They would have said that they wanted these studies to be made before making a decision assessing the various States in regard to the extra moneys in terms of the agreement. What would the arbitrator have immediately said? He would have said that he could not decide the matter until the evidence from the studies was available to him. Does the Leader think we would have got any better than that out of arbitration? Thirdly, we could have told the commissioner to get the best result he could for this State, and that was his instruction.

Mr. Shannon: He was instructed to agree to the deferment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He was instructed to get the best he could, within his discretion, for this State. Given the situation that I have just outlined to the House, what alternative was available to him? I do not know whether members are coming in here to kick the commissioner.

Mr. Hall: It is your responsibility; don't unload it as you have unloaded other responsibilities.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not unloading any responsibility. If the Leader is going to play politics, let him get up and say for which of the courses he wanted the commissioner to vote. He has not got the intestinal fortitude to get up and fight for South Australia: he wants to fight for himself. If this is the kind of thing this House can do, why in the world did we have the unanimous resolution which the Leader is now sabotaging? That resolution was agreed as a compromise between both sides.

Mr. McAnaney: It was better than your motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was prepared to accept it. I acted on the basis of that resolution and now what has happened? On the basis of the resolution, which was conveyed to the Commonwealth Government and which was conveyed to the public as a unanimous resolution of this House, I have been stabbed in the back by the Leader. What else is he doing? Is he supporting this State in its demands for water rights? Why is he cavilling at his own resolution? Why in the world are we getting questions in this House now having a piece of the resolution for which members voted? If we did not get agreement here, on what basis was that resolution passed? Either members are for this State or they are

against it. The question of the unanimous resolution of the commissioners was canvassed during the debate in this House and the Leader knows that full well. This question has been answered in this House quite clearly. What is the Leader now playing at?

Mr. McKee: He believes in the democracy of the governing class.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether he has teamed up with Mr. Fairbairn to say that the requests which were made by this House, and for which he voted, will not be met and are ludicrous, and that the people of this State are now playing politics in asking for their water rights. What I have asked for the people of South Australia is support to have the rights of this State recognized. I should have thought that anyone with any patriotism or loyalty to the State would support the Government in that respect.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My questions to the Premier arise out of the rather heated language that he has used in answering the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member knows he is out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry, Sir. My questions arise out of the answer that the Premier has given to the Leader of the Opposition about South Australia's position regarding Murray River waters. The questions that I should like to ask the Premier are as follows: First, did the Government direct Mr. Beany to vote for a deferment of the calling of tenders? Secondly, has the Attorney-General expressed an opinion or consulted with his Crown Solicitor about whether the action in voting for the deferment has weakened South Australia's position legally? Thirdly, how long does the Government intend to wait before it takes action to enforce this State's rights under the agreement to build the Chowilla dam rather than, as he has done today, talk about our rights?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have already answered the first question on more than one occasion. Our delegate to the River Murray Commission was instructed to get the best resolution for this State that he could.

Mr. Millhouse: You left him on his own, in other words?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The discretion was left to him. Regarding the second question, I do not know whether the honourable member has read the River Murray waters

Agreement. If he has, I do not know how he could get the slightest legal contention from it that the decision of the commissioners would weaken this State's position legally. I know of no law, nor have I ever heard the slightest contention in law, that supports this way-out suggestion that has been made by the honourable member. I do not know what his colleagues in Bar Chambers would say about it, but I can imagine. Regarding the third question, if the honourable member has read the agreement at all (and I hope that he has done his homework) he must know that one can take action for breach of an agreement only after a breach occurs. If the honourable member had listened to my speech in reply to the debate on the resolution unanimously passed by this House, he would be well aware that at present no breach of the terms of the agreement has occurred.

Mr. Millhouse: When will it occur?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It can occur only when it has been decided by the commission that Chowilla will not be proceeded with. When the honourable member asks such a question, I cannot conceive that he has read the agreement. If, when the studies have been completed, the commission takes such a decision (and I say categorically that it would be a decision opposed by the South Australian commissioner)—

Mr. Millhouse: Such a decision—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: —may never be taken.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary, a specific position of this kind will fall for decision by the commission as soon as the studies have been completed.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: When will that be?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Probably before the end of this year.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not intend to allow debate during answers to questions. I remind members that interjections are out of order and I remind members that I do not intend to allow to develop a situation in which every question and answer is debated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As soon as a breach of the terms of the agreement occurs, we shall be able to take action. Until then, we shall not. I do not know whether the honourable member thinks that, by saying that if a breach of the agreement occurs we will take action, I am talking about the situation: I assure him that I am not uttering empty threats.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I, as one representative of the districts that will be affected by Chowilla, am seriously perturbed about the difference of opinion in the Commonwealth Government, Victoria, and, apparently in this House this afternoon about the construction of the dam, a project that is important not only to my district but to the whole of South Australia. I think that some of the colourful language that has been indulged in this afternoon is not in accordance with fact. This report appears in this morning's *Advertiser*:

The Minister for National Development (Mr. Fairbairn) made this clear in the House of Representatives today. He said it would be ludicrous to delay such a meeting until the report of the technical committee of the River Murray Commission was available.

The meeting referred to was the meeting of Ministers. The Minister for National Development was not playing Party politics in making his statement as to what he said was ludicrous. The final paragraph of the report states:

The Prime Minister (Mr. Holt) will write to Mr. Dunstan later this week on his request for a Ministerial meeting.

Can the Premier say whether the River Murray Commission will hold a meeting soon in order to get the facts that will probably satisfy the Minister for National Development? How soon will the commission meet, and has the Premier seen the statement made on television by Sir Henry Bolte that Sir Henry was not opposed to the construction of the dam? In addition, what can be done in the interests of South Australia to overcome this impasse?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What can be done is what has been asked for by the Government and, as I have said previously in this House, we want an assurance from the parties to this agreement that we will get our water. A meeting of the River Murray Commission will be held on October 5 and October 6, but the technical reports on the studies related to the Chowilla project will not be available by then. It is hoped that the information will be available at a meeting to be held later this year. In the meantime, statements have been made by people in other States, in the Commonwealth Parliament, and in Victoria that show public concern about the development of this State and that some assurance is required. I would have thought people in the District of Ridley would think that.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: They do.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All we have asked for is a meeting of the responsible Ministers to see that that assurance is given.

The Government of this State has not said the kind of thing that has been said about the Premier of Victoria and what he has said about the project. Sir Henry Bolte has changed his tune from time to time, but I have not said anything unpleasant about him on this matter. Until today I have gone out of my way to be courteous and to be of assistance to the Commonwealth Government in this matter. I have not said anything attacking the Commonwealth Government about Chowilla.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: It is not as bad as it is made out?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All I know is that I am now charged not only in the Commonwealth Parliament but also from Opposition benches with having neglected this State's interests. The Minister for National Development charges me with playing politics when I simply wish to get the assurances that the constituents of the honourable member and the people of this State are asking for.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: The Prime Minister is still considering the matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I ask the House to proceed with the next question.

WATER RESTRICTIONS

Mr. CLARK: During the last few days I have heard much favourable comment about the Government's plan to obviate the necessity of water restrictions by encouraging and educating the general public to save water voluntarily. I believe the public is eager to co-operate and I know many people who are actively doing so already. Has the Minister of Works anything further to report about the campaign to save water?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I appreciate the honourable member's remarks about people expressing their satisfaction with the campaign and with the idea of trying to save water by voluntary restrictions. Both the Premier and I have also found that this is the case, as many complimentary remarks have been made to us about the campaign. Accordingly, tomorrow, through the press, radio and television, we will invite people to use the water they need but not to waste water. We hope that, with the co-operation of those bodies, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief will be able to issue statements and reply over the radio to any queries that may be raised by people about saving and using water. Also, during the course of the campaign we will advertise what is a reasonable quota of water to be used and we will inform people whether they are living within the limits of that quota. If people

fail to co-operate, we will explain what restrictions must be imposed. In all, there will be a full campaign, and I am confident that the people of South Australia, being loyal citizens, will respond to it.

CROWN PROCEEDINGS BILL

Mr. MILLHOUSE: From time to time during the life of this Parliament, both here and in the legal profession particularly, there have been reports that the Government intends to introduce a Crown Proceedings Bill. I think I am correct in saying that this was one of the contentions the Premier used against my proposal for an inquiry into the appointment of an ombudsman in this State. As time is drawing near for the close of the session (we have only another five or six weeks) will the Premier say whether the Government intends this session to introduce a Bill on this topic, as has been foreshadowed for the last two or three sessions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Negotiations between the Government and the Law Society concerning the contents of the Crown Proceedings Bill have not yet been completed. I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that a Bill was ready to be introduced last session. If the honourable member had read the minutes of the meeting of the Council of the Law Society he would know that it asked that the measure be deferred, and appointed a special committee to inquire into it. The deliberations of that committee and its submissions to the Government have not been completed and, in these circumstances, the Bill cannot be introduced this session, but it will be introduced by the Government next session.

ASSISTANCE TO MEMBER

Mr. McKEE: For the sake of the political career of the member for Mitcham, will the member for Gumeracha refrain from urging him to ask incriminating questions?

The SPEAKER: As the honourable member for Port Pirie anticipates, the question is not allowed.

IRRIGATION

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The River Murray Commission recently allocated 291,000 acre feet of water to South Australia this year in a period of restriction. Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government approved of the allocation made by the commission? Alternatively, was the allocation made in defiance of the South Australian vote?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Government did not approve, and I do not know

whether the allocation was made in defiance of the South Australian vote. The commissioner representing South Australia had to be reasonable, and I am sure that the member for Gumeracha in his calmer moments would expect him to be reasonable. The River Murray Waters 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.

RURAL SAFETY

Mr. RODDA: Some time ago the member for Light and I attended a seminar on rural safety in Canberra. Recently, I noticed on a television programme (I think channel 10) that a tractor seat had been developed with safety characteristics. At the conference in Canberra the rigours of tractor driving were demonstrated, and we were told that in Germany 70 per cent of tractor drivers were affected by vibration. The Adelaide University has developed this special tractor seat with desirable features that minimize the difficulty inflicted on tractor drivers. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether his officers have seen the seat and whether they will promote its general use on farms in this State?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I cannot comment on whether the seat will be used soon in this State. The honourable member would appreciate that the question of rural safety is dealt with by me, but the industrial side of rural activities comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour and Industry. Representatives concerned with both the agricultural and industrial aspects attended the meeting in Canberra, at which the honourable member and the member for Light were the only representatives of a political Party. This question

is slightly too involved for me to answer immediately. Far too many chances are still being taken by people with regard to the safety of children on mechanical farming equipment. Only last Sunday, when driving through the honourable member's district, I saw a young child of five or six years of age on a combine being drawn by a tractor at quite a reasonable speed. This sort of practice needs to be carefully watched by the people themselves who should have more regard for the safety of children in connection with farm implements.

WATER SUPPLIES

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Works say what quantity of water will be available for pumping during the critical period and how much water is stored in the reservoirs at present?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I might not be able to give the answers exactly as the honourable member has asked for them. However, on September 20 the metropolitan reservoirs held 13,890,000,000 gallons, and country reservoirs held 3,413,000,000 gallons. With regard to the pumping programme from the Mannum-Adelaide main, 14,470,000,000 gallons is to be pumped compared with 5,990,000,000 gallons pumped from July to September. The pumping programme for the Morgan-Whyalla main for 1967-68 is 6,150,000,000 gallons, the overall requirements of the State for 1967-68 being 41,000,000,000 gallons.

MARINO QUARRY

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from the Minister of Mines to my recent question about the progress of work on dust prevention at the Linwood Quarry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Considerable work has been done at Linwood Quarry to minimize the dust problem. Bituminizing of the roads to the crushing plants, speed limits on the roads, a change in drilling techniques, and a changing mining area have all assisted to this end. Regular operational maintenance, sweeping, and water spraying of roadways will keep the dust from these sources to a minimum. Additional exhaust fans, ducting, water baths, and the enclosing of the crushing plants, has considerably reduced the dust to atmosphere. A completely new water spraying system has been designed and will be installed shortly. This will provide additional dust suppression. The company is well aware of the problem, and is continuing its investigation on methods of

combating. The department is watching the position closely to ensure that the dust is kept to an absolute minimum.

MILITARY LEAVE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Over the last couple of years I have asked many questions of the Premier's predecessor regarding the policy of his Government on leave for State Government employees desiring to serve with the Citizen Military Forces. Last November the Premier's predecessor said that he would inform me if and when there was a change of policy. I did not hear from him, however, and I have not heard from the present Premier. Can the Premier therefore say whether the Government has considered this matter with a view to making conditions for members of the C.M.F., who desire to serve either full-time or at camps or courses, at least as attractive as are the conditions granted by the Commonwealth Government to its employees?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of the matter, but I will inquire.

ISLINGTON LAND

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about land at Islington that will become vacant, following the building of the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No final decision can be made regarding disposal of this land until the requirements of public utilities, services, roads, etc., in accordance with the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, can be finalized. These matters are being considered and the matter of disposal will be handled by my colleague the Minister of Lands when he is in a position to do so. Any inquiries from interested parties should be directed to him.

HOLDEN HILL SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: On June 28 last I asked the Minister acting in the absence of the Minister of Works a question about an area that was omitted from the approved original sewerage scheme at Holden Hill, and on July 11, I was informed that a further investigation would be made, and, on its completion, a report would be submitted. As this matter is being constantly raised by people living in the area who require the land to be seweraged, will the Minister of Works inquire whether a report has been completed by the Director and Engineer-in-Chief and, if it has, will he inform me of the result?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes.

WHEAT

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Premier, who is in charge of the Prices Department, a reply to the question I asked some time ago whether sufficient wheat was being held in the Adelaide Division for home consumption purposes in order to avoid the recurrence of a rather unpleasant incident that occurred some years ago when the division had to obtain wheat from the rest of the State with a consequent rise in the price of bread? Has he been able to obtain a report on the quantities of wheat at present held, and can he say whether they will be adequate for the home consumption needs of the metropolitan area?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have a detailed report from the Prices Commissioner, a summary of which is that when it became apparent in June that the wheat crop could be below average, the Wheat Board took steps to conserve supplies in the Adelaide Division. On present estimates, provided the position does not deteriorate any further, the Adelaide Division should have sufficient wheat for the coming season.

CRAYFISHING

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall:

(For wording of motion, see page 1167.)

(Continued from August 9. Page 1178.)

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): When the Leader moved this motion it was obvious that you, Mr. Speaker, were unsure whether the debate should take place at that stage but in your wisdom (and I believe correctly so) you left the matter for the House to decide. Our reason for previously wishing to defer the debate on this matter has become perfectly obvious: only last Thursday the Fishing Select Committee brought down its report. The Government naturally being aware of the impending report, there was no point in debating the matter previously. However, I have no objection to the Leader's moving the motion, for he was perfectly within his rights in doing so. The Leader said that he had visited South-Eastern ports where he had interviewed various fishermen and spoken to the representatives of fishing interests. However, I am sorry that he did not make that visit about two years previously for, had he done so, I am sure that we would have been further advanced in this matter than we are today.

Certain suggestions were made to me some time ago by the former Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation, suggestions relating to licensing generally, craypots and the number of people engaged in the industry. I subsequently visited the South-East and spoke at a large meeting in the Millicent hall to representatives of all sections of the industry, including people not only from the South-East but also from Port Adelaide, Victor Harbour, Kangaroo Island, and as far away as Port Lincoln. Although every fisherman present believed that something should be done about the industry, opinions were widely divided. I made that visit at the request of the Minister of Lands, who at the time was the private member for the District of Millicent and who was in hospital and could not attend the meeting himself.

Thinking that I would do the right thing, I asked the Director to prepare for me a statement concerning proposals to be circulated to members whose districts were associated with the fishing industry, in order that they might discuss this matter with me and arrive at worthwhile conclusions. My thoughts then (as they are now) were for the interests of the fishing industry. They were also the thoughts of the Government and that is why the Select Committee was appointed.

In the first place, it was agreed by the Leader of the Opposition and members on both sides of the House (including the member for Ridley) that a meeting should be held. Unfortunately, on the evening before the meeting was to take place, there was a late sitting of the House and another date for the meeting was therefore fixed. However, at that time a controversy arose in regard to another matter, as a result of which members opposite decided not to attend the meeting. Following the meeting, I still made available to all members the list of matters set out in the memorandum of the Director and gave them the opportunity, if they wished, to discuss the matter further with me. However, that course was not followed. It was apparent, while this was taking place, that much difference of opinion existed regarding the survey of fishing vessels. Therefore, this matter was also referred to the Select Committee.

At this stage, I should congratulate all members of the Select Committee for the attention they have given to this industry: I am sure the report they have brought down is worth while. I was amazed that two Opposition members, after having attended one or two meetings of the committee, decided that they

would not continue as members of it. The reason given was that they did not want to be inveigled into a decision which they might not favour. That seemed rather odd to me because, over the years, I have been a member of quite a few Select Committees. I remember one case in which I disagreed with the other members of the committee. Although it was not possible for a minority report to be brought down, I was able to have my views recorded and, subsequently, when the matter was before the House, I expressed my views in the debate. The Leader suggested during his speech on this motion that, although the two Opposition members had not remained on it, if the committee's report was worth while he would give it his blessing. I have not asked him his attitude to the report, but as soon as it became available I handed a few copies to him so I dare say he has had a good opportunity to peruse it. I hope he sees fit to accept it as worth while.

I believe members of the committee have devoted themselves to their task diligently. According to the report, they have gained much experience in this matter since the committee was appointed. I wonder why members opposite doubted what type of report would be brought down. Their attitude seems to me to have been jumping the gun, because they decided not to associate themselves with the committee even before it had a chance to do anything. Although one member said that he believed this committee was only set up as a means of getting me out of trouble, I assure members that, although I have been in much trouble in one way or another since I have been a Minister, I have not shirked my responsibility. Therefore, the committee was not appointed to help me out. I wanted guidance on this matter because I did not want to be a know-all in regard to this industry: I wanted to have something that would be of use to the whole industry. Surely that is not an improper attitude; if it were, we would not have had any Select Committees. I point out that, under the previous Government, Select Committees, Royal Commissions and other inquiries were instituted. When he spoke in this debate, referring to his visit to the South-East, the Leader said:

I told the fishermen in no uncertain terms that everything discussed in the House was political, and they accepted that explanation, which was a proper one. We are not going to be taken as minority representatives on a committee and inveigled into Government matters with which we may not agree. I also said that, if the report was a sensible one, we

would support it to the hilt. We are not playing politics in the way members opposite do.

I do not know just what can be described as playing politics in this type of case. When I visited Millicent with the member for the district (the Minister of Lands) last Saturday evening, the fishermen said that they did not want to see this matter made a political football. They said that they thought the Government had taken the best course to get the information available. Since the committee was appointed, the fishermen have come closer together: their associations have become more active and have supplied useful information. I believe that the Select Committee's report bears this out and that this information will be of great benefit not only now but also in the future.

About a week ago I went to a fisheries conference in Western Australia where many similar problems were expressed. All the Ministers present said that insufficient work was being done regarding fisheries; of course, this has been borne out by the Select Committee's report. I am aware that the fishing industry has been depressed in this State. The Queensland Minister suggested that fishing in Australia was a Cinderella industry. The attitude generally seems to be that there is a need to expand the fishing industry; that has been my view ever since I took over this portfolio. One of the matters that came out of the recent conference was that the industry should be putting more into the development of research and education and into extending the industry. I was told that Western Australia and Tasmania had already done something along these lines. In Western Australia, certain sums are being taken from the processing plants and placed in a special fund for fisheries development. In Tasmania, cray fishermen are levied a certain sum for each linear foot of their boats, the money being placed in a fund for the purpose of expanding the industry. Until now little money has been given by the Commonwealth Government towards fisheries development. It has given something to the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization for research and has made available some money for the fishing industry. South Australia received some a few years ago in connection with the experiments into the purse-seine method. This money came from the sale of the Carnarvon whaling station some years previously. In all, the amount of money that the Commonwealth has made available is insignificant.

During the meeting to which I have referred it was decided that each State Minister would consider whether money from the fishing industry could be put into an industry fund in a similar way to the way in which funds have been established in the beef, cattle and dairy industries. The Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry agreed to recommend to his Cabinet that the Commonwealth subsidize this fund on a \$1 for \$1 basis. The Directors will meet in Melbourne in a week or two to place the matter on an acceptable basis. The amount of contributions suggested in the committee's report is the amount suggested by the fishermen themselves, namely, \$20 a year instead of \$2 a year. Those contributions will bring in a large amount and give a start.

At an earlier conference South Australia recommended that there be co-operation by way of education in extension by the industry itself. A meeting was held in Canberra last February to consider the matter and some States have already agreed to the establishment of a Fisheries Council, comprising representatives of fishermen and those who market and process fish, for the purpose of carrying out this work for the industry. If it is desired that the industry prosper, those concerned should consider whether any other industry funds ought to be made available for promotion.

I think the exercise of appointing the Select Committee was good, because fishermen and all concerned with the handling of fish were brought together to promote the industry. I consider that there will be an upsurge in future development of fisheries throughout Australia. Members will be aware that Mr. Olsen has been appointed to the position of Director of our department. He has a wealth of experience in crayfishing and has been with C.S.I.R.O., the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries in Tasmania, and a firm in that State. When he takes up his position, he and the Directors from Victoria and Tasmania will discuss common interests and problems in the crayfishing industry. This is a step forward, because there is this inter-relationship among the States in connection with fishing: there is no obstacle about votes because of State borders or Bass Strait. By complete liaison and good fellowship among representatives from the three States we can get the best for the industry.

I think we shall have an upsurge in the promotion of fisheries such as we have not experienced before. Last evening I heard, during the broadcast of Parliamentary proceedings

from the Commonwealth Parliament, a question asked about large fishing grounds that have apparently been discovered off the coasts of South Australia and Western Australia. If this discovery has been made, I hope to hear more about it and how it can be developed.

Mr. Quirke: The Japanese have probably heard about it by now.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: We have problems about fishermen from foreign countries coming in and this matter will also be discussed by the Fisheries Council soon. There is at present an air of expectancy in the industry. The Fisheries Department's vessel *Investigator* is at present on the slip at Port Adelaide undergoing inspection and it is hoped that the vessel will be in the South-East when the crayfishing season begins on November 1. On Saturday night I had discussions with representatives of the various associations in the South-East and they were happy with the committee's proposals about a freezing of licences now held by people in the industry and the proposal that others be not allowed into the industry. This, of course, is the text of the Leader's motion. However, it is nothing new. It had been discussed with me and with the former Minister of Agriculture. The dockets show that the matter had been referred to the former Minister about five years before I came into office and that suggestions had been made about what should be done. However, nothing was done at that time. This Government, in about three years, has endeavoured to get together the honourable members interested in fishing so that the problem could be discussed. That was not successful and we then appointed a Select Committee which was successful and which has brought down a useful report.

The Leader moved his motion knowing that a Select Committee was sitting at the time. Although he would have liked to proceed with the debate, it was not proceeded with, because the committee's report was pending and, therefore, there was no need for the debate to go on. I, in moving the adjournment of the debate, considered that if I were to reply at that time, I would have had to cite many figures and statements from official documents, and I knew that you, Mr. Speaker, quite rightly would have asked for an assurance that that material had not been placed before the Select Committee. I could not have given such assurance. As members will see, much of that material is in the committee's report and also would be in the minutes. To continue the debate at that time would have been farcical.

It was not with any spite that I asked for the debate on the motion to be adjourned. The Leader had the right to move the motion and to speak to fishermen in the South-East, and I commend him for his action in visiting these places, because all honourable members should speak to people associated with this industry, but this action should have been taken two years ago. I oppose the motion not because of what it contains but because everything has been done by this Government to ensure that the interests of the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department and the livelihood of all fishermen are protected.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the motion. The Minister of Agriculture has maintained that since the Labor Government has been in office it has honoured its obligations, but there has been a decrease in the amount of assistance given to the fishing industry. I have carried out much research and spoken to many fishermen. For the Minister to say that the Commonwealth Government has not contributed much to the fishing industry is not a fair statement. Recently, that Government carried out an extensive programme of research in conjunction with the Tasmanian Government. At Victor Harbour, crayfish were tagged and research conducted on their activities, but when fishermen caught the tagged fish and informed the department they were told that that department was not interested in the tagged crayfish. The Playford Government was responsible for obtaining experts from other States and overseas to investigate the tuna fishing industry, but during the last two or three years no action has been taken by the present Government.

The Minister of Agriculture said that he did not want to be considered a "smart aleck" in making a decision on behalf of the industry, but advice is available to him from his departmental officers, and various fishing associations have given him much information. The Government has power to do many things for the crayfishing industry, either by proclamation or by regulation. The Minister of Agriculture was a "smart aleck" when he allowed South Australian egg producers to be controlled by the plan of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities without allowing them to vote on it: by contrast, the policy of the Liberal Government had always been that producers should be able to vote on whether they approved of such a scheme. The Labor Party has not spent as much money on the fishing industry as the Playford Government spent, and the Loan Fund allocations to build slipways, boat havens, and harbours, have been

decreasing. I hope the Government will have a change of heart and do something with drive and energy (as the Playford Government did) to help this industry develop.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): The district I have the honour to represent contains the major crayfishing ports of this State, from Kingston in the north to Port MacDonnell in the south, and every port in that area is in my district. In October last year the Government realized the need for an inquiry into this important industry, because of conditions in the industry at that time. That position had not been reached overnight. Since becoming a member, I have often referred to the difficulties confronting this industry, particularly in my district, and many times I asked questions of the then Minister of Agriculture concerning controls to be used in this industry. Each time I was not satisfied with the reply: the Playford Government seemed to be reluctant to introduce the controls that appeared to be necessary if the industry were to survive.

Following the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into this industry (it was appointed in the normal fashion with three Government and two Opposition members), it is well known that, subsequently, the two Opposition appointees withdrew and the Government had to appoint an additional two members in order to allow the committee to proceed with its important inquiry. The reasons for the resignation of the two members from the committee are better known to the Opposition than to the Government. Following that, about the middle of the year, the Leader of the Opposition in this House and the Leader of the Opposition in another place visited Millicent, accompanied by the Liberal and Country League's endorsed candidate for Millicent at the next election.

Mr. Rodda: He's a good colt.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I did not say anything about the qualities of my opponent, and I will not argue them. As the honourable member for Victoria has commented, he may be a good colt. However, he has yet to prove that. The motive of the visit, whether it was political or not, interests me. I have been left in no doubt really that it was, because I know what led up to it. I have no argument about that: they have a perfect right to do that sort of thing, and one has to expect it.

Mr. Nankivell: This is the thing these days.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, but I would prefer to see this sort of thing completely left out so that we could get on with the job. I think the member for Albert would agree with that. I did not enter into the fray in this matter, but let them have their little play because I was satisfied with what the Government was doing at that stage. At any rate, because the investigation of the Select Committee was continuing and, until it was completed and the Government had some idea what it could do, I could not say anything; nor did I. However, I am sure the Leader and his friends realized this and tried to make capital of it because of my position. I can only say good luck to them, because it caused me no worries.

The only thing that concerned me about their action was the publicity it brought in the area, and people who were thinking of establishing in the industry but at that time had done nothing positive towards it would have established immediately because they were afraid of missing out if controls were imposed. I believe this actually happened. Although perhaps the Leader thought he was going to help them, he did not do so: in fact, he may have harmed them. The report, a very good one, by the Select Committee was tabled in this House last Thursday, and on Saturday evening, together with the Minister of Agriculture, I discussed it with representatives of the South-Eastern Professional Fishermen's Association in Millicent.

Indicating the amount of work the committee has done since October last year is the pile of evidence that was laid on the table with the report. Generally, the recommendations made by the committee on every aspect of the industry were very sound, considering the relatively short time involved. I hope that, if not immediately, between the end of this Parliamentary session and the beginning of the next, new legislation will be formulated that will put this industry on a sound basis for the first time. The report contains good grounds on which to work. Immediately action needs to be taken to ensure that no fishermen other than those already established should operate in the industry. Further, if we are to impose that type of control, we should impose a pot limit. The Select Committee recommended the appointment of an advisory committee to study the report and inform the Minister what steps should be taken regarding not only the crayfishing industry but also other types of fishing and the safety survey of fishing vessels. This is an important

point and should be examined quickly. I think the suggestion of the Select Committee will be implemented: I am certain the first two points to which I referred will be observed during this Parliamentary session.

At present licences have to be issued by October 1, and I believe licences have already gone out to the various points of issue. It will be possible, without altering the present system of licensing, to control the number of vessels entering the crayfishing industry in the South-East. The committee considered many other important matters relating to crayfishing, the most important of which were to stabilize the industry, to impose a pot limit, and then to do all the other necessary things. Surely more research should be conducted in this important industry. Although complaints of a decline in the industry have been made, figures reveal that there has been a steady increase in the weight of crayfish caught in each year since 1962. More and more people are becoming established in the industry, and it is more difficult for them to rely entirely on crayfishing to obtain a reasonable living in a reasonable time. Many things apart from research need to be done, but they should not be entirely the responsibility of the Government. I believe the States should play their part, but in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government. The latter should make funds available to assist with the research necessary to enable the industry to continue. It is indeed a valuable industry, particularly in my district.

Mr. McAnaney: The Commonwealth Government is already helping.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not doing anything in the field of crayfish research: it is helping with research in the tuna industry.

Mr. McAnaney: It is in Tasmania.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member can talk about Tasmania if he wants to: I am talking about South Australia, the State that concerns me most. If the honourable member says that, he is really pointing out the lack of initiative of the previous Government because it did nothing in this field. I do not want to enter into an argument with the honourable member, because I do not think it is worth while. I am indeed pleased with the positive action taken by this Government since it has been in office. The motion moved by the Leader was purely political in motive and unnecessary because, as the Leader knew, at that time the Select Committee was reaching the end of its deliberations. The recommendations made by the committee, if they can be

put into effect, will play an important part in stabilizing the industry. As I believe that research is necessary and that more money must be spent on facilities for the industry in this particular area, I hope that that money will be forthcoming.

I think we can stand up and argue against anyone that in the short time we have been in office we can compare our achievements in this field with those of any other Government. I am talking now not merely of figures for this and that, as the Leader would do, but of actually tackling the problems that face this industry in the future. This is the important thing, and in this respect we have left the former Liberal Government for dead.

I am sorry that the Leader missed my opening remarks. I make it clear that he did not upset me in the least by doing what he did. I do not think I need say anything further. I know that some members of the Select Committee who are now much better informed about this industry and its difficulties than they were 12 months ago are now anxious to give the House the benefit of the experience and knowledge they have gained since then. As the member representing this district, which has such an important stake in this industry, I am happy indeed (and I know that the fishermen in the area are also happy indeed) to think that something positive is being done, that the fishermen have before them a report indicating that we have a good understanding of the industry and its problems and that we will be trying our hardest to do something for them as quickly as possible.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): In rising to speak to this motion, I do so in the knowledge that now that the debate has come on after the report of the Select Committee has been presented there is no limitation placed on the remarks that a member of that committee may make. We are now completely at liberty to refer to the evidence that was placed before the committee. I think certain features of the history of this committee need careful and detailed examination. First, we are informed by the Leader of the Opposition that as a result of his trip to the South-East he learned certain things. The Leader, at page 1168 of *Hansard*, said:

One thing I have learned from my meetings with cray fishermen, both on my first visit and last Friday, when I attended the ports of Grey (formerly Southend), Carpenter Rocks and Port MacDonnell (I have visited all six ports and talked with about 200 cray fishermen along the coast), is that the natural resource on which this industry is based is becoming seriously depleted.

The Leader of the Opposition learned that only as a result of his visit to the South-East. How did it arise that the Leader did not learn about the depletion of the crayfishing resources from some of his colleagues? The members for Alexandra and Flinders, prior to their resignation from the Select Committee, heard evidence from Mr. Caton, and they would have been fully apprised of the situation that had existed in that area for some years.

The honourable member for Alexandra was previously the Minister of Agriculture, and he had numerous representations made to him by professional fishermen from the South-East on this very matter. However, all those representations were ignored. Is the Leader not informed by his colleagues about what is going on?

Mr. Casey: Perhaps they do not take him into their confidence.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know. I was certainly surprised to hear his statement (page 1172 of *Hansard*) regarding the Select Committee:

We are not going to be taken as minority representatives on a committee and inveigled into Government matters with which we may not agree.

I do not think there is provision for a minority report. However, any member of a Select Committee can certainly record his dissent from a majority point of view, and he can use his influence to affect the kind of report that is presented to Parliament. Therefore, that particular reasoning is completely and utterly specious. No limitation at all would be placed on a member of a Select Committee in ultimate debate in Parliament or in what he said outside. If a member had not supported certain recommendations of that Select Committee and had in fact voted against them, how on earth could there be any limitation on him?

It is clear that the Opposition members were withdrawn from the Select Committee because they wished to play politics in the matter. The kind of politics they wished to play became apparent only a short while ago, when by misfortune I heard the Leader of the Opposition on a radio programme. When he was asked why the members of the Opposition were withdrawn from the committee, he said that the Government was putting up a proposal for the licensing of everyone, amateurs included, that this was completely unacceptable to the Opposition, and that it was for that reason its members were pulled off the committee. The Opposition had so much con-

cern about the crayfishing industry at that stage that it was not even prepared to allow its members to continue on the Select Committee. Those members could have helped the committee with its deliberations and helped it to come to a speedy conclusion, and they could have voted against any recommendation with which they did not agree.

To give the complete lie to what the Leader of the Opposition said on 5AD, I point out that there is nothing in the recommendations of the Select Committee that would establish the truth of the Leader's statement that the Government was going to license all amateurs. In fact, the licensing system that is recommended by the committee specifically excludes amateurs who are excluded under the present Act. There is absolutely no change with respect to the status of an amateur who is not licensed under the present Act and who does not need to be licensed.

Mr. Burdon: Where did this suggestion come from?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know, but obviously it was made. I think it is clear that at the stage the Opposition Party withdrew its members from the Select Committee it was more concerned to play politics than it was concerned about the conditions of the crayfishing industry. If it had had a real concern it would have kept its members on the committee and the Leader would then have known about the difficulties of the crayfishing industry without having to wait until he went down to the South-East a few weeks ago. The Leader claims that it was not until the Leader of the Opposition in another place contacted him that he became aware of this problem.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He'd do a lot for it, too.

Mr. HUDSON: Does not the set of historical facts that I have outlined suggest that this motion was just another means of trying to climb on the band waggon and trying to claim some political kudos in a group that was neglected by the Leader of the Opposition and the previous Liberal Government for more years than the Leader would care to remember? This industry has never been regarded as an industry by the former Government; it was never given industry status and, compared to the kind of treatment available to other primary industries, the fishing industry was completely and utterly neglected. It was not until this Government appointed a Select Committee that we had a series of

recommendations relating to the fishing industry, with the aim of the proper conservation and management of the fishery reserves of this State. That is the proper aim, which must govern all recommendations relating to the industry.

Mr. Casey: The Opposition's attitude was similar with regard to tourism in this State.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. I have not detailed the full history of this matter: we all know that Opposition members deliberately boycotted a meeting called by the Minister of Agriculture and accused him of not being prepared to take a political decision (or any sort of decision) but of trying to duck the whole issue. Members opposite should have known the Minister's repute in respect of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities plan. No-one can doubt the courage of the Minister; he has frequently demonstrated it when he has taken decisions that have brought great outcries from the Opposition. The Minister supported the full investigation of the industry and the setting up of the Select Committee, and I have no doubt as he indicated today, that he is satisfied with the report that has been presented to Parliament on this matter.

The motion is limited in its content: it refers only to the licensing of all commercial cray-fishing boats. The evidence presented to the Select Committee strongly suggested that, if a boat limit were to be imposed in order to restrict excess effort in the industry and therefore preserve properly the fishery resources of the State, some form of pot limitation should also be imposed; otherwise, we could have further great increases in the number of pots used on a fishing vessel, and that would lead again to excess effort. It was also pointed out in evidence to the committee that a pot limitation placed on commercial crayfishermen would not on its own be adequate: a pot limitation imposes a limitation on the earnings of those fishermen who are already engaged in the industry. Without a boat limitation being imposed, it would mean such earnings would be limited in the interests of conservation of the fishery, but at the same time new boats would be free to enter the industry, and no effective control over the entire fishing effort would result. The consequence of a pot limitation without any boat limitation would therefore be a reduction in the earnings of those already engaged in the industry; it would also mean no effective control of effort and therefore no effective conservation. I do not think it is appropriate that the House

should express its opinion on this matter in the limited and unknowledgeable way suggested by the Leader. I therefore move:

To strike out all the words after "and" first occurring and to insert "the Government is to be congratulated on the actions already taken and is requested to give full and urgent consideration to the implementation of the recommendations on crayfishing of the Select Committee on the Fishing Industry".

Mr. Millhouse: What a lovely amendment!

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Mitcham is so ignorant in this matter that he would not know what was what, and I suggest that unless he can make a constructive interjection he should keep on reading his paper, for he may benefit from that.

Mr. Millhouse: I think I know as much about it as you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg!

Mr. Quirke: He couldn't know less!

Mr. HUDSON: I should be interested to hear what the member for Burra had to say. The amendment should be fully acceptable to members opposite, because it means that we are requesting the Government urgently to consider implementing not only a system of licensing in respect of crayfishing vessels but also the other recommendations made by the Select Committee on this subject. In particular, I believe that the recommendations concerning pot limits should be seriously considered. As I have said, it is not sufficient to have a boat limit in crayfishing areas that are being overfished: one or two boats in the South-East are using almost 200 pots in comparison with the typical use of, say, 50 to 60 pots in the Port Lincoln area. The extent of overfishing in the South-East, particularly concerning those fishermen operating in Port MacDonnell and at Carpenter Rocks, is indicated by the extent of the rise in the number of pots used on a boat over the last few years. That rise is the only means that the individual fisherman has, acting on his own initiative, of trying to maintain his total catch when the catch for each boat is reduced. In my view, it is always a good sign that a particular fishery is being overfished if we see a situation developing where there is a large increase in the number of pots being used by each fishing boat. If there is no pot limitation when the normal pot usage in an area like Port Lincoln or even Kingston is, say, 50 to 60, whereas in the area being overfished it can exceed the 150 mark, and we examine the number of boats that can get an increase in the number of pots being used, we see the

potential for extra effort and recognize that there is still not effective control over the overall fishing effort.

If members consider this point, they will realize that it is not enough just to impose a limitation on the number of boats operating. I know there may be difficulties in policing pot limits. However, so long as we have the co-operation of the vast majority of fishermen (which I believe we shall get) the policing of a pot limitation ceases to be difficult because, if 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the fishermen are abiding by a pot limitation, that majority itself will police it. No man is prepared in the interests of conservation to restrict the effort he puts into earning his living if he sees other fishermen alongside him not obeying the law. If a substantial number of fishermen refuse to obey the pot limitation, it can be effective only if it is properly policed. However, it is quite clear that, if the great majority of fishermen are prepared to observe a pot limitation, any fisherman who departs from it in a particular area will be quickly reported to the authorities and appropriate action taken.

Where the majority of a group of people is behaving in one way in the interests of the whole group and one or two people depart from that pattern of behaviour in order to advance their individual, selfish interests, the majority will take the necessary effective action. At any rate, if the Government has difficulty, for example, in getting the necessary inspectors to do this work, getting the fishermen themselves to police a pot limitation will be an effective method. If we are to discuss this matter, we should also consider the recommendation of the Select Committee that a crayfish advisory committee be established. This is one way in which the fishermen themselves can be brought into the process of administration. That committee would be required to recommend on all matters affecting the crayfishing industry, and obviously in relation to pot or boat limitations in a particular zone the recommendations of that committee would be crucial in influencing the Minister on the appropriate course of action to be taken.

If we wish to get the co-operation of the fishermen, the use of such a committee is most desirable. Honourable members who have studied the report of the Select Committee will notice that the crayfish advisory committee is recommended to be constituted in the following manner: one member to be nominated by the Minister and to be chairman of the committee; two members to be nominated by the South-East Fishermen's Association; two members to

be appointed to represent other areas, those two members to be fishermen who for commercial purposes are actively engaged in the taking of crayfish; and one member who is an officer of the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department. This means that professional fishermen will form the majority of the committee. Four of the six members will be professional fishermen, and two of them will come from the South-East Fishermen's Association.

Honourable members will have noticed that for the remainder of the State the Select Committee suggested the appointment of only two other fishermen, not representing any particular association. The problem is that apart from the South-East Fishermen's Association there are no other effective overall fishermen's organizations covering other fishing ports in the rest of South Australia. I have no doubt that once the recommendations of this Select Committee are in the process of implementation, fishermen's organizations will develop promptly in other fishing ports on the West Coast, on Yorke Peninsula and in Spencer Gulf.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: There are such organizations now.

Mr. HUDSON: But they are not combined together. There is no banding together of the fishing groups as there is in the South-East. Consequently, we cannot specify in relation to the appointment of this crayfishing advisory committee that certain ports shall provide permanent representation on the committee. I have no doubt that, when a West Coast fishermen's association is established or a fishermen's association covering Yorke Peninsula and Spencer Gulf is formed, it will then be possible to revise the composition of this committee so that it consists in its fishing representatives, of two members of the South-East Fishermen's Association, one from the West Coast and one from Yorke Peninsula or Spencer Gulf; but first we would need proper overall associations formed in those areas. The legislation and actions of the Government in relation to this industry will result in the formation of this sort of association among fishermen. They will find that their opinion is being sought to a much greater extent than hitherto on matters affecting their industry; consequently, as their opinion is being sought, they will want some form of permanent representation.

I was interested in what the Leader of the Opposition said about the prospective report of the committee. He said:

I also said that if the report was a sensible one we would support it to the hilt.

I for one regard the report as a sensible one but, as a member of the Select Committee, my opinion is obviously prejudiced and I leave it to other honourable members to judge whether the Select Committee has used sound judgment and common sense in determining the appropriate recommendations to be made with respect to the crayfishing and general scale fishing industries; but I remind honourable members what the Leader of the Opposition has said about this. It will be interesting to see whether or not the Leader supports us to the hilt in this matter. I certainly hope he does; I hope he supports to the hilt the action taken by the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Lands in meeting the South-East Professional Fishermen's Association a day or two after this report was presented to Parliament. I hope that the action that will follow the meeting will be supported to the hilt by members opposite, because the urgent action that is, in my view and in the view of the Select Committee, necessary regarding the South-East zone is the introduction of boat and pot limits, with restrictions placed on amateurs selling crayfish.

Mr. Rodda: You are not talking about farmers in Naracoorte, are you?

Mr. HUDSON: If the honourable member considers carefully the recommendations of the committee regarding licensing, he will see that provision is made for part-time commercial fishermen. The committee was careful in this matter. Also, there is a serious problem of definition.

Mr. Nankivell: How do you define part-time commercial fishermen?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know whether the member for Victoria is talking about farmers who fish for part of the year or about farmers who are amateurs. If he is talking about farmers who are amateurs, I presume that he will support the proposition that, as they are fishing purely for their own pleasure, they should not be able to undercut the professional fishermen or exploit the fishery resources of the State in a way that is not in the overall interests of the industry. The basic proposition that must be supported in relation to this industry is that legislation or regulations must aim to serve and manage properly the fishery resources of South Australia. I suspect that we are probably already too late and that fishermen in the South-East will experience some reduction in income over the next few years. I am confident that fisher-

men in that area recognize that a pot limit together with a boat limit will mean a reduction in earnings initially.

Mr. Quirke: Have you considered artificial propagation?

Mr. HUDSON: Not in detail. If the honourable member looks at the report of the committee, he will find that little information is at present available on the breeding habits of crayfish. One of the recommendations of the committee related to that problem and to the need for further research into the matter so that gradually information would be available to us.

Mr. Quirke: Something is being done in Western Australia.

Mr. HUDSON: At this stage we cannot say for certain that a particular area is a breeding area and should therefore be closed completely to any crayfishing. There may be an area close inshore that is a breeding area.

Mr. Quirke: The assumption is that there is no breeding area.

Mr. HUDSON: I think the member for Stirling and his Victor Harbour cronies would seriously dispute that, because their case for permitting the smaller-size crayfish at Victor Harbour to be taken is based entirely on the proposition that they are locally bred and that, because of local features, the crayfish never grow to the normal size. Whatever we may say or think at present, no proposition can be put up in relation to the breeding habits of crayfish that can be substantiated with any degree of confidence. Consequently, we are unable to make appropriate regulations restricting crayfishing in certain areas. As the Minister of Lands indicated, it is most necessary to ensure that more research is carried out in this matter.

Mr. Quirke: If you put a bucketful of Victor Harbour crayfish into different breeding grounds, I think they would grow up.

Mr. HUDSON: I agree with the honourable member and, if he reads the report carefully, he will see that the Select Committee agrees with him. We believed it might well be demonstrated, by stricter controls on the taking of undersized crayfish at Victor Harbour and by the introduction of a closed season in October for the taking of male crayfish, that there was an increasing average size of fish caught there. If that were the case, then the recommendation of the Select Committee would be that it was now beginning to be demonstrated that, if the fish were allowed to grow in this area, they would grow to the normal size; we would then recommend that in

stages the size limit for crayfish caught at Victor Harbour should be raised to the same level as it was anywhere else in the State so that no distinction would be made. This recommendation was not made initially simply because, although the committee could reach an opinion whether Victor Harbour crayfish were peculiar to Victor Harbour and whether by some local magic they did not grow beyond 8 in., it was not possible to say with complete confidence, on the evidence presented to us, that one opinion or another was necessarily correct. Insufficient research has been carried out.

A great hullabaloo about this matter was created by the Leader, who managed to draw the attention of people in the South-East proposing to enter the crayfishing industry to the fact that it was possible that restrictions would be imposed. Anyone who was considering entering the industry during the next year was therefore given prior warning. Soon after the great hullabaloo created by the Leader numerous decisions were apparently made to build more boats to enter the crayfishing industry. I wonder whether the professional fishermen in the South-East have been well served by the Leader.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I doubt whether we would ever have had a report had it not been for the Leader's action.

Mr. HUDSON: It is a real joke when the member for Gumeracha, who was leader of a Government which did absolutely nothing about the fishing industry and which did not even regard it as an industry, makes that sort of interjection. The industry has never been given industrial status and matters relating to crayfishing have been coming up for years and years. The fishing industry was subject to years of neglect and stagnation. If the member for Gumeracha checks the records of the Fishing Select Committee, he will find that it ceased hearing evidence in July, before there was any mention of the motion of the Leader of the Opposition. Does the member for Gumeracha suggest that, after the committee had heard so much evidence, it could present a detailed report to Parliament within two or three weeks? The Select Committee, after deliberating for six or seven weeks, was able to come to sensible conclusions.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Who says they are sensible?

Mr. HUDSON: I do, and so do the fishermen, and the member for Gumeracha would say this, too, if he had studied the report; I suggest that he do so—he may learn something of value to him, to the House, and to the

fishermen themselves. In the case of certain kinds of announcement, such as financial announcements, great care must be taken not to give any hint beforehand of what will be announced; otherwise, people stand to gain financially. If this report is read carefully, it will be noticed that the committee hoped it would be possible to limit the number of boats to those already built or in the process of construction at September 1. This involves retrospectivity, which arises purely because of the action of the Leader of the Opposition.

I do not know whether the member for Gumeracha suggests that this committee would never have reported; if he does so, then I would, to use a Parliamentary term, say that he is guilty of a terminological inexactitude. I would certainly say that the statement was an untruth. If members who are interested in the industry and sincere in their desire to see it established properly will read this report, they will see that the committee used sound judgment in reaching its conclusions; it was concerned to produce a proper series of recommendations for the benefit of the crayfishing industry as a whole in order to protect fishermen already in the industry and to see that, if limitations were imposed, the reduction in income suffered by those already in the industry would not be too serious.

This is why the pot limitation suggested for the South-East is higher than that suggested for the other zones. If we were to adopt a pot limitation of one a foot, which exists in Western Australia and Tasmania, the reduction in earnings that would immediately occur in the South-East would be very great indeed, and some crayfishermen would be forced to leave the industry. I think that crayfishermen already in the industry recognize that, if the pot and boat limitation that is to be imposed is not successful in building up the catch a pot, then a further reduction in the pot limit will have to be imposed, and some fishermen may be forced to leave the industry. However, if the committee's suggestions are successful, the catch a pot will be improved and, as improvements occur, the pot limit can be reduced.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: To two pots a foot?

Mr. HUDSON: Some fishermen in the South-East are using 150 or more pots. If the limit was reduced to one pot a foot, which in all circumstances would ensure that fishermen could effectively look after their pots and see that they were pulled with sufficient regularity,

this would cause a reduction in income to 25 or 35 per cent of the fishermen's previous income.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Aren't your recommendations going to run them out of the industry, anyhow?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not think so. The member for Gumeracha made a mess of the crayfishing industry; he neglected it for many years, and he needs help now. I have great feelings of human kindness for him. At the current price level for crayfish most professional fishermen will be able to stay in the industry under the pot limitation suggested by the committee.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What percentage will leave the industry?

Mr. HUDSON: Not more than 2 per cent or 3 per cent at the present juncture; perhaps not that. I do not think this limitation will result in any serious exodus. However, if the committee had suggested a limitation of one pot a foot, there would have been such an exodus. It is clear that professional fishermen in the South-East are likely to accept the limitation.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Did they suggest it?

Mr. HUDSON: Various suggestions were put to the committee. One suggestion made in the South-East was for two pots a foot, and a further suggestion from the Port MacDonnell Association was for a limit of 45, plus one a foot up to a limit of 85. If the member for Gumeracha compares this suggestion, he will see that they give greater protection to the smaller fishing boat, say, a 25ft. boat.

Under the Port MacDonnell suggestion the limit would have been 70 pots, but under the committee's suggestion it is 60 pots. We do not regard our proposal as the ultimate answer: it is only a suggestion. At this stage, as this pot limitation imposes a restriction on fishermen's income that may turn out to be serious, we should seek the co-operation of the fishermen in the area. This is the answer for the crayfishing industry. I personally know the great amount of effort that went into this committee's work. The committee was careful to ensure that its recommendations were sound and based on common sense. The work of the committee shows that the reasons given by the Opposition members for withdrawing from the committee were sheer nonsense.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Can the honourable member tell us why the committee reported against Chowilla dam?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: I believe in observing the Standing Orders, and we are discussing crayfishing. I suppose the honourable member wants to establish a hatchery at Chowilla.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Won't this affect the water coming down the river?

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Gumeracha would make a good octopus, which is one of the main destroyers of crayfish. He puts out his interjections like the octopus puts its tentacles on a crayfish. His interjections are designed to distract and mislead, but not to help in the debate. The committee has done its work conscientiously and well. At no stage was there justification for the Opposition's withdrawal of its members from the committee. Further, at no stage could the Leader of the Opposition not have learnt about the problems of the industry if he, the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) and the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) had co-operated. The Leader of the Opposition had to rely on the Leader in another place to tell him the position. He could not rely on the previous Minister or his other colleagues in this place: he had to be dragged to the South-East by the Leader of the Opposition in another place.

Mr. Rodda: How do you know that?

Mr. HUDSON: He has said so. He said:

One thing I have learned from my meetings with crayfishermen . . . is that the natural resource on which this industry is based is becoming seriously depleted.

Why was he not told that by the member for Flinders or the member for Alexandra? Why was a member from another place required to take him by the hand so that he could find out? If that was the reason for his visit to the South-East, why did the Opposition withdraw its members from the committee and boycott the meeting with the Minister of Agriculture in 1966? That was done to avoid any responsibility in regard to the fishing industry. The Opposition took an interest at a late stage, but they have missed the boat. The only effects of the Leader's motion could be an increase in the number of crayfishermen operating in the South-East and that the imposition of limitations has been made more difficult. The motion would make it more difficult for the professional fishermen in the South-Eastern zone to obtain their livelihood.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I am pleased to second the amendment. It was rather curious of the Leader of the Opposition to place his motion on the Notice Paper, because representations had been made to the Playford Government for many years to have

something done for the crayfishing industry in the South-East. The Leader and a member from another place went to the South-East and tried to stir up strife there. They did a disservice to the crayfishing industry and to the crayfishermen in the area. One or two people from there have expressed opinions about the Leader of the Opposition but if I attempted to mention those opinions you, Mr. Speaker, would probably rule me out of order.

Mr. Rodda: I thought they were pleased to see them, and that they welcomed them with open arms.

Mr. BURDON: I thought it was suggested at one place that they be pushed overboard. I am justified in repeating that, when in 1965 the Minister in charge of fisheries asked all members whose districts included fishing areas to meet to discuss the best way to assist the fishing industry, particularly the crayfishing industry in the South-East, not one Opposition member attended the meeting. They all had various excuses for not attending. In 1966 a Select Committee was set up and two Opposition members were appointed to it. These Opposition members attended a couple of meetings but then wrote to the committee saying that they would not attend any more meetings.

Mr. Broomhill: What was their excuse?

Mr. BURDON: I would think that all they were thinking of was playing politics later. Politics has been the issue all along. The Leader of the Opposition attended radio station 5AD but he did not answer about half of the questions that he was asked. He said that some involved legal matters, and others were beyond his ability to answer. Why did the Opposition members withdraw from the Select Committee? The answer the Leader gave over station 5AD was, "Because we did not want to play politics." When he was asked the reason, he answered, "Because we heard the Minister was going to prohibit any person from catching fish." I dare say that what I have said is on record at the radio station. Throughout the crayfishing industry inquiry the Government has not had the support of the Opposition, although the Leader of the Opposition has said that if the Government brought down sensible recommendations he would support them. From the smiles of delight I have seen on the faces of the members of the Opposition this afternoon it is apparent that they are treating this matter as a joke, but if that is not so, let them come out and support the Government on the recommendations that have been submitted to it. These are only recommendations,

but I hope that the Government will act on them. It was the committee's job to make certain recommendations, and this has been done.

Mr. Hall: How far are you going with them this year?

Mr. BURDON: It took the Leader's Government over 30 years to do nothing, although representations were made to it over many years to do something. The former Minister, the member for Alexandra, had several years in which to do something, but he made no move whatsoever. It has also been suggested that some references have been made to the present Minister, but it is well known that he has the courage to make a decision. In due course he will make decisions in relation to the committee's report, and it will be up to the Government to implement those decisions. The committee has made certain recommendations, and the Leader of the Opposition in due course will be aware of what they are. These recommendations have been discussed with the fishermen and the Select Committee has taken evidence right along the South Australian coast from Port MacDonnell to Ceduna. While certain recommendations have been made regarding the South-East fishermen, others have been made regarding whiting, tuna, and the catching of crayfish on the West Coast—recommendations different from those for the South-East. Recommendations have been made for the south-eastern zone, the southern zone, and the far west zone, and all of these contain recommendations in respect of the registration of boats, the number of pots, etc.

Because of the neglect of controls in the crayfishing industry over the years most of the cray fishermen of today will be sympathetic to the committee's recommendations. Some of the recommendations could have been made by the previous Government, but nothing was done. I have been privately informed by cray fishermen who are operating larger boats that there will be a loss of income. This is borne out by what has happened in other States where limitations on boats, and particularly on the number of pots, have been imposed. It has usually taken one or two years for the industry to adjust itself to changed conditions, and after a couple of years the numbers of crayfish have gradually shown an increase. This is likely to happen in the south-eastern waters, with the effect of diminishing the incomes of the men in the industry. However, I believe that the majority of the fishermen

will welcome the implementation of some of the recommendations that have been made, because it will bring stability to the industry.

It has been mentioned by other speakers that if limits are placed on boats but not on the number of pots, nothing will be achieved. There are boats going to sea now putting down 100, 150 or, possibly, 200 pots. There will probably be boats going out with 250 to 300 pots, and I consider that it is humanly impossible for a large number of pots such as this to be adequately attended to. Therefore, it is the committee's opinion that if there is to be a limitation on boats there must be a limitation on the number of pots.

It has been suggested that there be an upper limit of 80 pots. I believe that this number will be accepted and, while this will initially cause some difficulties to the fishermen, I believe that with the modern methods of crayfishing, such as the use of echo sounders, these fishermen will make a greater use of their limited number of pots and will thus help to maintain their income. However, no reference was made to pots in this motion. Opposition members have always dragged red herrings across the path of any legislation introduced by this Government, but this motion omits many details because the Leader did not want to suggest that there should be a limit on the number of pots in the industry. I understand that the General Manager of the South Australian Fishermen's Co-operative Limited agrees with the recommendations, because his association has been fighting for many years to have them introduced. I hope the Government will implement these recommendations and that Opposition members will support legislation that will protect the crayfishing industry in this State.

This Government has tried to solve the problems facing this industry, and I am sure that those engaged in it will accept the recommendations imposing limits in the industry. At no stage did the committee suggest that a person would be prevented from catching fish: this suggestion was not made by any member of the committee or by any Government member. I do not know how the Leader arrived at this conclusion: apparently, he had a bad dream. The committee has recommended that amateur fishermen will be allowed to use three pots or three drop nets, which should be adequate. I remember that 25 years ago half a bag of crayfish could be caught with one net in less than one hour, but today that would be impossible. Provided

sea and weather conditions are suitable an amateur fisherman should be able to catch the fish he wants by using three nets or three pots. People who fish to supplement their income will be required to sell a quantity of fish to the value of \$500 to a licensed fish dealer during each licensing year before becoming eligible for a licence in the following year.

I believe that the recommendation of 10 pots a boat plus two for each foot with an upper limit of 80 pots is reasonable, and that most people engaged in the industry consider that this limit should be imposed. Some people will be affected, but most of them have indicated that they will accept this limit. As was told to the Leader at one of his meetings, his Party had 29 years in which to do something for the fishing industry, but did nothing. Yet, after three years of office this Government has taken action to assist the industry. Both the member for Albert and the Leader of the Opposition have tried to excuse the lack of action of the Liberal Government, which over the years allowed this industry to fall into a state of neglect.

I think most honest people will admit that no matter what one does one never pleases everybody. Some quite fantastic figures have been quoted by the Party opposite to support its claims about what it has done for the industry down through the years. However, some of those figures do not show that Party in a very good light. It has made some wild claims about the amounts it placed on the Budgets, but when we look at what it actually spent we see the situation in an entirely different light. Although it claims to have spent an average of about \$100,000 a year during the last 10 years it was in office, we find that, excluding the amount for one particular project, it spent an average of only about \$55,000 a year over that period.

In the three years this Government has been in office it has spent on average about \$49,000 a year. Therefore, the amount spent yearly by the present Government during the last three years is not that much less than was spent by the Opposition when it was in Government. I believe there will soon be a considerable stepping up of expenditure on facilities for the fishing industry, particularly along the South-Eastern coast.

Although we are talking this afternoon about the preservation of the crayfishing industry, it will be necessary for the department to have a close look at all aspects of fishing, whether it be the tuna fishing on the West Coast or any other aspect of the fishing industry. Large

quantities of fish are caught commercially around the South Australian coast. The Fisheries Department will have to examine these matters carefully in an endeavour to implement the major recommendations (if not all of them) of the Select Committee.

I have heard it said that it would not be possible to police regulations relating to the crayfishing industry unless more inspectors were appointed. As the Opposition is well aware, money has to be found for salaries and wages for additional inspectors. During its investigations the committee was informed that the fishermen themselves wanted more inspectors. I hope the day will come when the department will be able to provide these additional people. In the meantime, I believe that the fishermen, in their own interests, will do all they can to see that any recommendations implemented by the Government following the report of the Select Committee are carried out, because it is in the fishermen's own interest to do all they can to see that any new regulations are obeyed.

I believe there will be other opportunities to discuss various aspects of the crayfishing industry. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will be able to see his way clear to carry out some of the committee's recommendations, for I believe that the fishermen in the South-East would welcome many of them. Of course, they realize that if certain of the recommendations are put into effect they will suffer some loss of income in the early stages. However, I believe that the vast majority of the fishermen will accept this situation, because it is in the interests of the cray fishermen to see that the future of the industry is protected.

Mr. Hudson: Do you think the Opposition really wants to debate this matter?

Mr. BURDON: That is another question. I am not entirely convinced that it wants to take part in this debate to any great extent. The Leader has had an opportunity to take part in it.

Mr. Hudson: You would think the member for Mitcham would want to speak.

Mr. BURDON: I think he has been itching for some time to get up and say something. Of course, this would be nothing new for the member for Mitcham, because he loses no opportunity to do that. We will give him an opportunity presently to expound his knowledge, and we will then be able to see whether he knows more about the crayfishing industry than does the member for Glenelg. I do not know whether I need mention prawns.

Mr. Lawn: We will hear more from the member for Mitcham next year when he is Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse: What was I called?

Mr. BURDON: I do not repeat myself.

Mr. Lawn: Was he called a prawn?

Mr. BURDON: I could say a lot about prawns, including the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: I've been called much worse than that.

Mr. Lawn: I heard another name applied to the honourable member at lunch-time today.

Mr. BURDON: I should like to dwell just for a moment on a matter raised by the member for Adelaide that I know is dear to his heart, namely, that we shall have the member for Mitcham as the new Leader of the Opposition in 1968. I know that the member for Adelaide will welcome that event and that he wishes to be the first to congratulate the new Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Quirke: Is he going to be shaking hands with himself?

Mr. BURDON: It seems to the people of the State that the present Leader of the Opposition is already the member for Mitcham. I think that too much has been said during this debate to be healthy for the Opposition. Implementation of the recommendations made by the Select Committee will, within two or three years, greatly benefit the industry and I am confident that this will be welcomed by everyone concerned.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): If I were the member for Mount Gambier and wished to retain my seat, I would not make the sort of speech that he has just made, because it would not read very well in his district. If I wished to enter into politics in this debate, the best thing to do would be for me to circulate the honourable member's speech in his district, because it contains nothing constructive: the honourable member was merely holding the fort in order to prevent the Opposition from speaking. We have become used to that attitude; this debate, the only matter taken out of the Opposition's hands by the Government in many years, was put off until today because the Government was embarrassed. It ill behoves the member for Mount Gambier and his colleagues to use figures as loosely and incorrectly as they have been used today. We have also heard the Premier using incorrect figures concerning the numbers refused entry to the medical school at the university. That practice cannot continue in the House.

The member for Mount Gambier had the temerity to suggest that this Government had spent almost as much annually on fishing facilities as the previous Government had spent, but that is simply not correct. The Minister, too, is trying to boost the situation for his own Government by using incorrect figures. In the last eight years of the Playford Government an average of \$105,000 a year was spent on fishing facilities, compared with an average of \$33,418 spent in each of the first two years of the present Government.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: You were including the Lake Butler figure.

Mr. HALL: Of course I was. I am not ashamed to include money spent on Lake Butler.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: This was not money out of the Loan Fund.

Mr. HALL: Of course it was not. I am not hiding behind anything in this matter. I make it quite plain that the Government of the day diverted money from its Loan and Consolidated Revenue Accounts for the construction of facilities.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: You are quoting only two years.

Mr. HALL: Last year the Government put \$40,000 on the Loan Estimates, and it spent only \$20,000.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: This was not the Government's fault; it was because of the messing around at Kingston. Otherwise the money would have been spent.

Mr. HALL: The sum of \$80,000 provided this year is twice the figure for last year. The average for the three years of the Labor Government will be \$48,000, and this compares with \$105,000 in the case of the Playford Government. The committee's recommendations themselves constitute a vote of no confidence in the Government. Paragraph 21 of its report states:

The committee received various submissions concerning the inadequacy of slipway and other facilities at various ports. The committee is of the view that consideration needs to be given to increasing expenditure so that such facilities can be improved.

And what has the Government done? It has cut it in half! What sort of an answer is that?

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: There were two years when the Playford Government spent nothing at all.

Mr. HALL: The Minister is using the one year when the sum came from Consolidated Revenue. Whatever may have been done in

the past, his own committee says that the Government is not spending enough money. That should be enough! Of course, the figures given by the member for Mount Gambier are inaccurate. He said this should have been done years ago. Where was he during the last year of the Playford Government? Was he not a member of the House? Was a motion moved by the Opposition of the day? The Opposition never thought of it at the time.

Mr. Hudson: The member for Millicent made more representations on the fishing industry than the Leader ever dreamed of.

Mr. HALL: Such representations were not restricted in the way that the present Opposition has been restricted in its free speech; however, the Labor Party, when in Opposition, made no use of its opportunities to suggest to the Playford Government that more should be done for the crayfishing industry. It did not move a motion in this House.

Mr. Hudson: There are ways other than moving a motion. The Leader is just grand-standing.

Mr. HALL: The effect of this motion has been well recognized by fishermen throughout the South-East and has been accepted as a sincere attempt to assist them. I assure the Government that, if it thinks this is a political move, it had better be prepared for more political moves, because we intend to be an effective Opposition—

Mr. Hudson: For ever and ever.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to maintain order.

Mr. HALL: If the Government regards this as a political move and it arouses its ire, it had better be ready to be angry again because I give notice that I intend to consider fully the productive capacity of this State and to push the Government where it needs pushing. This much vaunted committee has laboured long and brought forth what we found out in two visits to the south-eastern fishing ports. I wonder what re-writing of this report took place after our recommendations were brought before this House. It is common knowledge in the south-eastern fishing ports that our resolution forced the Government into action. Of course, this report does make recommendations that I made when speaking to this motion. However, it does have one failure. The South-East fishermen are fully conversant with the reasons why members of the Opposition left the Select Committee, and they are quite satisfied with them.

I asked the fishermen themselves in three ports whether they wanted me to move this motion.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What has the Government done with the research boat?

Mr. HALL: No doubt the Government is scraping the barnacles off the boat, because an election is ahead, and it is sending it to look for crayfish. The fishermen instructed me to move the motion.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: The Leader does accept instructions, does he?

Mr. HALL: Yes, when they are good ones. I questioned the fishermen carefully so that they would completely understand the implications of a motion moved here; I said to them that the Opposition would be accused of being political. They said, "Forget those implications; for the sake of the industry, go ahead." Subsequently I did move the motion. The Government has recommended most of the things that I said should be done, but it has fallen down on some things.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: That is different from what I heard last Saturday.

Mr. HALL: In all fairness to the Minister I point out that the fishermen's comments covered a long period. I do not intend to denigrate the Minister.

Mr. Hudson: They had many more years of the Playford Government.

Mr. HALL: Of course they did. An important recommendation of the committee was that dealing with the composition of the advisory committee, which in my opinion does not meet the situation. The report states:

The committee also considers that it would be helpful to the Minister and of advantage to the crayfish industry if an advisory committee were appointed.

The report then deals with the composition of the suggested committee. I do not criticize the Government in this respect because this is only a suggestion, just as mine was a suggestion: I realize that it could be altered to meet the situation of the day. However, I point out that the committee is not of the type I recommended, which the fishermen approved during my meetings with them. I stated in my motion that the suggestion should come from the fishermen themselves. The Minister must have the right to make the final decision but fishermen should have the right to make sensible suggestions about the control of entry to the industry, pot limits, and so on: This advisory committee's personnel does not comply with what I recommended to the fishermen.

Mr. Hudson: Did you recommend to the fishermen, or did they recommend to you?

Mr. HALL: I recommended to the fishermen. I spoke to them and they were happy about it.

Mr. Hudson: Are you sure?

Mr. HALL: For the edification of the member for Glenelg, I point out that I spoke to about 140, and no-one said that there was anything wrong with what I said.

Mr. Hudson: Did you ask for a vote on alternatives?

Mr. HALL: A region seems to have developed in the South-East, which is the largest producing area in South Australia.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: And the most organized.

Mr. HALL: It is the most organized and the most over-fished. The nomination by the Minister of a chairman of the advisory committee is a fair enough procedure. Again, considering the State as a whole, the nomination of two fishermen from the South-East and two from other areas is also fair enough. However, different regions experience different problems and I consider that each region should be able to deal with its own particular problem. Each regional committee should comprise a majority of fishermen. I should like to see an alteration to this effect made, but it seems unlikely that the Government will be able to deal with the matter this year.

Mr. Hudson: What about problems that are common to all regions?

Mr. HALL: There would be nothing wrong with having this advisory committee and also having regional committees.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I have already sent invitations to all appropriate organizations to nominate anyone they desire.

Mr. HALL: I see nothing wrong with the advisory committee as an overall committee. However, there should be an opportunity for fishermen from a region to make recommendations as to what the pot limit in that region should be. Such matters as this should be dealt with by a local committee. This is the last private member's day on which we shall sit as the Opposition for many years.

Mr. Langley: That is the joke of the year.

Mr. HALL: The committee has admitted that it was unable to deal in detail with many problems, although when it set off at full sail

it thought it could. The committee has censured the Government in regard to fisheries. It has made many sensible recommendations, but these can be improved by giving producer control to the industry. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

LICENSING BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

THE ESTIMATES

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 19. Page 2035.)

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Attorney-General's Department, \$222,644.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is well known that the learned Attorney-cum-Treasurer-cum-Premier-cum-Minister of Housing has a large staff of publicity officers and press men. Now that the honourable gentleman has succeeded to the leadership of the Government, I desire to know whether any of his public relations officers' or press officers' salaries are paid under the line "Solicitors and clerical staff". If they are not, are any of them at present attached to the Attorney-General's Department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): No.

Line passed.

Crown Solicitor's Department, \$245,636—passed.

Parliamentary Draftsman's Department, \$39,012.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sure that all members of the Committee are distressed to know of the illness of the Parliamentary Draftsman (Dr. Anstey Wynes). We shall certainly miss his presence in this Chamber and its precincts, and it goes without saying that we shall miss the valuable assistance he gives us in the drafting of legislation. Can the Attorney say when Dr. Wynes will return to duty (something to which we are much looking forward), and whether he himself has been able to spare the time to see Dr. Wynes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not seen Dr. Wynes. He has returned home from hospital. We are expecting a report from his medical adviser tomorrow.

Line passed.

Public Trustee's Department, \$341,483—passed.

Supreme Court Department, \$301,345.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Concerning the reimbursement of jurors and witnesses and other expenses of prosecution, I notice there is a reduction of about \$20,000 in this line. What is the reason for this substantial reduction? The other matter on which I should like elucidation concerns the payment to the former Chief Justice on retirement from office. I notice that \$8,300 was paid in the last financial year. Can the Attorney say what the nature of that payment may have been?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During 1966-67 payments of \$15,570 were made to counsel and solicitors pursuant to judges' orders under section 3 of the Poor Persons Legal Assistance Act. It is considered at the moment that, although that is subject to some of the applications now before the Court, this figure will not be so great during 1967-68. This is a great increase on what was previously paid. There has been an encouragement given by the Law Society to solicitors to apply under the Poor Persons Legal Assistance Act instead of to accept the provisions under the grant to the Law Society in relation to criminal cases. Regarding the payment to Sir Mellis Napier, there was an agreement as to the amount that was due to him as a retirement fee, considering the great length of service he has given the State. This matter was examined and a recommendation made and, in consequence, it was considered that this was an appropriate amount to be paid to him in the circumstances.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Regarding the reimbursement of jurors and witnesses and other expenses of prosecution, why is it considered that this line will decline so steeply? Is some new arrangement to be made for the payment of practitioners who appear in these circumstances?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it is expected that shortly an arrangement will be made with the Law Society regarding new provisions for finance towards legal assistance in South Australia. As a member of the Law Society, the honourable member has no doubt received circulars on this subject. This matter is being examined by a committee currently, and it is expected that during this year arrangements might be made in this regard such as those that have already been undertaken in Queensland and Victoria relating to the payment of interest on trust funds. These arrangements are likely to alter the whole incidence of legal costs in South Australia, and I hope they will operate this year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not query the propriety of the payment that has been made to Sir Mellis Napier, as I think that this very fine gentleman has given magnificent service to the State. From the remarks I have heard, he has not only given a service to the State but has established the Supreme Court on a standing that is very high indeed. However, I point out that certain salaries are fixed by Statute, in order to make it clear that the judiciary is completely independent of the Administration of this State. I hope that, in future, the sum will be placed on the Estimates so that it can be voted before being paid. If the amount paid to Sir Mellis Napier were three times as much it would not concern me.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That practice would normally be followed, but there were extraordinary features connected with the retirement of the last judge. This action is not establishing a precedent.

Line passed.

Adelaide Local Court Department, \$195,848.

Mr. CUMBE: As for some years there has been a shortage of magistrates, what is the present number of magistrates and is it sufficient?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At present we are three magistrates below strength and have been carrying on with the assistance of retired magistrates. People of sufficient experience and standing in the profession are not willing to accept this position, even though salaries have been increased markedly in the last two years. It will be more difficult to maintain the number of magistrates with the appointment next week of a Licensing Court Judge and a Deputy Chairman of the licensing tribunal. We sought nominations from members of the legal profession for the position of magistrate, and considered a proposal from the Law Society for a three-tier rather than a two-tier system of courts. It was suggested that a better status would be available in the second of the tiers and as this would be more of a career position people would be encouraged to do this work, apart from the monetary emoluments. However, this proposal would not have the benefits suggested by its proponents. We have significantly reduced the time taken for Supreme Court cases since we took office from about two years to about two months.

Mr. Millhouse: I think it is longer than that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At present it may be longer, because one judge has been absent and the Davco case will affect the position. To provide a three-tier system would cost the Government more in running expenses with an enormous increase in capital costs, and the benefits are not commensurate with the costs to the State. Also, the Commonwealth Government intends to set up its court of initial jurisdiction, which will take away work from the present superior court in this State. It seemed that a two-tiered system, with most of the work being done at the first tier by qualified practitioners, was the pattern that should be adopted. We have increased the salary and there will be moves to improve, to some degree, the status of people by providing a career within the magistracy, but I do not think we can do more. As the profession enlarges, as it will with the present entrants, the situation will change and we should be able to obtain the required number of magistrates. In the interim, we will be short-staffed, but after a limited number of years the position will resolve itself.

Mrs. STEELE: What is represented by the payment for "Recoup to Agriculture Department for services of officers"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This was a payment of salaries of officers of the Agriculture Department engaged in work on operating, sorting, and tabulating machines on behalf of the Adelaide Local Court.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am interested in what the Attorney has said about the improvement in the status that is contemplated for magistrates and his suggestion that a *cursus honorum* is to be established. Can he say what he has in mind?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is still a matter of discussion and negotiation with members of the magisterial bench, and I do not think at this stage I should openly discuss those negotiations. However, I will be able to make an announcement soon.

Line passed.

Adelaide Magistrates' Court Department, \$159,987.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the line "Stipendiary Magistrates", under which \$45,410 is provided. One of the stipendiary magistrates whose salary is included in this amount is the magistrate of the Adelaide Juvenile Court, Mr. R. D. Elliott, and I wish to say something about his actions in the last few weeks regarding the admission of the press to his court. The Committee may recall that prior to the

new Juvenile Courts Act in the 1965-66 session the rule which had obtained under the old Juvenile Courts Act of 1941 and which had, so far as I am aware, worked quite satisfactorily (I had never heard any complaints about it), was that although the Juvenile Court was not open to the public certain specified classes of persons were permitted in the court during hearings. One of those classes of persons was *bona fide* representatives of the press.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must link his remarks with the financial provisions of the item. He cannot discuss the legislation that provides for the admittance of certain people to the court.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, Sir. I desire to discuss not the legislation but the action of one of the magistrates, Mr. Elliott (whose salary is included in this line), in allowing the press into the Adelaide Juvenile Court, and I am sure that you, Sir, will agree that that is entirely relevant to this line. I have sketched the position regarding the admittance of persons to the court before the amendment in 1966. The rule was that once admitted, as they were entitled to be, reports could be compiled by *bona fide* representatives of the press and published provided they did not disclose the identity of the juveniles involved in cases. In February, 1966, the law was changed, and instead of allowing enumerated classes of persons into the court the public was excluded and the only persons to be allowed in were those who had the permission of the magistrate. Even more drastic—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already warned the honourable member that he cannot discuss the legislation. I did not attempt to stop him immediately he mentioned the legislation, because I think he is entitled to make some passing reference to it; but I hope the honourable member is not attempting now to enlarge the debate on this matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, Sir, I am only sketching the background. I was explaining the change in the legislation that has led up to the action of Mr. Elliott, S.M., in the last few weeks.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Do you approve of his actions?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I do, and that was my reason for rising to speak on this topic. Under the present provision only the result of a case can be published, handed out, as it were, from behind a closed door—

Mr. McKEE: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I cannot see how the question

of the admittance of the press or the public to the court has anything to do with this line.

The CHAIRMAN: I will rule on that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I cannot understand why the member for Port Pirie is so sensitive about this and why he is persisting in his attempts to make me sit down. He is simply wasting your time, Sir. Mr. Elliott was appointed to the Juvenile Court bench about nine or 10 months ago and, if I may say so with the utmost respect to him, I know from my limited experience in appearing before him since his appointment that he is doing a very competent job. I have not appeared before him frequently, but I have done so at times and I can certainly say that he is presiding satisfactorily.

The point I am leading up to (and I thank you, Sir, for allowing me to sketch the background of the matter) is this: that he has said that when he took office as the Juvenile Court magistrate he believed that the arrangements set out in section 64 of the Juvenile Courts Act for the exclusion of the press and for the publication merely of the result of a hearing was a desirable arrangement, but that his experience since being on the bench had convinced him that the press should be admitted to the courts. The statement that he made on this matter was published in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday, September 12, and the most significant parts of the statement as reported in that newspaper are as follows:

When I first took over the duties of magistrate here, I thought that it was in the interests of the public and of juvenile offenders that not only the general public, but also the press, should be excluded from the court. I am still of opinion that the public should be excluded but I am now quite certain, after sitting here for some nine months, that it is definitely not in the interests of the community that the press should be excluded.

He then goes on to refer to the remarks of Lord Denning when he was here in South Australia some weeks ago for the Legal Convention. I may say in passing that Dean Irwin Griswold, the Dean of the Harvard Law School, is also of the opinion, based on his experience in the United States of America, that the courts should be freely open to the public. Mr. Elliott goes on in his statement to say:

There is nothing secret about justice and there should never be anything secret about it.

The last paragraph states:

In our modern society the press is one of our few remaining safeguards against injustice. Whether that—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I believe the honourable member has a Bill at present on the Notice Paper in regard to this matter and, therefore, in accordance with Standing Order No. 146, I rule his present discussion out of order. Standing Order No. 146 provides:

No member shall allude to any debate of the same session, upon a question or Bill not then being under discussion, except by the indulgence of the House for personal explanations.

The matter to which the honourable member is referring is the subject matter of the Bill to which I have referred.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know what Bills are before this place but I point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that there has been no debate whatever on the Juvenile Courts Act Amendment Bill and that the Standing Order provides that no member shall "allude to any debate of the same session".

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It also says "or Bill".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There has not been any debate at all.

The CHAIRMAN: The Standing Order refers to a debate on a question or Bill. The honourable member may move to disagree with the Chair if he so desires, but before he does so I point out to him that the second item under "Orders of the Day: Other Business" is "Juvenile Courts Act Amendment Bill. Second reading". I rule the honourable member out of order. He can move disagreement or accept my ruling and desist from discussing this matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I must respectfully move to disagree to the ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Mitcham has moved to disagree to the ruling of the Chairman in not permitting him to canvass the action of the Magistrate of the Adelaide Juvenile Court in permitting the press in his court as a rule, on the grounds that there has not been any debate in this Chamber this session upon such a question or Bill dealing with the matter.

The Deputy Speaker having taken the Chair:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to report that during the Committee debate on the Estimates the honourable member for Mitcham was referring to a matter that I, as Chairman of Committees, considered to be contrary to Standing Orders. I therefore ruled that the honourable member was out of order. He moved to disagree to the ruling of the Chairman in not permitting him to canvass the action of the Magistrate of the Adelaide Juvenile Court in permitting the press in his

court as a rule, on the grounds that there had not been any debate this session upon such a question or Bill dealing with the matter. I am now obliged to give a ruling as Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Millhouse: This is farcical.

Mr. Coumbe: What a travesty!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Standing Order No. 146 is quite clear: "No member shall allude to any debate of the same session upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion except by the indulgence of the House for personal explanations." It was made clear that there was no personal explanation, and the discussion was not taking place "by the indulgence of the House", because one point of order had already been raised. Standing Order No. 231 provides:

No motion shall seek to anticipate debate upon any matter which appears on the Notice Paper.

A Bill introduced by the honourable member dealing with the Juvenile Court (the subject matter of the honourable member's discussion in Committee) appears as item No. 2, Orders of the Day: Other Business. I therefore rule that the honourable member for Mitcham is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must move to disagree to your ruling in your capacity as Deputy Speaker, and in doing so may I say that I have the greatest respect for your integrity and for your ruling (even though I strongly disagree to it) as Chairman of Committees. I cannot help but say, Sir, that I think (and, again, I speak with the greatest of respect) that it is farcical for you to sit in judgment now as Deputy Speaker on your ruling as Chairman of Committees. This is absolutely contrary—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Whether or not the honourable member is correct when he states—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What do they do in the other place?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Whether the honourable member is correct or otherwise, when he says that it is a farce that the Chairman also being the Deputy Speaker is now in the invidious position of having to give a ruling on his own ruling, I point out to him that members of this House have created that farce, because it is provided in Standing Orders that the Deputy Speaker, in the absence of the Speaker, takes the Chair. There is no alternative but for me to take the Chair and to give a ruling in accordance with Standing Orders.

The honourable member may suggest that that is farcical but I cast no reflection on the House in that regard.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to make it clear that I do not reflect on you personally at all in what I have said but this is obviously (so obvious that it does not have to be said) an appeal from Caesar unto Caesar, and it is not as one would wish it to be. However, Sir, I leave that point entirely aside, and I do not propose to refer to it again.

I turn now to the substance of this matter and say that quite plainly the construction that should be placed on Standing Order 146 is that it is a prohibition on the allusion to any debate—not to the fact that there is a Bill on the Notice Paper, but to any debate in the same session on a question or Bill. There has been no debate on a question or Bill dealing with this matter. I should have thought that this was quite obvious and I cannot see that there can be any other interpretation. The Bill on the Notice Paper has not even been explained at the second reading stage; every stage up to the present has been entirely formal and there has been no debate at all upon the Bill. The first reading was passed, as it is invariably passed in this House, with no debate at all. I say with the utmost respect, Sir, that this is as plain as a pikestaff to me. Standing Order 231 states:

No motion shall seek to anticipate debate upon any matter which appears upon the Notice Paper.

I have not sought to anticipate any debate at all; indeed, we do not yet know what the nature of the debate will be upon that particular Order of the Day. I have merely discussed the action of one man, whose salary is paid under this line of the Estimates, in allowing the press into his court.

Mr. McKee: You never referred to his salary.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I did. I referred to his salary several times in answer to interjections from Government members. I made it perfectly clear that it was upon the fact that this line provided his salary that I based my remarks. There is necessarily no connection at all between any Bill that may be on the Notice Paper and the actions of Mr. Elliott in the Adelaide Juvenile Court, so I suggest with very great respect that neither Standing Order 146 nor Standing Order 231 applies in this set of circumstances. As far as I know, there is no other Standing Order to which you, Sir,

could refer to prohibit my discussing this matter, as I proposed to do. As I understand the position, in Committee there should be a full and free debate on a line so that the Committee may be satisfied that it should agree to the line, thereby agreeing to the disbursement of the moneys it provides. It is upon this general principle that I base my disagreement to your ruling as Deputy Speaker, and it is on the same principle that I based my disagreement to your ruling as Chairman of Committees.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I support the member for Mitcham in his contention that he has not offended against Standing Order 146 or 231. Last week the member introduced a Bill into this House entitled "The Juvenile Courts Act Amendment Bill". It was read a first time, but its second reading was set down for today. However, the second reading stage has not yet been reached. No explanation of the Bill has been given by the person who introduced it, nor has any debate in connection with it taken place. There can be no allusion by the honourable member in what he has said tonight to a debate in the same session, because there has been no debate on the Bill to which you, Sir, referred, nor has there been any debate upon any question. When you, Sir, gave your ruling as Chairman of Committees you referred only to Standing Order 146, and apparently you relied on it when giving your ruling. Since you have taken the Chair as Deputy Speaker you have relied also on Standing Order 231, which, I submit, has no relevance at all to this matter. It states:

No motion shall seek to anticipate debate upon any matter which appears upon the Notice Paper.

There was no motion submitted by the member for Mitcham to the Committee tonight; he was simply discussing a line in the Estimates. So, I contend that Standing Order 231 cannot be invoked in this case and cannot apply, as has been suggested by you, Sir. I submit, Sir, with deference, that your ruling should be disagreed to.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): I must agree with the motion before the Chair. The member for Angas has made practically the same remarks that I intended to make. Standing Order 146 which you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are relying on has a marginal note that is very important to its interpretation—"Debates of same session not to be alluded to". I emphasize the word "debates": there has been

no debate whatever on the Bill that has been referred to. Standing Order 146 states:

No member shall allude to any debate—

I emphasize the word "debate"—

—of the same session, upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion, except by the indulgence of the House for personal explanations.

I agree with the member for Angas in respect of Standing Order 231; I must agree that you, Sir, have overlooked this point. I am not, Sir, attacking you in any way; you are entitled to your opinion and to your interpretation in your capacity as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees. However, in my opinion as an ex-Speaker of this House, I must support the motion of the member for Mitcham.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The member for Mitcham has suggested, Sir, that your ruling should be disagreed to on the grounds that there has been no debate so far on the Bill that he has introduced into this House and that, therefore, there cannot be any allusion to a debate in the same session. However, I point out that where a Bill is before the House, even where there is only a formal motion concerning the matter, there is in effect a ruling that one is considered to have debated the Bill—even if one simply moves or seconds it.

Mr. Millhouse: The Premier is raising a technicality.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member talks about technicalities but, if he remembers the technicalities he raises, he should be loath to raise that objection. If the honourable member in the course of the motion for the adoption of these Estimates is seeking to anticipate debate upon a measure before the House, then he is offending Standing Order 231, as you have ruled, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If the honourable member is not speaking to the motion to that effect, he is out of order, and if he is speaking to the motion on the basis of anticipation, he is also clearly out of order. I do not know what he thinks he is doing but he has seen fit to put on the Notice Paper a Bill on this subject. Having proceeded to adjourn that debate, he—

Mr. Millhouse: No, I haven't. I didn't adjourn it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All right, it is still on the Notice Paper. Perhaps the honourable member now says that he seeks to cast it away. I do not know what he seeks to do with his measure.

Mr. Millhouse: If you had been in the House at 6 p.m. you would know that I did not do anything with it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was listening on my amplifier and I thought I heard the honourable member speaking. However, it seems that I have not accurately assessed his position. Apparently, he is trying to throw the Bill away and get it in by some back door method.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I shall not cite the two Standing Orders upon which you have given your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I wish to refer to something much more practical. I point out to you, and to the Premier, who has supported your ruling, that frequently we have on the Notice Paper two Bills or motions dealing with the same matter. In terms of the ruling you have given this evening, neither of those matters could be proceeded with. I took the trouble to get a previous ruling, because this is not the first time that the matter has arisen. This ruling is given in Parliamentary Papers for 1932, Volume I, at page 116 of the Votes and Proceedings:

The Speaker stated: In connection with the two Bills, the Reduction of Members (Proportional Representation) Bill and the Constitution Amendment (Proportional Representation) Bill, now before the House, I would like to say for the benefit of members that there is nothing irregular in having two Bills dealing with the same subject on the Notice Paper at the same time.

According to your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Government brought in a Bill that the Opposition did not like, all that the Opposition would have to do to nullify the Bill and any debate on it would be to bring in a Bill dealing with the same subject but not having precisely the same terms. That would be a farcical position. The member for Mitcham was not discussing his Bill this evening.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Up until now the discussion has been fair, and I ask members to maintain the same high standard. I ask that each member be heard in silence. The member for Gumeracha.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member was discussing the Juvenile Court and the magistrate in charge of that court.

Mr. McKee: He was discussing the admission of the press to hearings.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: You gave a ruling, so the second basis on which the Premier said the honourable member was out of order was contrary to the direct ruling

you have given. I point out that if you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, rule that a member's action in putting a Bill on the Notice Paper ties up that question for the rest of the session so that no member may discuss the matter, not even discuss the voting of money for the department concerned, Parliament will be rendered inoperative.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Read Standing Order 146.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I submit that your ruling, Sir, is incorrect and I support the member for Mitcham. Scarcely a session passes without there being before the House two motions, each of which has some bearing on the subject matter of the other. I suggest that you reconsider your ruling and give a decision tomorrow.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): At present we are debating the Estimates of Expenditure for all departments. Items on the Notice Paper cover many matters, so the ruling means that we cannot talk about the financial provisions made in relation to departments covered by those matters. The most important part of Parliamentary procedure is the examination of the expenditure of public money, and it is our duty to get as much information as we can on this expenditure.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Was the member for Mitcham discussing the expenditure of public money?

Mr. SHANNON: Whether the member for Mitcham is out of order in saying what he has been saying on an item dealing with payment to stipendiary magistrates is a matter on which we may have different opinions. One of the functions of members is to use their grey matter and get information about expenditure and the ruling that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have given could hamstring Parliamentary debate on the Estimates for a long time. I think latitude ought to be given when Estimates are being dealt with. I suggest that you would be wise to do as the member for Gumeracha has suggested and consider the matter overnight.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): The member for Mitcham made no reference to the expenditure on this line but referred mainly to the public and the press. Therefore, I have no alternative but to draw attention to the fact that he was wasting the time of the House. Standing Order No. 146 provides:

No member shall allude to any debate of the same session, upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion, except by the indulgence of the House for personal explanations.

I think that applies in this situation.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): In support of the motion, I point out the effect of this precludes any member of the House from asking a question on the line. Members on either side could be interested in this question, and we are perfectly entitled to raise this in connection with the salary of the magistrate concerned. The line is provided for this purpose. The opportunity is given, when discussing the line providing for the salary of any officer, to discuss the efficiency of that department and the way it is conducted. I suggest strongly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that your ruling is wrong and that the motion by the member for Mitcham should be carried, otherwise debate on this point will be stifled unduly.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): Standing Order No. 146 has been quoted, but I point out that the member for Mitcham did not allude to any debate in this session on a question or Bill not being then under discussion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to thank all of those who have spoken in support of my motion to disagree to your ruling. I am particularly gratified that the two former Speakers, the member for Angas and the Independent member for Ridley, support my stand on this matter. The only speaker against the motion, in effect, was the Premier, who based his opposition to my motion of disagreement and, therefore, his support for your ruling on some technicality that personally I regarded as unworthy of him and of his status as Queen's Counsel and the Attorney-General of this State. It was a mere legal quibble, and I am surprised that he would stoop to it. It is an indication of the weakness of the position he was trying to support that he could think of nothing to say other than that. The position, as has been put by the member for Gumeracha and by the others who have spoken, is clear: if this ruling stands, then the business of the House could be paralysed.

Mr. Coumbe: It could be taken as a precedent.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course, and it should be taken as a precedent, because Speakers' rulings are regarded as such. Surely, the whole point here is to see that we do not go over the same subject matter again and again. I close by referring again to the two Standing Orders under which you, Sir, ruled me out of order. I think as Chairman of Committees you referred to only one (Standing Order No. 146). That is plainly an allusion to any debate, that is, discussion

between members on the substance of a Bill or a clause of a Bill or any other question that has already taken place in the House or in Committee. One cannot allude to something that does not exist, and there has been no debate on the Juvenile Courts Act Amendment Bill, so one cannot allude to it. There has been no explanation given of the Bill. Every stage up to the present has been purely formal, so we are not trespassing there. When you upheld yourself as Chairman of Committees, you relied not only on that Standing Order but also on Standing Order No. 231, but as the member for Angas was quick to point out (and I missed this point when I spoke first), this refers to a motion seeking to anticipate debate.

I have not moved a motion and, therefore, I cannot possibly be out of order under that Standing Order. I knew this afternoon from the way in which the Government was conducting itself that it was determined that I should not be allowed to speak on this matter and that members of the Opposition should not be able to speak on certain other matters. The member for Port Pirie has taken this point undoubtedly to avoid embarrassment to his leader and to his Party by preventing discussion on this matter, which is one of great interest in the community and which is intrinsically of great importance. Indeed, it is known that, because of the actions to which I have referred, the Government is in an embarrassing position, and the whole aim of the exercise is to try to reduce that embarrassment by not allowing any debate on this matter. That is the sum and substance of the whole thing. I hope and repeat that I do not desire to reflect (and I have not, I hope, reflected) on you personally as Chairman of Committees or as Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Hughes: Not half!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If I have I did not intend to, and if I did I will withdraw anything that may be construed as a reflection on you personally. I reflected only on your ruling as Chairman of Committees, and on your ruling as Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Hughes: Isn't that a reflection on the Chair?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In view of the supporting arguments, which show clearly that I am not out of order under either Standing Order, I ask you, Sir, to reconsider your decision.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before putting the motion, I thank members for the very fair way in which this debate has been carried on. Having to give the ruling was not some-

thing of my choice but part of the duties of Deputy Speaker. During the discussion members claimed that the two Standing Orders referred to by me had no application.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On a point of order, Sir. After a reply to a debate has been given I understand that the procedure is for a vote to be taken immediately.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Speaker is at liberty to make a statement at any time and, as the member for Gumeracha knows because he has had more experience than I have had in this House, it has been the usual practice and custom for every Speaker in the last 18 years to my knowledge, when his ruling has been challenged, to speak prior to putting the motion, and that is what I am doing. During the discussion it was stated by honourable members that two Standing Orders to which I referred had no application to the matter. Two ex-Speakers of the House spoke in this discussion. Members cannot dispute the fact that both the ex-Speakers have ruled in this House several times and drawn attention to Standing Order No. 1, and to refresh the memory of members I shall read it:

In all cases not provided for hereinafter, or by sessional or other orders, resort shall be had to the rules, forms, and practices of the Commons House of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which shall be followed as far as they can be applied to the proceedings of this House.

Should Standing Orders Nos. 146 and 231 have no application we are obliged to consider the House of Commons procedure. Again, I am following precedent, and I quote from *Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice* Seventeenth Edition, at page 766, as follows:

The administrative action of a department is open to debate, but the necessity for legislation and matters involving legislation cannot be discussed in Committee of Supply.

Page 311 of E. G. Blackmore's *Manual of the Practice, Procedure and Usage of the House of Assembly of South Australia* states:

There is no rule of debate more clearly established than that it is irregular to anticipate and raise a discussion upon any matter which is to come on at a later period.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15)—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), and Nankivell, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller),

Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, and Walsh.
 Pair—Aye—Mr. Bockelberg. No—Mr. Ryan.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. SHANNON: I calculate that a total of about \$163,000 is to be paid as salaries to stipendiary magistrates. Can the Treasurer say whether the salaries of these magistrates vary depending on the venue of their operations, and also whether any of the magistrates enjoy the privilege of holding any other office of profit? Also, has he anything in mind regarding the Licensing Court judge?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no difference as to venue, but there is some difference as to seniority. Some magistrates are more senior than others and therefore attract a greater emolument. Those who attract a separate emolument for outside activities have this specified in the lines. The honourable member will see that under "Chief Country and Suburban Magistrate" a number of other matters are set forth.

Mr. Shannon: The stipendiary magistrates have a separate line.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The Chief Country and Suburban Magistrate in fact is a stipendiary magistrate holding a specific position. The Local Court Judge, as can be seen, also has certain other positions. So far as I am aware, no separate positions other than those stipulated in the lines are held.

Mr. Shannon: Is it permissible for them to hold other positions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, perfectly permissible. Regarding the Licensing Court judge, this is not covered under the line for stipendiary magistrates: it is a position for which a specific statutory emolument is provided in the Act.

Line passed.

Country and Suburban Courts Department, \$375,039—passed.

Registrar-General of Deeds Department, \$444,937.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Registrar-General of Deeds get any particular emolument for the extra responsibilities that will devolve on him as a result of legislation that has been passed by Parliament this session?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member is referring to the Real Property Act Amendment (Strata Titles) Bill, the answer is "No".

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$93,217.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Treasurer say when the course of instruction for justices of the peace will be available?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The course is available currently and has been now for some months. In fact, it has been publicized through the association. This course is paid for by the Government, and it is free to those who have already been created justices to enrol. An amount of \$1,500 has been provided for this purpose. In addition, for the first time some small amount has been made available to the Royal Association of Justices against some particular office expenses. In connection with the course, it is necessary for justices to have the handbook that has been published. It is not possible for the Government to provide a handbook free for all the justices in the State, because that would involve enormous cost. The handbook is provided for all courts of summary jurisdiction, but those who wish to undertake the course must purchase it themselves. However, the cost of the course itself is borne by the Government.

Mr. COUMBE: The modest grant to the Royal Association of Justices makes a difference and is greatly appreciated, for it assists in the administration cost involved in rostering the courts. The justices give their services completely free to the State, and the cost to the association of the telephoning involved in filling perhaps 20 courts in a day in the metropolitan area is considerable. Therefore, this modest subsidy is greatly appreciated.

Mrs. STEELE: I refer to the line "Pension payable pursuant to Supreme Court Act". The sum of \$43,275 provided on this line is an increase of \$8,346 compared with the amount expended last year, and I imagine that there is some mistake here. Can the Treasurer explain how many pensions that would include?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It certainly is not a mistake. It is in the singular, but this is the amount of pension payable subject to the Supreme Court Act. Pensions are paid to widows of Supreme Court judges and to a number of judges who have retired. Parliament passed in the last year an alteration of the Supreme Court Act to provide for an increase in pensions and this, together with the amount paid to the Hon. Sir Mellis Napier, accounts for the increase in this line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I notice that the line "Printing consolidation of South Australian Statutes" disappears from the Estimates after this year. An amount of \$6,000 was voted for the line last year and nothing at all

was paid. We know that there have been difficulties following the unfortunate death of Mr. Cartledge, who was going to undertake the editorship of the consolidation. However, I point out that the last consolidation of the South Australian Statutes was made in 1936, more than 30 years ago, and we very badly need to have our Statutes consolidated. I am disappointed to see that this line is to disappear, having been carried forward for two or three years without any money being spent and without anything being done. Can the Attorney-General say what the position is in this matter, and particularly what plans the Government now has to have a consolidation of our Statutes effected?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will be aware that no consolidation had been planned at the time this Government took office. Negotiations having subsequently been undertaken with Mr. Cartledge and the Law Book Company, it was announced that a consolidation would be proceeded with. A contract was concluded and provision made on the Estimates for the consolidation. However, very unfortunately, Mr. Cartledge died. Essays were made both by the Law Book Company and the Government, in order to obtain an editor for the consolidation, without success to the time that these Estimates were prepared. I assure the honourable member, however, that success has now crowned our efforts and that a consolidation will be undertaken as soon as the contract has been completed (which I expect will be shortly), when I shall be able to make an announcement concerning the matter. Since at the time these Estimates were prepared and presented to the Committee no conclusion had been reached, the initial expenses during the coming year will have to be covered under an excess warrant.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable gentleman is obviously unwilling to say much more, and I guess this matter will be reserved for one of his Wednesday evening telecasts, but I should like to ask him now (and I do not think it will spoil the surprise that he hopes to create) whether the arrangement that he has been able to make will be broadly of the same nature as the arrangement with the late Mr. Cartledge, or whether it is something else and, if it is, what.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: By and large, the arrangement is rather similar to the one made with Mr. Cartledge.

Mr. Millhouse: In other words, you've found someone who is prepared to do it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. We have made certain arrangements for a person to undertake the consolidation, providing certain facilities.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Will the Attorney-General explain the reason for a reduction of \$127 under "Miscellaneous", concerning the Judge in Insolvency?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The salary of the Judge in Insolvency is, in fact, paid by the Commonwealth Government. He is the Commonwealth Judge in Bankruptcy but he also administers certain rather ancient Statutes in this area that are State Statutes. We receive a certain sum from the Commonwealth and pay it to the Judge. The actual sum provided by the Commonwealth is \$3,300 and the sum shown in the Estimates, in consequence, is an adjustment on that basis.

Line passed.

PREMIER, TREASURER AND MINISTER OF HOUSING
Premier's Department, \$352,311.

Mr. SHANNON: I refer to two lines of a similar nature, the first relating to the Director of Industrial Development and others, and the second, under "Industries promotion, research and assistance", relating to "publicity and information for industrial promotion". Concerning the latter line, \$100,000 was voted last year but only \$102 was spent. Will the Treasurer say whether the officers employed by the Government for publicity purposes are included in either of these two lines?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The publicity activities of the Premier's Department are included in these general lines. They are not included specifically in the line relating to the Director of Industrial Development; that officer's salary is set forth quite clearly.

Mr. Shannon: The sum proposed covers more than his salary.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Consulting Engineer, Industries Promotion and Research Officer, engineers, technical, research and clerical staff come within the Industries Development Branch, but the publicity and information officers are included in the line "Publicity and information for industrial promotion". These officers (there are three of them) are involved constantly in industrial promotion and in preparing information material for the Government; they work considerable hours and do quite invaluable service in this regard.

Mr. Shannon: How many are employed in this department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At the moment the department's full staff has not been reached. We have provided an item on the Estimates on the basis of what the staffing of the department is expected to reach during this current year. Also included, of course, are sums that will be expended on outside people for industrial promotion and research. It will be necessary for us to undertake a number of studies related to the feasibility of industrial promotion and research in South Australia.

Mr. Shannon: Will this involve consultants?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It relates to consultants and also to publicity and information for industrial promotion. The people who supply us with general information will also be providing us with publicity and information for industrial promotion and it is necessary for them to inform those people, who desire industrial investment in South Australia, of the potentialities of the State. Much money will need to be spent in promotion activities in other States and overseas where potential investors exist. In supplements that have appeared in publications in other States and overseas in years past, South Australia has been significant by its absence.

Mr. Millhouse: Not in results, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think I am in a position to debate that at the moment but I assure the honourable member—

Mr. Millhouse: It wouldn't be to your advantage to debate it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member chose to look at the facts instead of indulging himself in certain hallucinatory activities, I suggest he would not be making the kind of remarks he is making. In fact, in the past we did not have the kind of industrial promotion activity in South Australia that other States had, and they got ahead of us; they have had this kind of activity for the last decade, and we must catch up with them quickly. So, the Government appointed a Director of Industrial Development who is particularly capable, and he is making recommendations to the Government concerning industrial research activity and the staffing of his department, which recommendations will take up the amount provided in this line.

Mr. McANANEY: I do not think the Treasurer has fully explained why it was considered necessary to vote \$100,000 for this purpose last year, which was not spent. I refute the Treasurer's remarks concerning the past years. Between the last two censuses South Australia had a relatively large increase in population.

Now the rate has decreased. Why has the Government been so lethargic?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know why the honourable member suggests that there has been any lethargy in this matter. The Government appointed a staff that has been of singular use to it and to the people of this State, and I point out that it was a staff that did not exist before the Labor Government took office; indeed, the Government has gone on to appoint additional staff. This line on the Estimates originally provided for film material for industrial promotion activities. However, after examination of the film material suggested, the Government decided that this was not the best avenue for spending money for industrial development, and so it chose to save it, rather than spend it in an area where the best results would not be produced. The expansion of this branch is something that I understood the Opposition had been urging for a long time. However, now that the Government is dealing with this matter the member says that it is lethargic about it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: What are the duties of the press secretary to the Premier and Treasurer?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: His duties deal with press, television and radio relations of the Premier and Treasurer and of all his Ministers; they are the same as those prescribed for press secretaries of the Government of New South Wales and of Commonwealth Ministers. The Commonwealth Minister who represents the district of the honourable member has a press secretary who was a journalist in Adelaide prior to his appointment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand that the Premier and Treasurer now has three officers doing public relations work. Is this correct? Also, do any other Ministers share in their services and, if they do, to what extent?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All the Ministers in the Government share in the work of the public relations staff in the Premier's Department; the staff is generally centred in the Premier's Department. There are three officers; first, the press secretary to the Premier and Treasurer, who is not appointed under normal Public Service conditions (this applies in other States, too).

Mr. Millhouse: Under what conditions is he appointed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As a weekly paid officer. He does not have the benefit of protections under the Public Service Act; he was appointed in this way upon the recommendation of the Public Service Commissioner.

The other two officers are the public relations officer in the Premier's Department, Mr. Combe—

Mr. Millhouse: He was transferred with the Premier and Treasurer from the Attorney-General's office.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; he was formerly public relations officer in the Premier's Department. He was transferred some time before I became Premier and Treasurer. The other officer is the publicity officer in the department, Mr. Malin. These officers are doing work not only for the industrial development branch of the Premier's Department but also for other Public Service departments. For instance, all three officers have been engaged in the campaign in relation to water conservation over the past few days.

Mr. Millhouse: Very necessary.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is known for not being very dry behind the ears, and so he generally prefers to get in out of the wet. I point out that most other people are far more interested in water conservation than in levity.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier and Treasurer has been of some assistance to me in spite of his remarks about me personally, but not of sufficient assistance to serve my purpose. I was interested to hear his remarks about his public relations staff (we know that to all intents and purposes it is his personal public relations staff and that it exists to promote him primarily as an individual at the expense of the State).

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Two of them served in my department this week.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is mere camouflage; we know that they are the public relations officers of the Premier and Treasurer. Mr. Combe's name appears in the Public Service list for 1966 under the Attorney-General, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and the Minister of Social Welfare. So, to say that those officers are for the benefit of the Ministry and Government as a whole is quite hollow. However, I desire to ask the Premier and Treasurer or any other Minister what proportion of the time of these officers is spent on work under the Premier's control, and what proportion, therefore, of their time is spent on work for other Ministers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Since these officers are in my department, all their time is spent under my control. However, with my agreement they are available to all other Ministers, and there is not a single Minister—

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Other Ministers are urged to use them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —in the Government who does not use this staff constantly.

Mr. McANANEY: Does the amount being provided for the Government motor garage include the purchase price of new white cars about which I have read?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The amount provided is the net cost of replacements in the changeover of cars. We receive money for the cars that we sell and we get a fairly good deal on the new ones. Regarding the white cars that we shall get, first, the drivers, for whom members of this Government have some consideration—

Mr. McAnaney: And members of this Parliament.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether the honourable member has any consideration for them. The drivers requested that we transfer to white cars because the black ones were extremely uncomfortable in hot weather. The Queensland Government has white Government cars and they have proved much more comfortable than black cars. The second point is that the Alpine white cars have standard duco and, consequently, the duco is of much better quality than the specially-applied black duco. Therefore, maintenance of white cars will be cheaper. I assure members that there is a reduction in expenditure as a result of the changeover. I appreciate that there are in this State some 18th century characters who believe there is some virtue in the other colour, but I do not think they have yet managed to transfer themselves to the 20th century.

Mr. McANANEY: I did not criticize the Government for buying white cars, although the Treasurer has been on the political rostrum about the matter. I wanted to know what the amount provided was intended to cover, and how many cars were involved.

Mr. SHANNON: I favour the change in colour. I have noticed the big difference between the temperature in a black car and that in a white car. I should like to know how many motor vehicles are to be purchased with the \$2,000 provided under "Industries promotion, research and assistance". The Treasurer has said that there are three officers in this branch. However, it seems to me that sufficient money is provided for only one vehicle.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The amount of \$2,045 is for the purchase of a motor vehicle for the Director of Industrial Development, for his use alone. A Premier's Department car is normally driven and garaged by the Secretary of my department, but it is available for other officers. Some officers use their own motor vehicles and are reimbursed under the normal Public Service arrangement. Regarding the matter raised by the member for Stirling, I cannot tell him exactly how many cars will be changed over this year, because the changeover is not made at the same time for all cars. The amount provided is for those changeovers that will take place during the year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Treasurer give the reason for the changed method of presenting the accounts in connection with items dealing with Government motor cars? In the Estimates for 1964, all items dealing with the Government motor garage, including drivers, purchases and insurance, were dealt with together, and Parliament was able to make a comparison with other years. However, the items are not now all shown in the Estimates for the Premier's Department. For instance, insurance is provided for elsewhere, and doubtless other items are provided in other places.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The items for the normal expenditure by the Government motor garage are shown on this page. Because the portfolios of Premier, Treasurer, and Minister of Housing are now under one Minister, whereas previously the Government motor garage was under the administration of the Minister of Lands, the provision in relation to insurance is made elsewhere.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am referring to the provision of about \$105,000 for salaries and wages for the manager, drivers, workshop and other staff of the garage. Farther down is \$1,795 for the purchase of motor vehicles. Farther down again, under the heading of "Government Motor Garage" is the purchase of motor vehicles, additions to fleet (\$4,749), net cost of replacements provided last year in the Estimates (\$5,600), and actual payments (\$10,048). I do not know whether there is some logical explanation for the scattering of these items, which previously came under the Government Motor Garage. Members should be able to see what the white cars are costing the taxpayers and how quickly they are being brought into circulation. I do not criticize the reasonable use of motor cars, but I object to the items

being spread so that there is no opportunity to see how the costs are growing from year to year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is being deliberately difficult this evening. He must know that there is no longer a Government Motor Garage Department. The garage is now a branch of the Premier's Department, and it has been normal accounting, both under him and under this Government, that the salaries and wages items of the department are set forth in one group, and the other specific costs of administration are set forth separately. The Public Service Commissioner has constantly pointed out that South Australia has more Government Departments than has any other State and that this leads not to greater efficiency but to greater inefficiency in administration; therefore, it is to the advantage of the Government to reduce the number of departments.

When the Government Motor Garage was taken over by the Premier's Department it did not become a separate department but a branch of the Premier's Department. In consequence, the salaries of that branch of the Premier's Department are set forth the same as those for any other department, and the various other expenses of the department are set forth separately. The honourable member has referred to the purchase of motor vehicles under "Industries Promotion, Research and Assistance". This was not the purchase of a motor vehicle for the Government Motor Garage but, as is the case in other departments where a motor vehicle is purchased for a branch or department, it is shown separately, not as part of the Government Motor Garage. That would be misleading. I should not have thought that the honourable member by doing a few simple sums would have been in any difficulty at all.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Treasurer say what proportion of the time of his public relations staff is spent on work for other Ministers and what proportion of their time is spent on work in departments under his personal control?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That varies from week to week.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suspect that very little time is spent away from the Treasurer's office, and this is confirmed by his virtual refusal to answer my question.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You are trying to make political nonsense, as usual.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My suspicion is that very little of the time of these public relations officers is spent on work other than for the Treasurer, but he will not so far answer the question. I am confirmed in my view that these public relations officers work for him, despite what he says. The Treasurer is intelligent enough to be able to make an estimate of the time that these people spend on work for other Ministers if he wants to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is trying to make political capital out of this. It has been obvious from the bitter things that have been said by the Liberal Party at their meetings from time to time and everywhere they go that they hate the fact that this Government has an adequate public relations staff. What the Government is doing is known to the average person in South Australia. This is something that is bitterly resented by members of the Opposition, and so jealous are they that this is so that they have set about getting privately paid public relations staff themselves to try to do something. I take it as a tribute to the officers of the Government when the Opposition becomes so upset and bitter about the activities of these officers. In the last three days about 10 per cent of the time of the three officers referred to has been spent on activities for me, the rest of their time having been spent on duties for other Ministers. There have been other times when on three days 90 per cent of the work of these officers would have been spent in departments under my control and only 10 per cent for other Ministers. This varies considerably according to the work of various departments.

Mr. Millhouse: Take it over a longer period, say, six months.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not had a computer run on the subject. What the honourable member is trying to do as usual is to make political capital out of precisely nothing.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Regarding these public relations officers, can the Treasurer say whether the project for the preparation of films is to be carried out or whether the whole idea has been abandoned? I have become somewhat confused about press secretaries, public relations officers, and industrial promotion in general. The promotion of industries is extremely important and should be above the promotion of the Government as a political organization. The Government's legitimate aims are twofold: to establish new industries in the most effective way and to make the public of South Australia aware of what it does.

The information that is being given to the public is largely promoting the Government's political interests. I do not blame the Government for wanting to promote its interests to the public, but industrial promotion to establish and attract new industries is entirely different. On July 12, 1966, when I asked the then Treasurer a question about the appointment of a public relations officer, the Treasurer said:

The work of the proposed public relations officer in the Premier's Department would consist of the preparation of material and films for television screening and other viewing. He would also be required to prepare material for radio work and press announcements. It would be essential that any appointee to this position should have had experience in all phases of this work.

He also said:

Although it will take a few weeks to complete, as soon as a certain documentary film is available invitations will be extended to all honourable members and others to attend a screening of the film, because I intend that, in the interests of South Australia, this type of publicity should be made available overseas. From what the Treasurer said that activity has been abandoned. Will he explain the precise activities and the estimated results of this appointment since it was made in July last year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Several scenarios for a documentary film were submitted but, after examination, they were rejected after the assessment of their value for industrial promotion showed it would not warrant spending money on them. The work outlined on press, radio, and television has been done by the officers.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Where has it been done?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Since the appointment of these officers many announcements on television, on the radio, and in the press about industrial development in this State have been made, most at the request of the organizations concerned. The honourable member was present at the premises of Hill's Hoists Proprietary Limited in his district when several announcements were made on the radio and much television film shot. I do not know whether the honourable member realizes how that was arranged. On this and many other occasions the staff of the Premier's Department is available to those undertaking industrial expansion and, at their request, the staff is used.

Mr. LANGLEY: I compliment these officers on the way they have helped people and the courtesy they have shown. Recently, people interested in establishing in this State were conducted around the metropolitan area and

they were enthusiastic about the way they were looked after. I am sure these officers would do everything possible to make welcome people interested in establishing in this State. I have received letters praising the way in which Mr. Belchamber and his officers have conducted themselves, and I am sure that the results will satisfy. If members give them information, these officers will do their best to encourage industry to establish here.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I, too, praise these officers, particularly Mr. Belchamber. They are extremely conscientious in performing their duties. When I have spoken to them or introduced anyone to them the person concerned has been satisfied. However, is this effort being concentrated in the proper place to attract new industries? If information is propagated only within South Australia little will be achieved. We should try to attract overseas industries and those from other States, and that is what I understood would be done. Is that being done by these officers? What films are being prepared for overseas viewing or to encourage industry to come to South Australia from other States?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Films are not being prepared by these officers for viewing outside the State, because after considerable investigation it has been found that this is not the most effective way to obtain investment in industry. Regarding whether work is being done in the other States, I would point to the interstate and overseas publications of material concerning this State. I do not know whether the honourable member has read the supplements to the *Australian*, the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the *Sydney Daily Telegraph* or the *Wall Street Journal*, but the material for those was prepared by the public relations officers of the department in conjunction with Mr. Belchamber and Mr. Benveniste and, now, with the Director of Industrial Development.

Material is prepared and forwarded to the Agent-General in London. The address which I gave in Sydney to a very significant gathering of some of the largest financiers and industrialists in this country shortly after my appointment, at no cost to this State at all, was organized by my press secretary. Of course, the work of this department is directed to public relations material in areas where we can anticipate investment and interest. This is a constant activity of the members of the department.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Quite frankly, I still cannot understand the figures the Treasurer gave in reply to my pre-

vious question. Certain amounts are provided in the Estimates of the Premier's Department under the item "Industrial Promotion, Research and Assistance". However, the line "Industries Development Committee—Fees and expenses" appears under "Miscellaneous", and I would have thought that those two activities were at least similar. I am not complaining about things being put into the department, as the Treasurer suggested: what I am complaining about is that they are all being separated.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Gumeracha is discussing the Industries Development Committee, a statutory body which is not mentioned in the line, and he cannot link that up with the item covering the Industries Promotion Section of the Premier's Department.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Chairman, there are certain items in connection with the Government Motor Garage while certain other items are excluded from that department and are shown in another part of the Estimates. There may be some reason for this, but in my opinion it does not bring the items of the department together, as the Treasurer says it does: in fact, it is separating the items, and those items previously shown under one department are now shown under several headings.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As usual, the member for Gumeracha knows that he is talking out of the back of his neck. Previously, there was no line "Industries Promotion, Research and Assistance" under the Premier's Department, because there was no Premier's Department under the previous Government. The honourable member knows that perfectly well, and he knows that there were no officers. He also knows that what happened previously was that the line for the Industries Development Committee was under the "Miscellaneous" and it remains under the "Miscellaneous" item of Premier and Treasurer. It is a separately assigned item because the expenditure for the Industries Development Committee is separate from the Industries Promotion, Research and Assistance line.

The honourable member knows the set-up of the Industries Development Committee. In fact, he was partly responsible for it. To suggest that because this happens to be under the "Miscellaneous" line whereas the other thing is under the general line of the Premier's Department it is making difficulties for him is sheer nonsense, and the honourable member

knows that it is. He is only trying to hold up the work of the Committee.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Treasurer a question that I was quite entitled to ask him, and there is no occasion for him to start on personal abuse.

Mr. Millhouse: Hear, hear!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the Treasurer wants a bit of personal abuse he can have it at any time he likes. If he wants to know what I think of his Premier's Department and the work of his Premier's Department, I will tell him frankly what I think of his management of it. However, I do not indulge in personal abuse.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And I did not.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer did. The Treasurer always imputes motives to people. I asked him perfectly reasonable questions about the setting out of the accounts before the Committee, and he has no occasion at all to become personal or rude. If he wants to indulge in that sort of thing he will be here until 6 a.m. and he will not get very far with his Estimates tonight. I still do not know why the insurance that is charged upon motor vehicles is not put on the line "Government Motor Garage" as it always was. If the Treasurer will tell me why it is taken out and put somewhere else, I shall be happy to hear it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have already explained that to the honourable member, and I am sorry that he did not listen to me. He knows perfectly well that when this was a separate department that was a line that had to be separately charged because it was payable to another department; now it is not so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have listened to the debate on this line and on the question of industrial development in South Australia and the work of the Premier's public relations officers. What I heard from the Treasurer in answer to questions and remarks on this side of the Chamber has confirmed me once again in the feeling I have had that he is mostly words and very little action. He has been in office now since about the beginning of June. He came in with a great fanfare of trumpets, saying what he was going to do to improve the economy of this State, and he has talked about it ever since. He is always saying that we are on the verge of this, that and the other thing, but the stark fact is that, despite all this, all he has done is to get an extra \$126,000-odd

provided on this line and things in South Australia have not got better under his control.

If the example the Treasurer has given to us tonight in his handling of this line is his usual form, as I am afraid it is, then there is no hope of things getting better in this State. He will go on making his announcements through his public relations officers and his press secretaries about how jolly good things are going to be in South Australia or about the difference he has made since he took over from the Minister of Social Welfare, but there is no substance at all in it. I do not know whom he thinks he is fooling; he is not fooling the people of South Australia, who know that their situation is the same as it was under the Walsh Government, and who know also that they are not as well off or as prosperous as they were under the regime of Sir Thomas Playford. This is the substance, as against the froth and bubble we get from the honourable gentleman that is exhibited excellently in this line.

Under Sir Thomas Playford's Government, this State went ahead, because of the former Liberal Treasurer's ability to administer the affairs of the Government and his ability over a long time to attract industry to South Australia from other States and overseas. He did it all without the necessity for an Industries Development Branch or anything else. He did it himself, because of what he was able to do—because of his own experience and capabilities. Since March, 1965, we have had the member for Edwardstown in office, a pathetic figure who could not attract industry to this State because he could not inspire confidence in the people whom it was hoped to attract. Since the beginning of this session we have had the present Treasurer with the paraphernalia of all his public relations officers, etc., at the expense of the State, and he has done no better than his predecessor did. These are the facts and it makes me cross to hear the Treasurer speak as he spoke a moment ago in reply to the member for Gumeracha.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The gallery can hear you!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is all very well for the Minister of Lands to interject, trying to come to the Treasurer's aid. I know he would have liked to change places on the front bench; indeed, we may have been better off if he had, and many have said that. But the fact is that the member for Norwood, the present Treasurer, is in office and is in charge of the affairs of this State until the next election. The sooner that comes the better.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have heard some more bubble and squeak from the honourable member, and I do not intend to waste much time on it. The honourable member is whistling in the dark as usual. Every time an improvement takes place in this State he says, "Woe, Woe! Everything is terrible. Let's bash the confidence of this State." Indeed, he says, "Let's tell untruths about the situation within the State on employment and expansion. Let's deny that any exists." He has played to the gallery this evening in his usual fashion. The honourable member says that the people of this State do not know that things are on the improve here. With great respect to the honourable member's understanding of what people fear in this State, I can only say that he has not been sitting with his ear close to the ground, or with his mug on one side and his wump on the other.

As to his personal remarks concerning me, I am rather used to them: the honourable member makes personal remarks about differences existing on this side of the Chamber, but I suggest that he is not really in a position to talk about personal differences within Parties. I suggest that the frustrations that the honourable member has exhibited in this place over the past year or so have been so obvious to everyone here and outside that the resulting activities have done full credit to him. I suggest that the honourable member pay attention to the development of this State rather than indulge in the kind of debate in which he has indulged this evening.

Line passed.

Treasury Department, \$108,746.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I refer to the line dealing with the Under Treasurer, who is outstanding in dealing with this State's finances. I have been privileged to attend many Loan Council meetings with him and I have seen the quality of his work. My Government used to rely on him to a large extent, and I believe that the present Government does, too. I have sometimes criticized the setting out of the Government's accounts. However, I point out that I have not intended such criticism to be interpreted as a criticism of Mr. Seaman or the officers of the Treasury Department, because I have every confidence in them.

When I was associated with the department there were three principal officers, and in them we have one of the best teams of its kind in the Commonwealth. When I criticize lines on the Estimates I do not mean my criticism

to be regarded as a criticism of the Treasury officers, who are there to carry out the policy and instructions of the Government. I believe that they would equally well carry out my instructions, or those of the present Government, or those of the present Leader of the Opposition when he assumes the office of Treasurer next year.

It has been customary for the Treasurer to refer to his indebtedness to the work of the Treasury officers, and it was no doubt an oversight on the part of the present Treasurer that he omitted such a reference this year. Perhaps the oversight occurred because he was reading from a document.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have paid a sincere tribute to the Treasury officers many times. Mr. Seaman, Mr. Carey, and Mr. Barnes are very loyal officers. I agree with the honourable member's statement that they are valued officers who give loyal service to whatever Government is in office. This Government has relied heavily on them for advice not only in regard to day-to-day work of the Treasury, but also on policy matters. The officers have been unstinting and untiring in their work. I have also paid a tribute to the work of the officers of my department, whom I work very hard indeed. They have spent many hours after normal office hours and at weekends giving generous and loyal service to the Government. I do not think that they consider that I have not paid due tribute to them.

Line passed.

Prices Branch, \$161,325.

Mr. McANANEY: Yesterday I referred to a restrictive trade practice and what I thought was a breach of the Act in regard to discounts. The Treasurer assured me not that the Prices Commissioner would examine the matter but that a report would be made in regard to the new licensing legislation. I do not think the licensing legislation covers the point I made. Therefore, I ask the Treasurer to request the Prices Commissioner to report on the matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When I get a report upon prices, I shall get it from the Prices Commissioner.

Mr. McANANEY: The matter refers to a practice rather than to the price of a particular commodity. I do not think the licensing legislation deals with the specific complaint.

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member is not dealing with a matter handled by the Prices Branch, he is out of order in raising it.

Mr. McANANEY: I am saying it is a prices matter, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Treasurer has said that, if he gets a report on prices, he will get it from the Prices Commissioner, not under the licensing legislation.

Mr. McANANEY: I am referring to what he said yesterday. A provision in the Prices Act deals with the matter about which I complained, and it should be investigated immediately by the Prices Commissioner.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I said yesterday that, when the Licensing Bill was passed, I would have a review made of the prices charged for liquor in South Australia. That review will be carried out under the Prices Act by the Prices Commissioner.

Mr. McANANEY: The Treasurer has still not explained why he has to wait until then to do something if the matter is covered by the present Prices Act.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The licensing legislation affects costs in relation to these matters, and I suggest that the honourable member read it.

Mr. McANANEY: Nothing in the licensing legislation will affect the fixing of these prices. This matter relates to a rebate on the sale of beer at present, and relates to the Prices Act.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member obviously has not followed what has happened in another place. I suggest that he find out.

Line passed.

Superannuation Department, \$172,836; Agent-General in England Department, \$129,738; Land Tax Department, \$373,951; Stamp and Succession Duties Department, \$143,757—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$17,757,470.

Mr. HALL: I should like the Treasurer to explain more fully the vote to the Railways Department this year, which is increased from \$6,400,000 to \$8,400,000. The Premier's financial statement states:

The estimate of \$30,440,000 for cash receipts from fares and freights of the railways services is \$356,000 above the actual receipts of last year. An increase of about \$300,000 will flow from the operation for a full year of book rates—

I am not sure what these increased book rates mean. I take it that it is an increase in some rates charged for railways freights in some

direction or other that will operate in the full year. I should like an explanation on the term "book rates". The financial statement continues:

... and about \$330,000 will be due to the fact that no further increase in outstanding accounts is expected in 1967-68 whereas 1966-67 cash receipts were reduced because of a temporary increase in outstanding accounts at the year's end. There will undoubtedly be a number of variations as between the two years 1966-67 and 1967-68 in the volume of carriage of various commodities and in special contract rates, and the net effect of these variations could be to reduce revenues by almost \$300,000.

Even so, it is estimated that the reduction of revenues this year after the various contracts and operations of the railways are carried out will be \$300,000. Last year's shortfall, considering over-expenditures and underpayments resulting from revenues, amounted to \$1,858,000. This is rather confusing, because of the very short explanation given in the Premier's financial statement. It is very short indeed for an expenditure of \$6,400,000. I consider that it is a necessary requirement that the Treasurer bring some reasonably detailed statement into the House to explain the railways vote, especially as it has been increased by \$2,000,000.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The deficit in the railways working expenses has been a constant burden on the State Budget. The additional transfers to the Railways Department this year are designed to reduce the prospective deficit in the railways accounts to a figure that could possibly be eliminated by further achievements in reducing expenditure or attracting revenue. The possibility of balancing the departmental budget is a real target and incentive for railway officers. Because of the impact of increased awards and other costs an additional \$2,000,000 is proposed this year in the amount provided towards working expenses. It is expected that general increases in award rates and other associated costs will require this extra allocation during the coming year.

Mr. HALL: As the position has worsened by an estimated \$1,858,000 is this being covered by the additional \$2,000,000 allotted this year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are covering any prospective deficit this financial year. The additional increased awards will have an impact but we believe that savings are possible within the department. The department considers that this is the figure necessary as an additional transfer from the Treasury to cover its expected deficit.

Mr. HALL: This is an inadequate explanation. What sums are covering this worsened position?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot tell the honourable member that immediately, but I shall obtain a report.

Mr. SHANNON: Does the provision for "Insurance" cover all Government vehicles and if it does, does it include comprehensive and third party insurance payments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The sum covers all Government vehicles, but is limited to third party liability.

Mr. McANANEY: The sum received from freight on wool has been reduced by \$50,000 despite the fact that the department sent representatives to farmers to ask them to send their wool by rail. Freight on grain has increased by \$700,000 but this is not in proportion to the increase in freight rates and the larger harvest. Apparently, farmers cart their grain direct to terminals rather than use the rail services. Although railway services have helped to develop South Australia many are now a complete liability and do not provide the necessary service to the community. The Labor Government tried to increase charges on road transport in order to subsidize rail services, but the department should be placed on a proper business footing. Adequate depreciation has not been written off for many years so that the department is now over-capitalized. The sooner we put our railways on a proper system of book-keeping, the better. We should depreciate the assets and make the railways competitive with road transport. The railways should cut their losses where necessary. The essential lines should be fully developed, and there should be modern equipment on the lines that are essential to the future needs of this State.

The traffic on the interstate lines is increasing. Any line that is over 100 miles in length can and should be competitive if efficiently run. This has been proved in other parts of the world. Our railways are taking money out of the Budget each year to make up the losses on the short hauls, and no business or industry can continue to operate under those conditions. This is bad for the outlook of the railways officers themselves. I repeat that we should get the Railways Department back on to a proper system of book-keeping and thereby give it an opportunity to be efficient and competitive.

The department runs a spur line of some 12 miles in length to Milang. I think four or five railcars go to Milang in a week. The

total revenue of that line is \$4,500, and as it is necessary to have a stationmaster there the loss incurred on the line can well be imagined. Yet at the same time it does not provide any service to Milang that could not be provided by a passenger bus three or four times a week. We must face up to this problem, and we must set an example to the rest of the community in the way we run our Government services. We are not setting any example in regard to the Railways Department.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer has offered to obtain for me details concerning the moneys covering the railways deficit that is shown at just over \$1,500,000. Can the Treasurer say whether that is a normal deficit? It seems to me from the explanation given in the Treasurer's Financial Statement that it is an abnormal deficit and, if that is so, one would expect some of the extra \$2,000,000 that we are voting this year to cover some of last year's deficit. Will the Treasurer ascertain the significance of this deficit in regard to next year's vote? As the deficit has increased on last year's figure by about \$568,000, it seems to me that if the position continues to deteriorate it will have to be covered by the use of permanent funds.

I understand that the Railways Department has reduced stock freights by 25 per cent in respect of quantities of more than two-van loads. It therefore seems to me that the department would have to obtain significantly increased stock-carrying business if its receipts are to equal the receipts that obtained before the reduction occurred. Will the Treasurer obtain details of the increased percentage of business that must be obtained in this respect?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report for the Leader but I point out to him that it is clear from page 188 of the Auditor-General's Report that the amounts of deficit for the year ended June 30, 1967, have not been covered by any credit arrangements. They have been covered by the ordinary Revenue Account of the South Australian Railways. The balance at June 30, 1966, was \$1,764,449; the net contribution from Consolidated Revenue for the year was \$2,171,599, a total of \$3,936,048, less a deficit for the year ended June 30, 1967, of \$1,578,974, leaving \$2,357,074 in hand in Revenue Account.

Mr. HALL: The Government intends to introduce additional long service leave benefits, but I do not know how these apply to the railway staff and what impact they will have in fringe areas. There is a Bill before members to alter the long service leave provisions in

South Australia, and there is administrative action (I am not sure whether there will be legislative action also) to provide for an extra week's annual leave for public servants. Can the Treasurer say whether there are any fringe areas in respect of which an additional week's leave might impinge upon the finances of the Railways Department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think that this arises, but I shall obtain a report for the Leader.

Mr. McANANEY: I ask the Treasurer for details of intrastate and interstate passenger traffic numbers, and revenue received.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall try to obtain that information.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Under "Miscellaneous" is the item "Interest on Trust Funds and on other moneys, \$430,000". I assume that this relates to the trust funds set out on page 359 of the Auditor-General's Report, which states: "Trust Funds Accounts—Balances on June 30, 1967. Section A. The balances listed below represent amounts held by the Treasurer on behalf of various bodies and upon which interest is paid." The next page of the report then lists all moneys held by the Treasurer on which interest is not paid. I cannot find in the documents the sum relating to the trust funds upon which interest is paid. Can the Treasurer say what rates of interest are at present being paid on these trust accounts and what interest rates are being received for such portions of them as are being deposited on fixed deposit at the Commonwealth Bank?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is a whole series of transactions for which varying rates of interest are payable. Interest-bearing balances were above expectations last year. For the current year balances of much the same order as last year are expected. I shall try to get a summary of the particulars of interest rates for the honourable member.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF LANDS, MINISTER OF REPATRIATION,
MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND MINISTER OF
IMMIGRATION AND TOURISM

Department of Lands, \$3,251,755.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As a member of the Land Settlement Committee, I express my appreciation of the work done by the Executive Officer and staff of the South-Eastern Drainage Board in assisting the committee. I am concerned that we are still working on the 1924 report of the Royal Commission on Drainage. The engineering design was resolved at that time and we have not since changed our

thinking. Rather, we have been giving effect to the proposals that were recommended then. Has the Minister of Lands considered having this matter fully reviewed in the light of present knowledge and changed circumstances, particularly the changed nature of agriculture in the South-East since that time? In earlier years the object was to make the land suitable for arable agriculture, but that is not the position today. If the Minister has not considered the matter, will he do so?

Ultimately, we shall have to take action to preserve our valuable water instead of letting it run into the channel through Beachport. Developments in the last five years or six years by the extension of Bool Lagoon outlet, the provision of control gates at Bool Lagoon, and the extensions to Baker Range drain, again with control gates, have enabled the control of the Eastern Division waters so that they could be moved northwards along the normal drainage channel. We ought to consider undertaking this work. The practice outlined in the 1924 report was to take the water by the shortest route to the sea. I ask the Minister that, if he has not given consideration to it, he request his colleagues to have the whole matter of South-Eastern drainage reviewed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): The honourable member referred to the executive officers of the South-Eastern Drainage Board, and I agree with his remarks. He will be aware that recently the board has almost been reconstituted. The previous Chairman, Mr. Anderson, has tendered his resignation because of ill-health and has been replaced by an agriculturist, the Deputy Chairman of the Land Board (Mr. Roe), whom I consider to be a first-class officer and very knowledgeable on all aspects of land. The Surveyor-General (Mr. Bailey), because of his appointment on the Planning and Development Committee, has been replaced on the board by Mr. Ligertwood of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Without casting any aspersions on members of the previous board, I think that could lead to further investigations into methods adopted in the South-East. In addition to this, the other proposal put forward by the South-Eastern Drainage Board has been examined by the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee, of which the honourable member was Chairman for three years and, no doubt, a member prior to that.

Surely, it would be competent for that committee to make observations in connection with the methods used for drainage in the South-East. The honourable member knows

that there has been a controversy in the South-East, particularly in the Western Division, about the drainage that has now been completed and there is strong advocacy for the installation of weirs in the drain to control the flow of water at certain times of the year. There is also on the part of the South-Eastern Drainage Relief Committee an advocacy that we cease all activity in the Eastern Division of the scheme which is at present under consideration and that we re-examine the situation. In connection with this request the South-Eastern Drainage Board will meet the South-Eastern Drainage Relief Committee at Millicent on September 27 to see exactly what it wants and why it believes its proposals are sound. I have said previously in this place that I do not think that there is sufficient liaison between agricultural authorities and engineers in this matter, because I consider that if an engineer is asked to drain water it is purely an engineering task and he will do his job effectively and efficiently, whereas some thought should be given to pastures; but at present I do not intend to radically review the policy that has been pursued in regard to the drainage of the South-East. Because of the activities of the new Chairman and his board there may be some change in attitude. I have considered constantly what can be done to improve the situation, but it would cost an enormous sum to close the Eastern Division scheme and re-open another one. Strong representations have been made for drainage to continue, but a minority of people in the area has advocated no further drainage. The committee has taken evidence and made certain recommendations which are being implemented. We are not unaware of the problems, but I cannot say whether a radical change in policy will take place.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Land Settlement Committee inquires and reports on a specific reference. I am not querying whether what has been done is correct: this is a drainage proposal that is in line with an overall scheme, and I do not suggest that the Eastern Division drainage should be discontinued. Limited drainage is needed in this area, but I am concerned with the disposition and the final destination of the water. I believe that this water should be controlled and directed in a northerly direction, but the whole engineering project has been designed to allow the water to travel westward by cutting across the natural flow to reach the sea by the shortest route.

Hydrologists in the Mines Department have emphasized that what has been taking place has not had their blessing. They have seriously

objected to the overall policy, and pointed to a serious loss of liaison between hydrologists and engineers. The new appointments to the board are admirable. These men are competent officers and may have different ideas, but I reiterate that there is a tremendous quantity drainage of water of an intermittent flow that may be used to better advantage in the long term than it has been used in the short term in the past.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister give me some information about the administration of the weights and measures legislation? I understand that regulations have been or are to be introduced. It has been suggested to me that councils are being invited to hand over their authority in the administration of this legislation to the Lands Department. In fact, it has been suggested that the department is saying that this matter is so complicated it would be better for it to control the whole thing. Does the Minister not think that this is weakening the authority of local government?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: An Act passed earlier this year repealed the old Weights and Measures Act. That Act provided that it would be competent for a council to request the Minister to take from the council its function in regard to weights and measures. However, the request had to come from the council. This was done at the request of a number of councils. I say categorically that it is not the department's desire or intention to take this function away from local government. The department does not want it. It took this action merely for the convenience of councils that had requested that this happen, and in doing so it had no idea of the results that would follow. Although we can proclaim that the central authority will do this work on behalf of the councils, the councils may request the Minister to revoke that proclamation. Therefore, if a council wants this authority back at any time it can have it back.

In the first instance, steps were taken to discourage councils from renouncing this function. Before I will proclaim that the central authority will do this work, I have to be thoroughly satisfied that the councils do not have the facility or are not competent to perform these functions properly. Unfortunately, what has been suggested to the honourable member has been bandied around the countryside, and this disturbs me. It is claimed that the new Act and regulations make it so difficult for an

inspector to perform this function that it virtually makes it impossible for local government to continue in this field. However, that is complete and utter rubbish. The regulation lays down that the inspectors must be competent to perform their functions, and surely this is reasonable. In order to assist them, the department has set about instructing the inspectors in certain districts. I believe that the attitude of some inspectors is completely wrong: they fear that the examination set for them will be too difficult, that they will fail and have to face the council, whereas the test that I have seen is a simple one that even I could pass. We are trying to encourage groups of councils to employ a qualified inspector and to continue as they have in the past. We do not wish to take over this function: the facility has been provided and, if a council insists that we take it over, we do so, in order to assist.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Concerning the "contribution under clause 7 of the War Service Land Settlement Agreement Act—amount payable to the Commonwealth", \$100,000 was voted last year but only \$36,996 spent, and \$130,000 is proposed this year. Am I correct in assuming that this item relates to the agreement entered into between the State and the Commonwealth in order to share the losses arising in some cases when a final valuation is made on soldier settlement properties? Does this line represent the State's contribution of two-fifths in this respect? If that is so, will the Minister of Lands say where these writings off have occurred? Further, will he say whether all settlers have now received their final valuations and whether the sum proposed represents a final contribution?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: True, this item represents the State's contribution of two-fifths concerning the sum paid in acquiring and approving land in excess of the valuation fixed under the War Service Land Settlement Agreement Act. Regarding the question whether all valuations have been issued, the honourable member will of course be aware that in zone 5 of the war service land settlement scheme there are still some legal battles proceeding concerning rentals, and therefore those valuations have not yet been issued. I cannot give the honourable member details concerning exactly where these payments have been made but I shall be happy to obtain this information as soon as possible.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I ask the Minister of Lands whether it is now necessary to have the long procedure of gazettal for the transfer of leases. In view of the changed circumstances,

is it possible to reduce this period? There have been considerable delays in the checking of surveys. In view of the successful photogrammetric techniques now being employed, I ask the Minister whether this section of his department's work could be used to speed up this work. I point out that his department is very well equipped in this respect.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Regarding the gazettal time in connection with transfers, if the honourable member will guarantee that he and his Party will support me, I shall wipe it out altogether; however, I do not know whether such support will be forthcoming. If the period of two weeks can be reduced to one week both I and the department will be happy. There is every possibility that a transfer will have been processed and have my approval within three to four weeks of the time of its arrival, and this includes the gazettal time. I do not know how many times the department is blamed for a delay in a transfer when, in fact, it has not received it, and the land agents or solicitors have conveniently blamed the department. Neither I nor the department appreciates this.

Regarding the checking of surveys, the honourable member is no doubt aware that I said this year that a survey co-ordination Bill would be drawn up. This will provide a central office of information and could lead to a minimizing of the delays that do occur. However, I must again point out that it is amazing how often these surveys have to be sent back because something is wrong with them. The department is not to blame if the survey has not been done correctly. I agree that some improvement may be possible in this field and I shall draw the honourable member's remarks to the attention of the Surveyor-General. We may be able to do something about the gazettal time of one week when we are dealing with the relevant legislation.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I thank the Minister for his unequivocal assurance about the weights and measures legislation, which was dealt with when I was absent. Provision of \$800 is made for the destruction of rabbits on Crown lands. In some years provision is not made for this item. Although \$800 was voted last year, no money was spent on the item. The same provision has been made this year and I should like information about this expenditure. Another matter about which I should like information is the provision of \$2,500 for oversea visits of officers.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The amount of \$800 for the destruction of rabbits on Crown lands is to enable councils that apply to the department to have the necessary funds to control such rabbits. Obviously, no such application was received last year, because no money was spent. However, complaints may be received this year and the money will be available.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I have traced the item back for many years and it seems to be a "dead" line.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If applications are received this year, they will live it up. The provision regarding the oversea visit is to enable an officer of the Survey Department to undertake photogrammetric work in a famous institution. The Assistant Surveyor-General has been to the institution and we consider it desirable to send an officer to undertake this course. The officer will be going during this financial year.

Mr. COUMBE: Funds are being provided as a contribution towards the maintenance of drains in the Millicent and Tantanoola districts. Can the Minister say to whom these moneys are to be made available and for what purpose? The amount provided seems to be steady.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The District Councils of Millicent and Tantanoola maintain drains within certain areas in their districts. By agreement with the Government, the councils are reimbursed annually for the loss of revenue sustained when the assets are taken over and allotted under Crown tenure by the Government. That is why the Government pays the maintenance. There is a good drainage system in this area. The councils no doubt make their claim for this amount. I think it was paid last year, and no doubt the same amount will be paid this year.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think it should be cut out?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not think so, without considerable investigation, although I do not think we will do it on this occasion.

Mr. RODDA: In connection with the destruction of rabbits, the Minister will remember the field day held at Greenways and the demonstration of the latest procedures for the destruction of rabbits by using 1080. I think at that meeting questions arose regarding the amendment to the Act to enable poison to be put on roads. Land owners are using 1080 to advantage, but they are breaking the law by putting poison on roads. I know some very

distinguished men in the Naracoorte area who have shown initiative by putting poison on the roads, thereby killing many rabbits. Can the Minister say what progress has been made with that amendment?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am endeavouring to do everything I can to have the Bill presented in this session, but owing to the illness of the Senior Parliamentary Draftsman—

Mr. Millhouse: The Parliamentary Draftsman.

The DEPUTY CHARIMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I hope I will be able to introduce the Bill in this session.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In connection with the administration of the Act, the Auditor-General has set out at page 130 of his report a statement of receipts and expenditures for this department. Taking into account the collection of Crown rents and other departmental revenues, the net cost to the Budget is nearly \$2,000,000, although it is slightly less than it was last year. Is the department being reorganized to make it, if not a revenue-producing department, at least a department that is holding its own in keeping with what we expect of it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Is the honourable member implying that the department is inefficient?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: No.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although the costs of transfers and the processing of mortgages have increased, the cost of administration is not recouped by these charges. Irrigation rates in the upper Murray River have been decreased so that the Government has to contribute what could be called a subsidy. No increases can be made for rents on perpetual leases, as it would be difficult and politically dangerous to alter them. The cost of administering the department is constantly reviewed and we have varied many charges to the public. If the honourable member requires details of these variations I shall obtain them for him, but the department is always adjusting charges to try to meet the cost of administering the service we give to the public.

Line passed.

Publicity and Tourist Bureau and Immigration Department, \$763,891.

Mr. LANGLEY: We are too modest when dealing with tourism in this State. The members of this Chamber who recently went on a trip to Wilpena Pound learned a great deal about

the tourism attractions of this State. Mr. Kevin Rasheed, the Manager there, proved to be a wonderful host. I am sure that anyone visiting the pound would be able to spend a fortnight there without seeing everything. Incidentally, Mr. Rasheed said that he was very happy with the way the present Minister was helping tourism in this State.

People can go on half-day and day trips from Wilpena Pound and see many interesting things. Also, there is always some entertainment at night. A holiday there offers plenty of opportunity for people to keep fit. I trust that with the passing of the new Licensing Act it will be possible to improve the facilities there even further. On this trip we had the opportunity to see some of the real tourist assets of this State. Spacious caravan parks and camping areas are available to visitors to the pound, most of whom, I understand, come from other States. I am told that this year Wilpena Pound attracted a record number of visitors and caravans. I am sure that all members who made the trip consider this pleasure resort to be one of the finest in this State.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

JUVENILE COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It restores the rule as to the admission of the press to juvenile courts and the publication of the proceedings of juvenile courts to that which applied before the operation of the amending Act that came into force in February, 1966. That Act made two great changes in the law on this particular topic. First, it made the court a closed court, because section 56 of the new Act provides:

The room or place in which a Juvenile Court sits shall not be open to the public and at the hearing before a Juvenile Court of any information, complaint, charge or other proceedings against a child the court may order that all persons not directly interested in the case shall be excluded from the court or place of hearing.

The old provision, excluding the public, was contained in section 11 of the 1941 Act, as follows:

(1) No person shall be present at any sitting of a Juvenile Court except . . .

Classes of persons who were permitted in the court were then set out, one of those classes being *bona fide* representatives of newspapers or newsagencies. The other great change that was made, concerning the right of the press

to report the proceedings in the court, is contained in section 64 of the present Act. This provision means, in effect, that only the result of the proceedings of a Juvenile Court can be published, and that result is, as it were, handed out to the press from behind closed doors. The press is not allowed into the court but may only be told—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation. The honourable member for Mitcham!

Mr. McKee: What's it all about?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members would listen instead of conversing among themselves they might be able to understand. The honourable member for Mitcham!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The effect of section 64 is that the press is merely handed the result of a case and is not permitted to publish anything else; it is not permitted to be present in the court unless by special order of the magistrate. The previous rule, contained in section 12 of the old Juvenile Courts Act, provided that the press could be present and could publish everything that could be published in any other court, except details that would lead to the identification of the juveniles involved in the proceedings. So far as I am aware, that rule worked well for over 25 years. I did not in my experience ever hear of a complaint about the way in which it worked, and I do not know of any good reason why it was changed. However, it was changed when the Attorney-General introduced the Bill in October, 1965, for an entirely new Juvenile Courts Act. The Attorney-General, when explaining that Bill, hardly mentioned the significant change he was making in the law. He said:

Clause 64 deals with the publication of reports of proceedings in juvenile courts or in the Supreme Court on appeal or committal from juvenile courts. The existing provisions of section 12 of the Juvenile Courts Act have been expanded to cover publication by radio and television in addition to publication in newspapers. The clause enables publication unless the court otherwise orders, but, unless permitted by virtue of a court order, the name, address or school of child concerned must not be revealed.

One would not have suspected from this short explanation the change that the Attorney-General proposed in the laws of this State. In Committee I referred to clause 64 as follows:

This is the only clause on which I have serious misgivings.

The Attorney then explained the difference between this clause and the provision it replaced

(section 12 of the old Act). No-one else said anything, and I must take responsibility for this; I interpreted the silence of members to indicate general acquiescence in the change and the general belief that we should see how it worked. In fact, the provision went through in the form in which it had been introduced. However, it has been criticized considerably since then.

When its effect was realized there was a considerable protest within the community, and this was canvassed by both daily newspapers. Ever since, complaints have been made that the Juvenile Courts of this State are virtually closed, by virtue of section 64. Questions have been asked of the Attorney but he has refused point-blank even to consider introducing an amendment to the Act. Of course, we must realize that this change is in line with the present Government's policy, and I remind members that in the first session of this Parliament the Attorney introduced the Evidence Act Amendment Bill, which would have made significant changes in all courts in these regards. It would have cut out the press substantially in its task of reporting cases in our courts. So, it is not surprising that the Government has stood firm on this; its policy is to cut down on the common law right of all the Queen's subjects to be present in the courts of law.

Doubts have been expressed ever since February, 1966, about this proposal. Comments were made by Dean Griswold of the Harvard Law School when he was here for the Legal Convention: he drew on his experience in the United States of America. Further comments were made by Lord Denning, who drew on his experience in the United Kingdom. Both these gentlemen said that the courts should be free and open to the public, particularly to the press.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: New South Wales is also moving in this direction.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The underlying reason for this is that publicity is a safeguard of the liberty of the individual. I have already mentioned the common law rule; it is referred to in Hannan's *Summary Procedure of Justices*. The author cites an English case, *Scott v. Scott*, in which the following rule is laid down:

The public has a right to be present in a courtroom whilst a court is sitting therein, for "every court of justice is open to every subject of the King".

That is a rule to which I acknowledge there may be occasional exceptions. Sir, even the Minister of Social Welfare the other day took a stand rather different from that of

the honourable the Attorney and said that in serious cases for offences that were prevalent the press should be allowed in. This is what he said, in part:

As a general policy, I would not agree that first offenders should face an open court unless the offence was of a most serious nature. But offences which may be particularly prevalent at the time, such as personal violence, car stealing or breaking and entering should warrant a public hearing.

What decided me to introduce this Bill was the view expressed by Mr. Elliott, S.M., in the Adelaide Juvenile Court at the beginning of last week. I do not think I need to remind members, because I was able to say earlier in the evening that Mr. Elliott was a new magistrate, having been appointed to the Adelaide Juvenile Court only nine or 10 months ago. He said he had begun his duties in court prepared to accept the fact that the courts were virtually closed and believing that this was in the best interests of all concerned, but his experience since has convinced him otherwise.

Now, Sir, this a most compelling point of view and I do not think I need do more than remind members of the long statement that Mr. Elliott made, setting out his reasons why, in his view, the courts should be open to the press. Now, it may be argued (no doubt it will be argued by the Attorney-General) that under the present section 64 the court may be conducted in the presence of the press if the magistrate so desires, but (and this is the point that I make most strongly) if the magistrate is to allow the press in his court, then he virtually has to make an exception of every case, that is, an exception from the general rule of closed courts. I point out further that Mr. Elliott is not the only magistrate who sits in this jurisdiction. I think most of the magistrates who sit in this jurisdiction share his views on the presence of the press, but this will not necessarily always be the way, and I believe that the general rule of law laid down by Parliament should be in accordance with the practices established. This can be done only if we go back to the provisions that were in force under the old Juvenile Courts Act.

I personally believe, from my own limited experience, that it is desirable to have the press present. The advantages of publicity outweigh, in my view, any disadvantages. I point out further (and I say this because of the final paragraph in Mr. Elliott's statement) that there are in the general law provisions to exclude from the court in certain circumstances.

I merely refer to sections 69 and 70 of the Evidence Act, which give power to exclude and give power to prohibit the publication of evidence in certain circumstances. These provisions apply to the Juvenile Court as they apply to other courts and, in my view, this is a sufficient power of exclusion to cover any of those cases in which a magistrate in the Juvenile Court considers that the press should be excluded.

So, the purport of my Bill is to get back to the position that operated here before the amending Juvenile Courts Act operated in February, 1966. In the Bill, I have reproduced almost exactly the wording of old sections 11 and 12 of the Juvenile Courts Act in place of the present section 56, which refers to those who may be present in court, and section 64, which refers to the press. The only alterations I have made (and here I took the advice of one of the Parliamentary Draftsmen) were to bring the old provisions up to date by including radio and television as well as the press. So that, in fact, new section 56 (1) (e) will refer to *bona fide* representatives of newspapers, news agencies, television stations or radio stations. Those persons may be present in court. There is the same slight variation in section 64. The only other alteration is to increase the penalty from £50 to \$200, which is in line with the penalties in the present Act.

To sum up, the whole purpose of my amending the Bill is to bring the law back to where

it was before the present Act operated. This will allow the press into the court and allow the publication of reports of proceedings in every respect, except those that could lead to the identity of the parties or the juveniles involved. This may be done on the special order of the magistrate. I believe that it is desirable that we should go back to this rule, and Mr. Elliott's views are cogent evidence of that fact. I hope the Attorney will allow this debate to continue. I know he is in an embarrassing position. It was he who introduced the changes that have caused the protests in the community and who has steadfastly refused up to now to consider any changes in those arrangements, yet we have the evidence of the man who now has the heaviest responsibility with regard to charges against juveniles in this State. I hope the Attorney will be prepared in the light of what has been said in the last couple of weeks to agree to go back to the old arrangements which have worked well in the past and which will work well in the future. They are a compromise between having perfectly open courts as we do for adult offenders and having closed courts, which have all sorts of undesirable features.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.49 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 21, at 2 p.m.