

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

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

QUESTIONS**DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

Mr. HALL: I understand from news reports that the Prime Minister has replied to the application by the South Australian Government about drought relief and has asked for details additional to those given in the application. Can the Premier give the House the detailed information that has been submitted, and can he also say what additional information has been requested by the Prime Minister?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think it would probably be best if I tabled the correspondence in the House tomorrow, and I shall do that.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Doubtless the Minister of Lands appreciates the great urgency of assisting many farmers who are experiencing distress at present. Can he say whether a share-farmer in urgent need of assistance but unable to pledge anything may apply for benefits, as announced in the press by the Minister of Agriculture some time ago? Further, can a general farmer having property and urgently needing help be assisted by the Government pending finality of negotiations with the Commonwealth Government and also pending the passing of the Bill at present before Parliament?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Regarding the first case mentioned by the honourable member, it is competent for a share-farmer to apply for unemployment benefits if he is in the position that the honourable member has indicated. Regarding a farmer who is in necessitous circumstances because of drought, I am afraid that I know of no way in which the Government can assist him until the legislation has been passed. I hope that the measure will pass this House before the end of this week and, when it is in operation, we shall be able to investigate cases and help where necessary.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES

Mr. CLARK: As more television lessons are being taken in schools and as special lessons are televised for this purpose, will the Minister of Education consider making available a \$1 for \$1 subsidy for the purchase of television receivers?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: At present the South Australian offices of the Australian Broadcasting Commission are providing 35 weekly sessions, each of 20 minutes, for primary and secondary schools. About 60 programmes on subjects ranging from film study to poetry and science will be initiated and produced in South Australia during 1967. I consider that a significant number of schools is already taking educational telecasts but, unfortunately, many schools have not purchased television sets because previously these items have not been approved under subsidy. In contrast to this, radio equipment is approved for subsidy. I have now approved of television sets being placed on the normal subsidy list, and they will be subsidized in future on the normal \$1 for \$1 basis.

KEITH WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a report regarding the Mines Department's proposals for further drilling in connection with a water supply for the township of Keith?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In the opinion of the Mines Department, there are two possible sources of good water supply for the Keith township. The first is from bores around 150ft. to 200ft. deep into the Gambier limestone some miles east of Keith. So far this has been tried, without success, in one bore at Emu Flat, three miles east of Keith, but it is proposed to carry on further scout boring with a rotary drill, starting a farther one and a half miles north-east, and working eastwards if necessary. This is considered the more likely and more satisfactory source of supply.

The second source is from deeper bores 250-300ft. deep in the Keith township area, into the bottom aquifer, the Knight sands. There are two problems here: first, the nature of the aquifer, which is probably fine sand requiring screening and careful development, and, secondly, possible contamination from overlying waters. Previous bores testing this aquifer have yielded poor results, due it is considered to not fully penetrating the aquifer in most cases, coupled with unsatisfactory screen and development techniques. Whilst conscious of the difficulties, the geologists consider this aquifer merits full testing using modern techniques, and propose one trial bore in the township area to determine whether it shows sufficient promise to try and develop a number of bores in it.

With regard to contamination, the existing deep bores have been tested by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and found satisfactory, and it is considered unlikely this problem will prove serious in properly constructed deep bores. The immediate proposed programme is to commence scout drilling to the east with a rotary drill within the next few days, and at the same time test ideas in the Keith township area, by deepening a bore currently under construction for the police station, to explore the lower aquifer.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. CURREN: As press and radio reports indicate that the Premier has received a reply from the Prime Minister to his request for a Ministerial conference concerning the deferment of work on the Chowilla dam project and its application to the supply of water for South Australia, can the Premier give the text of the reply and the information sought by the Prime Minister?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have the letter from the Prime Minister here, but I received it at the weekend. The effect of the reply was that, in view of the added cost of the Chowilla dam project, and of the studies that it was intended that the River Murray Commission should undertake, the Prime Minister considered that a Ministerial conference would be premature until the studies were completed; that the Commonwealth Government was sympathetic to South Australia's claims; but that a conference would be better held once the added information sought by the commission was available. I have expressed to the Prime Minister my disappointment at this view, because it had seemed to me (and I understood to all members) that the South Australian Government required an immediate assurance and one not pending studies, the exact time of which had not yet been fixed. However, I shall continue to press the Prime Minister on this point and to try to set a time limit when the studies will be available so that the information can be supplied to the various Governments and to the commission.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support what the Premier has said about pressing South Australia's claims. As he said he intended to set a time limit beyond which we would not wait for the conference, what time limit will he suggest to the Prime Minister as being the appropriate one?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the estimate given by the engineers of the River

Murray Commission the studies were to be completed in three months from the time of the original decision of the commission to seek the studies. I shall ask that a date not later than this be fixed for a Ministerial conference.

Mr. Millhouse: When would that make it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give the honourable member the exact time but I am sure that he can do a sum as easily as I can.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the employment of Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electricity Commission engineers on the Chowilla dam project?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have received the following information from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief:

The five engineers were made available in an advisory capacity to the Engineering and Water Supply Department as the constructing authority for the River Murray Commission for the Chowilla project. Their work involved a visit to the dam site and nominated quarry site for aggregate, consultations with Engineering and Water Supply Department engineers, and the preparation of a report covering the design of the dam and tenders received for its construction. Costs incurred in their visit were met out of River Murray Commission construction funds.

FREELING SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on August 29 last about the need for new toilets at the Freeling Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Revised plans for standard toilets to suit the needs of particular types of school have now been completed by the Public Buildings Department, and estimates of cost based on these plans are being prepared. It is considered that a substantial reduction will be effected in the adaptation of these standard plans to the requirements of the Freeling Primary School. The Director of the Public Buildings Department expects to be able to submit the revised scheme to the Education Department for consideration shortly.

GAS

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Premier the detailed report for which I have asked concerning contracts entered into for the transmission of natural gas to the metropolitan area; an estimated unit cost to the consumer; and any agreement relating to royalties (who will receive them and how much will be paid)?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although I cannot at present locate the reply, I point out that the royalties are fixed by Statute: it is a 10 per cent royalty, payable into general revenue. Concerning the arrangements for the pipeline, it is not possible at this stage to indicate definitely the price at which gas will be available to industrial consumers, but I have previously forecast the likely price. Arrangements between the authority and the producers, as well as arrangements by the authority for the pipeline construction, are well in hand, and I shall be making an announcement concerning them within the next couple of days.

WALLAROO HOSPITAL

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I recently asked about additional work to be carried out at the Wallaroo Hospital in respect of accommodation for elderly patients for whom wonderful work is being undertaken?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports that plans and specifications for the verandahs of the geriatric ward have been prepared, and private tenders have been sought for the work involved. Subject to a satisfactory price being received, the department expects shortly to be in a position to make a recommendation for the acceptance of a tender for the work.

NEWTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of last week about the Newton Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Newton Primary School opened in May last year (as the honourable member would know) with an enrolment of 200. It has reached about 450 at the moment, and it is expected to grow to 735 by the middle of 1970. A site has been reserved for the erection of an infants school building, but for the time being timber classrooms will be erected to meet the school's needs. New schools in developing areas are still required and Newton, with its modern 13-classroom solid-construction building and some timber, will be very comfortably housed until it is possible to provide a solid-construction infants building. No indication can be given at present as to when this will occur. Regarding the honourable member's question about the development of the oval at this school, \$500 was made available as an extra subsidy, as I indicated to the honourable member in a previous reply.

PORT PIRIE MAINS

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the replacement of old water mains at Port Pirie?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The mains in the following streets at Port Pirie are to be replaced with 4in. diameter asbestos cement pipes:

| Street | Length of Main ft. |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Dorothy Street | 1,940 |
| First Street | 370 |
| Second Street | 1,090 |
| Third Street | 1,050 |
| Lorna Avenue | 245 |
| Clara Street | 930 |
| Jervis Street | 920 |
| Florence Street | 2,250 |
| David Street | 500 |
| Hardy Street | 1,140 |
| Beach Road | 310 |
| Manders Street | 590 |
| Square Street | 1,260 |
| Warnertown Road | 1,300 |
| Sandery Street | 690 |
| Moorhouse Street | 340 |
| Wright Street | 920 |

THEVENARD HARBOUR

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Marine any information about improvements to the Thevenard harbour? If he has not, will he obtain a report on the matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: At this stage I cannot give the required information, but I am fairly confident that I shall be able to supply some information next week.

WATER RESTRICTIONS

Mr. BROOMHILL: As I have noticed during the last day or two comments in the press about the attitude of the public to the voluntary water savings that have been recommended in this State, can the Minister of Works comment on the situation at this time?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It is difficult to say what the real effect of the savings has been at this stage. However, in spite of the recent warm weather, the water consumption has not been as great as it might have been had the appeal to the public not been made. I am particularly thankful for the part that the radio, press and television have played. Also, the department and I appreciate what school teachers (particularly those in the metropolitan area) have done by going to the trouble of instructing children about the the necessity to save water. This has had a remarkable effect, as the children have told their parents how to save water in relation to turning off taps and watering gardens.

The available water at 23,880,000,000 gallons represents an 8 per cent reduction on the estimated demand over the seven critical months. The gross demand from October, 1966, to April, 1967, was 24,177,000,000 gallons, practically the same as the supply recommended as being available this year (actually 1 per cent more). The metropolitan population has increased by 45,000. Services supplied by the department have increased by 15,779 to 238,121 in the Adelaide Water District. This means the safe supply to Adelaide this coming summer requires a per capita saving on last year's use of 8 per cent, and the coming summer may well be hotter and more prolonged. The basic requirement is an effective and collective reduction of 8 per cent on personal, industrial, commercial and public demand. A certain amount of publicity has already been given to the need to conserve water.

To the householder this requires care in all operations. Some suggestions for saving water are as follows: Gardens and lawns should be watered carefully, with sprinklers never left and forgotten. Garden beds and shrubberies should be mulched. There should be no plantings of summer annuals, and vegetable plots should be kept to the minimum. Cars should be bucket washed. Bathing should not be extravagant; people should never wash under a running tap. Laundry work should be organized not to waste water. Public gardens and sporting clubs should water with care, never allowing water to run away to drains and never overwatering. Industry and commerce should examine their own usage of water and effect savings wherever possible. Automatic sanitary flushing units should be regulated, and turned off over idle periods. With commercial gardens people should exercise every care to use water prudently.

The alternative to co-operation in the scheme is enforced restriction. This would inevitably involve a complete ban on the domestic garden sprinkler, requiring all watering to be done by bucket or a hose held in the hand. It would involve all industrial and commercial users in a quota system at a fixed allocation scale to be determined, but probably 10 per cent below last year's usage. Public bodies, schools and sporting bodies would need to be restricted to a formula, probably based on minimum needs to maintain essential grassed and planted areas.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Minister of Works personally satisfied with the metropolitan consumption of water in the last few days, particularly over the weekend as it was, I under-

stand, higher than consumption over the previous weekend? Also, has he a reply to my recent question about the use of bores and the effect that the hard water from the bores would have on domestic appliances?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In reply to the first question, the department is satisfied with consumption because, although this weekend was warmer than the previous weekend, the consumption was below the figure expected by the department. Of course, we can only make estimates, but we have good reason to believe that the campaign has had the desired results. In reply to the honourable member's second question, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports:

The bores which will be used to supplement the metropolitan water supply system are all located generally to the west of the city. They are included in the area bounded on the north by the Port railway line, on the east by the main south railway line to Keswick then by the Anzac Highway to the South Road and from thence by the South Road to the southern limit of the area which takes in Oaklands Park and Hove. Portions of the following councils and corporations are included in this area: Port Adelaide, Woodville, Enfield, Hindmarsh, Henley and Grange, Thebarton, West Torrens, Glenelg, Brighton and Marion. The area to the west of the city which generally comprises the R.L. 273 zone is an area of considerable demand. It is into this area that the bore water will be delivered but because of the large trunk mains which bring water into and through this area from Happy Valley reservoir, Hope Valley reservoir and from the terminal storage of the Mannum-Adelaide main, the maximum dilution of the bore water will be able to be achieved in this area.

COUNTRY DRAINAGE

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the possibility of a subsidy being paid to country councils that install septic drainage systems?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Director-General of Public Health reports:

The Department of Public Health has planned in detail complete common effluent drain schemes which have been installed in Barmera, Berri, Maitland and Pinnaroo. Surveys have also been completed of Kapunda, Meadows, Mount Barker, Cleve and Cummins. Smaller installations in other towns have been dealt with. No fee has been charged for this service. It has been done as a demonstration of the desirability and practicability of installing such schemes. This has been so successful that numerous other areas have decided to plan and install similar schemes themselves. These include Renmark, Nuriootpa, Clare, Port Elliot, Eudunda, Saddleworth, and parts of Tea Tree Gully. In these cases the department gives advice, and exercises supervision, again without charge.

The South Australian Housing Trust has also installed similar schemes.

It seems open to question that in future some areas should receive a free planning service, and others should pay. The alternatives would be for the Government to pay all planning costs, whether done by private consulting engineers, council engineers, or this department, or for a suitable fee to be charged when planning is done by this department. One difficulty in the latter would be that the work in this department is done by experienced health inspectors and draftsmen, working under medical supervision, and is not done by professional engineers. Departmental officers obtain advice, when necessary, from the staff of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. In considering the question of payment by the Government for planning work, I call attention to the following points:

- (1) Each scheme benefits primarily the people of the town in which it is installed.
- (2) A rate is paid to the local council, and this is in all cases distinctly lower than Engineering and Water Supply Department sewer rates in other areas.
- (3) There is no return to State revenue from these works, though there is a very major saving in State Loan funds as compared with installation of sewers.

In my opinion, on balance there is not a good case for payment by the State of the cost of planning these installations. I believe the department should continue to encourage local authorities to plan their own installations at their own cost, with advice and help as required from this department. The interdepartmental drainage co-ordinating committee advises the Engineer-in-Chief and myself on these schemes, and the committee consults with local authorities on many major schemes. It does not appear to me desirable or practicable for this department to charge local authorities for the advisory services it gives. Future commitments for survey and design by the department should be for areas where some further demonstration of the feasibility of the scheme is needed, or where there is some special or unusual public health problem.

REFLECTOR TAPE

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently several serious accidents have occurred when motor vehicles have hit formidable structures. Reflector tape has been placed in several advantageous positions in the Unley area to help motorists to see obstacles at night. One instance of this is near the St. Vincent dePaul Orphanage in Mitchell Street, Goodwood. As motorists appreciate this safety device, can the Minister of Lands say whether the Minister of Roads intends to proceed with this innovation at dangerous spots in other districts?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to ask my colleague for a report on this matter and to bring it down for the honourable member as soon as possible.

TUNA FISHING

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Last week, at the request of tuna fishermen at Port Lincoln, I asked the Minister of Agriculture to examine as a matter of urgency the factors involved in the limiting of the number of boats to operate for tuna in that area during the forthcoming season. Has he a reply?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have had this matter fully examined. I see some difficulties in the honourable member's suggestion. I can appreciate his concern and also the concern of the fishermen already engaged in the industry. I point out that much assistance has been given by the State Government to this very important industry, and it is important that those people who are committed to the State Bank and other financial institutions are protected. I should like to sound a note of warning to people who are thinking of entering the tuna industry, because it is quite evident that last year there was quite a slackening off in catches in the Port Lincoln area. Therefore, I think that the Government needs to watch this matter closely. If there is any danger of this area being over-fished, as is feared by some fishermen, we may have to take action quickly on the matter. It is also intended that, as soon as the new Director of the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department takes up his appointment (which will be towards the middle of next month) a meeting will be held with the Fisheries Directors of Victoria and Tasmania, and problems and matters of mutual interest will be discussed. I consider that much good can come from these talks in connection with the ironing out of some present problems. It is also apparent that New South Wales will need to be brought into the discussions, and I am sure that this will be arranged.

MARINO ROCKS TRAINS

Mr. HUDSON: About 18 months ago I raised with the Minister of Transport the infrequency of the railway service to Marino Rocks. Most of the trains running from the city on that line terminate at Marino, and Marino Rocks is served by train at only irregular intervals. This creates much inconvenience for residents of Marino Rocks, particularly those living south of the railway station. In response to my previous representations the Minister

promised that further consideration would be given to improving the service to Marino Rocks when the population affected by the poor service was greater. As there has been a significant expansion in the Marino Rocks area in the last 18 months, will the Minister of Social Welfare ask the Minister of Transport to review this service so that it can be improved as soon as possible?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, and I hope that the Railways Commissioner will be able to accede to the request, because I believe in railway transport being made available wherever possible to passenger traffic.

LOTTERIES AGENCIES

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have had brought to my notice the position regarding facilities for the purchase of lotteries tickets at Christies Beach, Christies North and Port Noarlunga. Although lotteries agencies have been established in the Christies North and Port Noarlunga shopping centres, the Christies Beach shopping centre (possibly the busiest centre of the three) has no agency. I understand that the Lotteries Commission, having reconsidered this matter consequent on a request I made by letter to the Premier, has decided to make no change at present. The effect of this decision is that this very busy shopping centre has no facilities for the purchase of lotteries tickets, and many inquiries are being made of most of the trades people, and also of the post office and banks, about where tickets may be purchased. The local chamber of commerce fears that this lack of an agency may substantially change the shopping habits of the people in the district. I do not know whether that factor will affect the Lotteries Commission's consideration, but I am interested in whether the commission will consider the need for the service in the district and the effect of not establishing an agency at Christies Beach. Will the Premier discuss with the commission its attitude regarding the establishment of agencies and ascertain whether the commission will consider the trading needs of a district as well as the commission's own particular needs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall take the matter up with the Lotteries Commission.

NURIOOTPA PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked a few weeks ago about the repairs that the school committee considers are

urgently necessary to the primary school buildings at Nuriootpa?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have been informed that arrangements are already in hand to renew the guttering and downpipes at the Nuriootpa Primary School, and that the work is expected to commence soon. It is proposed to proceed as a matter of priority with the preparation of documents to enable tenders to be called for the general repairs and painting. The date of calling tenders will depend on the availability of funds at the time.

OVERLAND

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply from the Minister of Transport to the question I asked some weeks ago concerning moves by the Railways Department to improve the patronage on the Overland express?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister of Transport states that there was an increase of 4½ per cent in the patronage between Adelaide and Melbourne during the year ended June 30, 1967. The Railways Department has undertaken an advertising campaign in the Adelaide daily and leading country newspapers, to give the public a more complete understanding of the services offered by the South Australian Railways. The campaign is spread over twelve months. The Overland will share in the publicity given to railway operations, not only in the contract arranged by the department but also in that under the banner of "Railways of Australia".

SIREX WASP

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked a fortnight ago about siren wasp in timber?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The infested timber was part of the ship's dunnage, which had been loaded at Montreal, Canada. The ship's master was carrying a certificate of fumigation of the dunnage but, apparently, several large pieces of timber were not effectively treated. The facts of the case have been reported to the Director of Plant Quarantine, Canberra, for follow-up investigations with the Canadian authorities and to notify other States where the vessel will berth. No signs of infestation were detected in the cargo itself so that the holds were fogged progressively during unloading, pieces of dunnage found with emerging wasps were fumigated and burnt, and the remainder of the dunnage was not taken off board.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT

Mr. HALL: An article in the *South-East Times* refers to the action by soldier settlers in zone 5 to have certain aspects of their contracts brought before the court. An extract from the newspaper states:

The settlers had then authorized their committee to take legal action. "We have been battling for three years to have our action brought before the court," Mr. Matthews said. The settlers' legal action was simply one of seeking specific performance of a contract, that is, that the rent should be 2½ per cent of cost or of productive value, whichever was the lower.

I use this extract to bring the matter to the Minister's attention. Can the Minister of Repatriation say whether he is doing everything he can to facilitate the court action so that the matter will be settled? If he is, when is the action expected to be heard?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader is aware that this matter started in 1963 and has been proceeding since then but, because the matter is at present before the court, it is *sub judice*. At no stage have I done anything to delay the court hearing. I believe that legal indecision exists about who should be charged or sued, but these are legal technicalities and difficulties about which, no doubt, the Attorney-General would know more than I know. I have done nothing to delay the case nor do I intend to delay it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand the hearing has now been fixed for October 10 on a preliminary matter concerning whether the plaintiff should have proceeded by writ, as he did, or by petition of right. Will the Attorney-General give an assurance that the Crown intends to contest the action that has been commenced on its merits and not by taking technical points, which I understand it has taken up to this stage, and of which the present application is one?

The SPEAKER: I must rule that question out of order, first of all because it would appear that it relates to a matter that is *sub judice*. I had doubts about the matter when the previous question was asked. Apparently, the matter is before the court and, until I am satisfied that that is not so, I will not allow the question.

PORT BROUGHTON ROAD

Mr. McKEE: Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads how much has been spent on the Port Broughton road, what stage the project has reached, and when it will be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain that information.

MORGAN-WHYALLA MAIN

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the capacity and the use made of the duplicated Morgan-Whyalla main?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has supplied the following details:

The duplicated main from Morgan to Whyalla is now in service and, in particular, the gulf crossing was commissioned on October 21, 1966. The current capacities of the mains supplying Whyalla and Iron Knob are, respectively, 10,000 and 3,200 gallons per minute. The latter figure is, however, restricted to 1,400 gallons per minute by the present pumping equipment on two-pump operation, which is fully adequate to meet demand. The total consumption of Whyalla, including that supplied to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, was 1,097,000,000 gallons for the year ended June 30, 1967, and the total consumption of Iron Knob during the same period was 128,000,000 gallons.

CIGARETTES

Mr. BROOMHILL: During recent weeks, when I have suggested that the nicotine and tar content of Australian cigarettes should be made public, I have referred to the conflicting statements made by various State anti-cancer organizations on this matter. Recently, I asked whether the Minister of Health would consider referring this question to a meeting of State Health Ministers, and I understand that the Minister of Social Welfare now has a reply.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister of Health is prepared, at the next Health Ministers' conference, to raise the matter of making cigarettes safer.

MINIMUM RATING

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about a minimum rate being applied to adjoining blocks in a council area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have received the following report:

The Local Government Act provides that a council may fix a minimum amount, which shall be payable by way of rates on ratable property. This minimum amount is payable where the normal rating is less than that minimum. The Act further provides that where adjoining properties are owned by the same owner and occupied by the same occupier the properties shall be deemed to be one property for the purpose of the payment of the minimum amount. Several cases have occurred in which a number of adjoining blocks are owned

by the same owner, but are not occupied. Because of the definition of "occupier" in the Act, the owner cannot be deemed to be the occupier. The Act requires that an occupier must have "physical" occupation of properties. Accordingly, in these cases, a minimum has been applied to each block, and this appears to be quite legal under the provisions of the Act. The question of occupation of property within the meaning of the Act is one that can be decided only on the facts of each case.

The desirability or otherwise of amending the definition of "occupier" to permit an owner, in certain cases, being deemed the occupier is being considered by the Local Government Act Revision Committee. The Minister of Local Government will consider the suggestion of the honourable member that councils be advised on this matter.

MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: In view of the restriction in the use of Murray River water, can the Minister of Works give the percentages of the total quantities of water allocated to the various States and details of the restrictions being imposed? I understand South Australia's allocation this year is 291,000 acre feet. Has a similar percentage been applied to the other States?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although I do not have the figures at present, I think 480,000 acre feet was to apply in the other States, as against 291,000 acre feet for this State. Rather than guess at the percentage of restrictions, I will obtain a report and let the honourable member have the information tomorrow or Thursday.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: People in my district have discussed with me the matter of taking irrigation water. Can the Minister of Works say whether the salty slug in the Murray River has reached the outskirts of Waikerie? Further, has he information about a fresh water supply passing through the river in order to freshen the river water and, if he has this information, when is this freshening likely to occur?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The slug referred to by the honourable member is not yet that far down the river, although I cannot give its exact location.

Mr. Quirke: It is crawling along.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That is correct, and it is causing concern. We are receiving co-operation from the other States about breaking down the slug with fresh water. I shall obtain the information for the honourable member, because it is of great interest to people in his district.

TRANSPORT STUDY

Mr. COUNBE: Can the Minister of Lands say when the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study is likely to be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study report will be completed soon, and negotiations for its printing have been commenced. However, the printing of such a report will of necessity take several months to complete.

WATER PERMITS

Mr. RODDA: I understood the Minister of Works to say last week that the Government did not intend to deny anyone the use of Murray River water if the person concerned had already made a reasonable investment. Some people in my district have interests on the Murray River, one person having unfortunately been refused a licence altogether (although I must confess that that relates to the upper reaches of the river). However, some of my constituents are affected by restrictions elsewhere. Can the Minister of Works say whether, when this matter is eventually ironed out, the applications for water made by those people who have already made an investment will be considered?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think the honourable member's interpretation of the present situation is a little incorrect: the undertaking given by the Government and the department was to the effect that where a party had been given assurances that water would be available and had, because of such assurances, made commitments, that person would receive some water. The committee is examining that aspect. Regrettably, some people have made considerable investments before obtaining an assurance from the department that water will be available. I fear that we shall not be able to help those people.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This afternoon, and on two or three previous occasions, the Minister has said that water will be available where an assurance has been given. Can the Minister say what authority there is for giving an assurance and which officer has the authority to give an assurance?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Until recently there was no thought of restricting the use of water in the upper reaches of the Murray River. Many people approached the department, either in person or by letter, asking whether it would be all right for them to go ahead with what they intended. On some

occasions, the previous Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the department (Mr. Dridan) stated in writing that it would be all right for them to go ahead. If people have spent money in accordance with those assurances the department will honour its assurances, but I point out that no assurances have been given by the present Director.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Can the Minister of Works say what water licences have been granted and what licences are proposed for diversions from the Murray River?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have received the following report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief:

The recommendations made by the inter-departmental committee on water diversion from the Murray River stated that the acreage under irrigation along the full length of the river in South Australia should preferably not exceed 97,250 but that, with known commitments above Mannum and uncontrolled development below Mannum (before the Act could be extended to this section), this acreage would almost certainly be exceeded. The committee considered that the probable demand that would have to be met was 105,900 acres and that requests for an additional acreage of 10,000 acres along the full length of the river could not be met. The committee has now interviewed all those persons who have holdings above Mannum and who have previously had assurances on the availability of water. The last interview was on Thursday last and the recommendations of the committee are expected to be available shortly (within the next few days). The area involved under review is approximately 7,500 acres and the committee will make recommendations on the portions of this, on which it is considered commitments have been made, due to the previous assurances.

Mr. RODDA: In view of the statement by the Minister of Works that permits would be granted only where commitments had been entered into, could he indicate generally the prospects of settlers in this position and say what action he would consider they ought to take regarding any investments they might have made?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think the honourable member has in mind a specific case about which I have heard something. If that is so, it is one of the cases that have been investigated. Regarding the future, I do not want to make any misleading statement. I would think the prospects were fairly bleak. However, if the honourable member gives me details of any specific case, I shall have it examined.

HILLCREST MENTAL HOSPITAL

Mr. COUMBE: I have been approached by several constituents, who are on the committee at the Hillcrest Mental Hospital (a committee that helps patients in their rehabilitation and welfare), expressing concern about the lack of provision for a chapel at that hospital. Although I understand that a chapel was promised some time ago, I point out that nothing has materialized and that, in addition, nothing lavish is required, for a modest building would suffice. Will the Minister of Social Welfare ascertain from the Chief Secretary whether a chapel might be erected that would, I imagine, greatly help patients in this type of institution?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take up the matter with my colleague.

UNLEY POLICE STATION

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about repaving the yard of the Unley police station?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports:

Following the survey of the yard, which was undertaken early in August, 1967, consideration was given to the most expedient manner in which to undertake the work. Because of the heavy programme for this type of work being undertaken by departmental labour, it was decided to prepare detailed documents to enable public tenders to be called for the work. The preparation of tender documents has now been completed and tenders will be called this week with a closing date of October 17, 1967. Subject to a satisfactory tender being received, every effort will be made to have the work completed at the earliest possible date.

POULTRY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about assistance for the South Australian Poultry Marketing Co-operative?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I do not have a full reply for the honourable member as yet because I have referred the matter to the Treasurer for consideration. As I have said previously, I saw representatives of this organization and made representations on their behalf for consideration under the industries assistance provisions. They followed this course for some time. Following the honourable member's question last Thursday, I spoke to one of the directors of the co-operative, who told me that she did not know of any of the directors having approached the honourable member regarding financial assistance. In fact, she said that at that time she believed

that there was some improvement in the situation, that changes had been made, and that it was expected that some payments would be made to producers, even this week. However, she pointed out that the co-operative would appreciate assistance, and this matter has been referred to the Treasurer. The co-operative appreciated the fact that it had had an opportunity to speak to me again on the matter. Although it had not intended to raise the matter, now that it has been raised the co-operative intends to follow it up.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES

Mr. HALL: In last Thursday's *News* (and I think a report on the same subject appeared in the following day's *Advertiser*) an article dealing with Parliamentary salaries attributed the following comments to Mr. Justice Travers:

I wrote back, saying we might be entitled to continue because we had adjourned and not concluded our inquiry, notwithstanding that the Treasurer did not want us. We received no reply. I wrote again saying our job was unfinished. We have had no acknowledgment nor a reply to this letter.

I can understand the Premier's reluctance to have this matter aired before the next State election. The report continues:

Mr. Dunstan said today private members of Parliament were canvassed for their views on whether the tribunal should sit.

Without expressing any opinion whether or not the tribunal should sit, I ask the Premier which members were canvassed by him before he made the statement to which I have referred.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I canvassed all members on this side and intended to speak to the Leader of the Opposition about the matter. The letter I received from Mr. Justice Travers did not ask for an immediate reply but simply pointed out that, if the tribunal were not to continue an adjourned inquiry at this stage, he believed that all members should be informed. I intended to bring that letter to the notice of the Leader and to inform him of the position. If the Leader and all other members on his side believe that at this stage it is desirable to proceed with this inquiry, I shall certainly be happy to convey their views to the tribunal and to have the inquiry proceed.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The Leader would like to know which members were canvassed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have told him. I was asked for a statement by a newspaper reporter to whom the Chairman of the tribunal had gone instead of speaking to me.

Mr. Millhouse: He had written to you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The telephone is as available in my office as it is in the office of a newspaper reporter. I have never known a chairman of a tribunal or a judge of a court to proceed to make his tribunal as much a matter of public controversy as this judge has seen fit to do. I rather wonder what are his motives. I have made it clear to members opposite that I am happy to let them have the correspondence in this matter. If they believe that at this stage the tribunal should proceed with an application for additional fixation in relation to members' salaries and allowances it is open to them to say so, in which case I will refer the matter to the tribunal.

Mr. HALL: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HALL: Following the strong inference in last Thursday's edition of the *News*, that members of the Opposition must have been included in the general reference to members who had been canvassed regarding the salaries tribunal, I want it clearly understood that neither I nor any other member of my Party was canvassed as to whether the tribunal should sit to consider the matters it wished to consider. If we had been canvassed we might well have come to the same decision as the Premier has already made, although we would have arrived at it for different reasons; not for election reasons, but for reasons bound up with South Australia's economic situation. Basically the question the Premier tried this afternoon to impute to members on this side was whether he had extended the courtesy of canvassing our side of the House. It has been clearly established that he did not extend that courtesy.

PENOLA HOUSING

Mr. RODDA: At the weekend, in Penola, I had brought to my notice the immediate need for further housing in that area. However, no new houses for Penola are listed in the Estimates. People currently employed in Penola and living at Nangwarry are suffering a disadvantage in that they must find their own transport. Therefore, will the Premier, in his capacity as Minister in charge of housing, see whether something cannot be done about the matter, if not currently then soon?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

WHEAT

Mr. McANANEY: The *Financial Review* forecasts this year's South Australian wheat harvest as 25,000,000 to 30,000,000 bushels.

As this seems optimistic, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether his department has made any assessment as yet?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member will appreciate that these are only estimates and that a man's estimates are his own. Of course, circumstances can vary according to seasonal conditions. I have always noted that Mr. Pearson (a recognized authority on estimates of grain yields) when making statements at this time of the year usually says, "Provided certain conditions continue, it is expected . . .". I did not read the article referred to by the honourable member, but I think the writer would have been wise had he used that proviso.

HACKHAM SEWERAGE

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On August 29 the Minister of Works, replying to a question I asked about South Coast sewerage facilities and the sewage treatment works at Hackham, gave the priorities involved. However, it was not clear from his statement whether Hackham would be included in the Morphett Vale area. Will the Minister therefore say what is to be done about the Hackham area? This area is experiencing difficult sewerage problems at present because it has an impervious layer of soil just below the surface and houses at present fitted with septic tanks are being flooded from higher areas, which causes most offensive conditions. As the old school is involved and as many houses are seriously affected, will the Minister obtain a report?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am sorry that the previous answer was not clear. As I appreciate the difficulties that the people in the Hackham area are experiencing, I will obtain a report and let the honourable member have it. Because of the circumstances outlined, I hope that Hackham comes within the area referred to.

HILLS STATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to the question I asked last week about the erection of a railway station on the hills line between Coromandel and Eden Hills stations?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister of Transport states that in recent years requests have been received by the South Australian Railways Department for the construction of a railway station between Eden Hills and Coromandel, not only from the Mitcham Hills Swimming Pool Committee but also from the Corporation of the City of Mitcham and a

business organization interested in land subdivision in the vicinity. Residential development in this area has been kept under periodical scrutiny but even at this point of time it is not considered that the potential patronage is such as to justify the expense involved in the construction of the station. However, the matter will continue to be borne in mind. With regard to the swimming centre, it is not considered that it would generate enough railway business to warrant the provision of a station.

KEITH AREA SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: For about three years there have been plans and proposals for an extensive drainage scheme for the Keith Area School. This matter was inquired into by consultant engineers and an elaborate plan prepared. However, it was pointed out to me during recent discussions with the staff of the school that all the existing drainage bores in the schoolground are functioning effectively, except the bore that drains the paved area immediately in the front of the school. As the Mines Department now has equipment and a geologist in the Keith township area, and also because a drainage bore may meet the requirements of the school and obviate the necessity for the elaborate drainage system proposed, will the Minister of Works have this matter considered now, as this seems to be an opportune time?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I thank the honourable member for his suggestion. As I agree that the time may be opportune, I shall have the matter investigated.

PORT LINCOLN ROAD

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question about a road at Port Lincoln?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads states that negotiations with the South Australian Railways Department and other landowners regarding the alignment of the new West Road near the freezers at Port Lincoln have proved more protracted than was expected. Although progress is being made, it is doubtful whether the matter will be resolved prior to the start of the grain-carting season.

LAND SUBDIVISIONS

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question about the according of priority of application for subdivision to applicants whose applications were refused in the

interim period between the repeal of the Town Planning Act and the proclamation of the Planning and Development Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Local Government states that in the particular case of land subdivision referred to, the Attorney-General, as Minister administering the Town Planning Act, decided under section 12a (2) not to consent to the application. This action precluded the Town Planner from exercising a right or power to refuse or not to refuse. As the Town Planner was unable to make any decision in the matter, no appeal lies under section 13 of the Town Planning Act. Although no right of appeal exists the subdividers can make further application under the Planning and Development Act.

VICTORIA SQUARE BUS STOP

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply from the Minister of Transport to the question I asked the week before last about a bus stop at the Angas Street depot of the Municipal Tramways Trust?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister of Transport states that there is no bus zone near the trust's Angas Street depot where passengers could alight from buses returning to the depot. Passengers cannot be set down with safety inside the depot premises because of the presence of inspection pits and servicing equipment. The trust has written to Adelaide City Council asking that a bus zone be established in the eastern roadway of Victoria Square just north of Angas Street, and if this request is granted passengers will be able to continue their journey to that point.

LUCINDALE COTTAGES

Mr. RODDA: Two railway cottages are situated in the main street of Lucindale. As the matter of their removal has been raised not only with this Government but also with the previous Government, will the Minister of Lands ask his colleague whether these cottages can be removed by the council to a more suitable site, at the council's expense?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This matter has not been brought to my attention before. Are the cottages suitable for occupation?

Mr. Rodda: They are being lived in.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I understand that the council wishes to move them to a more suitable site to be made available free of charge by the council. If that is the case, this is a matter for the Minister of Transport to consider, and I shall refer the

question to the Minister of Social Welfare and ask him to obtain a reply from the Minister of Transport.

EFFLUENT FOR IRRIGATION

Mr. McANANEY: As some weeks ago the Minister of Works told me that he was negotiating with people to use effluent from the Bolivar treatment works for irrigation, can he say whether any of the negotiations were successful?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The department is in the process of negotiating an agreement with one person and expects to negotiate further agreements soon.

POLICE FORCE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the present strength of the Police Force?

2. Is this considered satisfactory?

3. If not, what strength would be so considered?

4. What steps are being taken to bring the Police Force to such strength?

5. What was the strength at June 30 in each of the years 1964, 1965, 1966 and 1967 respectively?

6. Has there been any change in the last two years in the strength considered satisfactory?

7. If so, what has caused this?

8. How many police cadets are at present in training?

9. What is the length of the training course?

10. How many cadets have graduated to probationary constable rank in each of the years 1965 and 1966 and in 1967 so far?

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

1. 1,693 (at September 25, 1967).

2. The Government considers it is desirable to enlarge the force.

3. A figure something over 2,000.

4. There is an active recruiting campaign, and 105 cadets will become probationary constables during 1967-68.

5. Active strength at June 30, 1964, was 1,496; in 1965 it was 1,558; in 1966, 1,595; and in 1967, 1,660.

6. Yes.

7. (a) The awarding of an additional one week's annual leave to all police personnel.

(b) The advent of National Service training.

(c) The requirement for additional police at Holden Hill, Darlington, Port

Pirie, Port Augusta, Mount Gambier, Elizabeth, Whyalla, the upper river areas, and several small places such as Coober Pedy and Andamooka.

(d) Additional duties required to be performed by police officers through increased numbers of learner-drivers' tests, court orderlies, summonses served personally, and other extraneous duties.

(e) The general increase in population in the metropolitan area.

8. 354.

9. The cadet training course is of three years' duration.

10. The number of cadets graduated to probationary constable rank for the year ended June 30, 1965, was 103; for June 30, 1966, it was 85; for June 30, 1967, it was 118; and from July 1, 1967, to September 25, 1967, it was 27.

MEDICAL SCHOOL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many students who were properly matriculated applied for admission to the Medical School of the University of Adelaide, in each of the years from 1960 to 1967 inclusive?

2. How many of such students were accepted for such admission in each of these years?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The replies are as follows:

1. Local applicants qualified to matriculate for admission to the Medical School of the University of Adelaide in the years 1962 to 1967 were as follows: 1962, 126; 1963, 145; 1964, 179; 1965, 235; 1966, 219; 1967, 213.

2. The numbers accepted for admission in each of these years were as follows:

| Year | Local | Overseas | Tasmanian |
|------|-------|----------|-----------|
| 1962 | 108 | 10 | 2 |
| 1963 | 105 | 7 | 3 |
| 1964 | 108 | 9 | 3 |
| 1965 | 110 | 8 | 2 |
| 1966 | 114 | 6 | — |
| 1967 | 116 | 5 | — |

The number of local applicants offered admission but who refused were as follow: 1962, 16; 1963, 22; 1964, 7; 1965, 8; 1966, 2; 1967, 4.

The quota in each of these years was 120. In 1960 and 1961 there was no quota on the admission of local candidates; all local candidates qualified for matriculation were admitted. The date for enrolment for the medical course in 1965 was February 22 and the quota established in the time of the Playford Government was applicable to these enrolments. Of 235

local applicants, 110 were accepted and 125 rejected. The Premier's statement that under the Playford Government a situation had arisen where more than half the local applicants for the medical course were turned away was, therefore, completely correct.

MILLICENT SEWERAGE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Millicent Sewerage System.

Ordered that report be printed.

LICENSING BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

(Continued from September 21. Page 2136.)
Amendment No. 58.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Last Thursday I moved to amend the Legislative Council's amendment by striking out "a visitor in the presence and at the expense of a member" in subclause (1) and inserting "visitors under and in accordance with subsection (1a1) of this section".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

After subclause (1a) to insert the following subclause:

(1a1) A permit under this section shall be granted upon condition that liquor shall not be supplied to a visitor except in the presence and at the expense of a member and that a member shall not introduce more than one visitor to the club on any one day during the period within which liquor may be supplied under the permit.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): As I believe that a member of a club may occasionally wish to bring more than one visitor to the premises, will the Premier explain the purpose of this limitation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Our purpose was to ensure that the existing provision was not just a means of the public's gaining access to liquor trading outside normal liquor trading hours, the original intention being to limit the provision to *bona fide* club members. A limitation of one visitor to one member seems pretty reasonable to me. If the Leader suggests that the provision be wide open and that a whole series of visitors to clubs be permitted, no control whatever will exist. Our purpose was to keep existing illegal activities at their present stage and not to allow them to increase by permitting anybody to enter clubs (and

that would be the case under the amendment made by the Legislative Council).

Mr. HALL: The Committee would be kidding itself if it thought this amendment could be policed.

Mr. Hudson: The clubs will police it themselves.

Mr. HALL: I can imagine club members saying to their friends, "I can bring only one of you"! The amendment is unworkable.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A provision already exists imposing a restriction on membership. A person other than a member must have some relationship to the activities of the club, and there must be a restriction on membership. I am merely pointing out that I am prepared to go a small distance in compromising with the Legislative Council in an endeavour to cope with a specific case, which was raised and which led to the amendment here. Either we restrict the provision to members (and the court has to be satisfied as to restrictions on membership in granting these permits under the rules of the club), or we allow a member to have one visitor. This activity will be policed simply by a policeman checking permits occasionally, as is the case at present. Where it is found that the permit is breached, an offence will have been committed, and there will be a prosecution.

Mr. SHANNON: I think there is justification for a limitation in this matter, but the Premier's amendment is unworkable in the sense that it will be difficult to prove that a member brings only one visitor to a club on any one day. A member accompanied by a visitor would have to be asked, "Have you had a visitor previously today?" or "Will you have another visitor later today?" The onus will be on a policeman to decide whether or not a club member has broken the rule. I should be happy if the provision related only to one visitor to one member. However, I believe it would be difficult to police the provision restricting a member to one visitor a day.

Mr. McANANEY: At many small country bowling clubs a member will take his wife, who is not a member, to have afternoon tea. If that member also had a visitor to the club, either the visitor or his wife could not have a drink. Will the Premier consider providing for a member's spouse?

Mr. HEASLIP: When interstate bowling tournaments are held, in other States a person watching the tournaments may have a drink. However, this will not be possible in South

Australia. If I met the Premier and the Minister of Works at the bowls, I could invite only the Premier to have a drink.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Most bowling clubs that have regular drinking facilities will apply for an additional licence and not merely for permits. The permits under clause 66 would apply to times when people were playing on the links outside the normal trading hours of additional licensed clubs. In those circumstances (which would be on Sundays), at those clubs that see fit to play, I should not have thought it difficult to find another member who would invite the Minister of Works to have a drink.

Amendment carried.

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

In subclause (1b) (a) after "storekeeper's licence" to insert "licensed in respect of premises in the vicinity of the club premises". This and my next amendment are to restore the provision in relation to restrictions on purchase to the form in which it left this place. However, it will be subject to a further amendment to allow a choice of purchase from a licensee so that the restriction upon purchase in the vicinity will not be so restrictive as to confine it to one licensee. It will be required of the court that it allow a reasonable choice of licensee from whom to purchase.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (1b) to insert the following new paragraph:

(a1) from the holder of a full publican's licence or a retail storekeeper's licence, if the club has purchased supplies of liquor from that person prior to the first day of August, 1967.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (1b) (b) after "paragraph (a)" to insert "or (a1)"; and after "complied with" to insert "or if the limitation of the permit pursuant to paragraph (a) and (a1) of this subsection would prevent a reasonable choice of licensee from whom to make purchases."

Mr. SHANNON: It may be difficult to define what is a reasonable choice. In certain circumstances, a club may not purchase from the licensee in its town but from the licensee in an adjoining town because the latter licensee belongs to the club. However, the premises of the latter licensee may be four or five miles from the club.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot guarantee that it means someone some distance away who happens to be a supporter of the club. It says, "You shall not be confined to one licensee with whom you may have a

disagreement." The restriction to purchase from the vicinity does not apply if it means there is not a reasonable choice of licensee from whom to buy. If there are two licensees in one village and there is a reasonable opportunity to play one off against the other the court would probably say, "You should buy from the people in the area whose trade you will affect by having your licence." The basis of the Royal Commission's proposals about additional licences is that the objection of a local licensee to a club's getting a licence without a local option can be overcome by saying, "All right, the club shall buy from him." Here we are stipulating the limitation: "If it means that a club may be in difficulty because it must buy from a licensee whom it does not like or who will not give it service, the court will not apply the limitation, and there shall be freedom of choice." At the same time it retains the general rule that the club should satisfy the objection of someone whose trade may be adversely affected by its getting a licence.

Mr. SHANNON: It appears to me from the trade's point of view that there should be no complaint if a club elects to buy from a licensee in a neighbouring town, especially if that licensee not only supports them but makes valuable donations to the club.

Amendments carried; Legislative Council's amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 59 to 65.

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

That amendments Nos. 59 to 65 be agreed to.

These are largely drafting amendments.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 66.

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

That amendment No. 66 be agreed to.

I do so with reluctance. While some matters in the amendment are proper, I am not at all happy about existing registered clubs selling liquor in quantity to members for consumption off the premises, which would be the effect of this amendment. I understand, however, there is much support for this practice, so I shall not press my view.

Mr. HALL: This is an important amendment. Clubs that previously obtained their rights by local option polls were not restricted in the quantities of liquor they could sell to their members. The Bill legalizes many practices which in the past have been illegal and I cannot see why we should try to take from these properly constituted clubs the right to sell liquor in greater quantities than in half-

gallon containers. The Legislative Council's amendment is proper.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I also support the amendment, as such clubs as the Eudunda and Cadell clubs would be in financial difficulties if not allowed to retain this privilege, which they have enjoyed for many years. A perusal of their balance-sheets shows that their off-club sales amount to at least half their gross liquor income. I am pleased that the Legislative Council has seen fit to ensure that their rights are preserved.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 67 to 70.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That amendments Nos. 67 to 70 be agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 71.

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

That amendment No. 71 be disagreed to.

It restricts the rights of membership of a club, although there is no definition of what is or what is not full membership of a club. As the amendment stands it will be unworkable and meaningless. There is no limitation whatever in the Bill on the rights of people who are not full members but are members in some other way. Therefore, as it stands, the amendment is pointless and will only be harmful in the Bill.

Amendment disagreed to.

Amendments Nos. 72 to 87.

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

That amendments Nos. 72 to 87 be agreed to.

These are mostly consequential. There is a consequential amendment in the clause relating to barmaids, but it retains the effect of the section as it left this place. I am pleased to say that I understand that an application for a consent award pursuant to this provision will be made to the Industrial Commission, and it is expected that it will be dealt with so as to come into force next Monday.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 88.

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

That amendment No. 88 be agreed to.

This amendment was worked out in conjunction with wide sections of the liquor industry for the fixation of minimum prices without restriction on the power of the Minister to fix maximum prices generally within the provisions of the Prices Act. The minimum price structure adopted by the industry is given some support here. However, the Minister can intervene and has to approve the minimum

price structure as it is fixed. This was worked out over some period after consultations by the Australian Hotels Association, other liquor interests, and myself. In consequence, there is general agreement.

Mr. HALL: The Opposition's objections to the clause that was before us were not successful, and the provision has come back in amended form. I understand that the members of the Legislative Council who were dealing with the matter came to some sort of understanding with the liquor industry that there would be a move to institute a common price for liquor throughout South Australia. This is an important move. We have had a series of prices in areas close to the metropolitan area and a bottle of beer costs 5c more in the South-East than it does in Adelaide.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You are talking about minimum prices, surely?

Mr. Quirke: Are you referring to zone prices?

Mr. HALL: Yes.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Those are maximum prices and are not affected by this amendment.

Mr. HALL: I understand that the members of the Legislative Council, in making this amendment, have conferred with the liquor industry and have been assured that the industry will move for a one-price structure.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I do not know of any assurance on that.

Mr. HALL: Apparently the Premier has not been able to gain the assurance that the Legislative Council has had.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support what the Leader has said. I think all members, including the Premier, know that the industry is prepared to move towards a common price throughout the State, and this is a great advance. I do not like price control on any product, because I consider it unjust and a waste of time. However, I think we could all be appreciative of the work done by the Legislative Council on this clause and generally on the Bill. The Premier on Thursday mentioned the useful amendments that have been made by the Legislative Council, and that was a remarkable acknowledgment from one such as him. We can also be appreciative of what has been done by the industry, which has problems about a common price. One problem arises when a person purchases a lease of a public house and in so doing relies upon a differential price. If the differential is changed, the value of the lease is changed, too. It is a matter of moving slowly and steadily towards uniform prices.

If the Legislative Council had not intervened, I doubt that we would have got to the general understanding that this is the intention of the industry.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am surprised at what the Leader has said, because this amendment merely makes a condition that, instead of minimum prices being fixed by the Minister, there is to be a certain structure in minimum prices with the consent of the Minister, provided that the Minister may intervene. Otherwise the amendment is, in effect, as the provision left this House. As a matter of fact, I had much to do with the drafting of the amendment.

Mr. Millhouse: That makes one suspicious of it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that: the honourable member is always suspicious. For the Leader to say that thereby certain practical things will obtain in South Australia, namely, that there will be one maximum price, seems strange. Maximum price is not referred to at all, except for the provision of a power for the Minister to fix maximum prices throughout South Australia. The statement that this was an achievement of the Legislative Council was strange in view of the fact that I had been in consultation with members of another place and was responsible for drafting an amendment that was acceptable to the Government, as distinct from the measures that originally came forward. Information given to me since the Leader has spoken is that there is no such assurance as he has mentioned. I understand that certain areas of the industry, not all sections, have indicated that they are willing to work towards one price at some stage. I hope we can achieve this, and I assure the Leader that the existence of the provision retaining the right of the Minister ultimately to fix maximum and minimum prices will have a salutary effect on the achievement of what he has said is desirable. However, I think that the assurances that may have been given elsewhere may have been exaggerated.

Mr. HALL: I am pleased that the Premier confirmed what I said, and that from the recent information given to him he now understands there is to be a move towards one price in South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is a matter of a maximum selling price.

Mr. HALL: I hope that the Premier's reference to the Price Commissioner is not a threat that he will retain the differential, and

that, in fact, he will co-operate in the move to be made.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I shall do more than co-operate.

Mr. BURDON: Whatever the intention, I support this aspect, particularly if it reduces the overall price of liquor to the consumer in the South-East and does away with the present differential. The person living in the country should not be penalized, and anything that can be done to reduce the price of bottled beer has my support.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 89 and 90.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That amendments Nos. 89 and 90 be agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has considered the Legislative Council's amendments referred to it, and agreed to amendments Nos. 1 to 20, 22 to 26, 28 to 45, 48 to 52, 55 to 57, 59 to 70, and 72 to 90, without amendment; has agreed to amendments Nos. 21 and 58 with amendments; has disagreed to amendment No 27 and has amended it; and has disagreed to amendments Nos. 46, 47, 53, 54 and 71.

The following reasons for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments were adopted:

As to amendment No. 27, because to allow additional club licences to purchase other than from those whose licensed trade will be affected by the existence of the club will certainly adversely affect the granting of these licences, since the objections of licensees could not then be overcome.

As to amendments Nos. 46 and 47, and 53 and 54, because it is impossible adequately to define "recognized youth centre".

As to amendment No. 71, because the amendment is unworkable, and no rules differentiating full membership from other forms of membership are set forth, nor can they reasonably be framed in relation to this clause.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the amendments made by the House of Assembly to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 21 and 58, without amendment; that it did not insist on its amendment No. 27, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed; that it had agreed to the amendment made by the House of Assembly to the words reinstated in clause 27 by the said disagreement, without amendment; that it did not insist on its amendments Nos. 46, 47, 53 and 54, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed; but that it insisted on its amendment No. 71.

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

That the disagreement to amendment No. 71 of the Legislative Council be not insisted on. Although I am not happy about the drafting of this amendment, which was designed to cater for the situation in a particular club not coming within the exception of athletic clubs, which are not required to have all members of 21 years of age or over, I understand there is a certain cultural association of long standing and with a large membership that would want to come within this category. It was thought by the mover of this amendment that this form of amendment would cover the situation. I am not entirely satisfied that it does so effectively, but I do not think it does any harm. In order to get agreement, I suggest that we do not insist upon this disagreement.

Motion carried.

THE ESTIMATES

(Continued from September 20. Page 2098.)

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I refer to a matter of great urgency in South Australia and in Australia, that is, the possible use of the drug lysergic acid diethylamide (L.S.D.). For several reasons it is important to South Australians and to the present Administration that this matter should be discussed. Reports have appeared in international journals for some years of the increasing use of this drug in the community, and in the last few weeks we have become accustomed to an increasing reference to it in our newspapers. One important factor that has made us realize how the use of this drug affects people is a report published in the *Advertiser* of September 4, about the time a reporter spent at a party in North Adelaide at which L.S.D. was used. The report states:

On Saturday night I was invited to a house at North Adelaide to sit in on an L.S.D. party—euphemistically called a "take-a-trip" party. It continues:

There were about six people in the room and four more arrived later. They ranged in age from 16 (a girl) to about 30, and in occupation from student to housewife.

The report describes the behaviour in the room and the condition of people who had taken L.S.D., and it continues:

Our conversation was interrupted at that point by a wild scream from the pregnant

woman. Her "trip" had begun. She sat cross-legged on the floor, arms akimbo, and moaned softly to herself, saliva running slowly down her chin.

"She's always like that—she thinks she's a baby," said "Bob".

A reliable report on the effects of the unauthorized use of L.S.D. appears in the United States magazine, the *Saturday Evening Post* of August 12, 1967, headed, "The hidden evils of L.S.D.: New research finds it's causing genetic damage that poses a threat of havoc now and appalling abnormalities for generations yet unborn." The report lists a number of case histories, as follows:

In Oregon, a young mother brought her newborn baby in to be examined. The child had a defect of the intestinal tract and its head was developing grotesquely—one side growing at a much faster rate than the other.

A mental patient in New York and six young men in Oregon were found to have extensive damage of their heritage-carrying chromosomes—damage of the type that is known to result in misshapen and defective babies.

Two of the young men in Oregon also were found to have a chromosomal abnormality that seems to be identical with the first stages of leukemia, the incurable blood cancer that proliferated at Hiroshima after the bomb fell.

A graduate student in Los Angeles has twice undergone typical epileptic *grand mal* convulsions—one time with seizures so violent that he broke two vertebrae.

The young mother, the mental patient in New York, the young men in Oregon and the graduate student—along with several thousands of new mental-hospital inmates—all have one thing in common. They all took L.S.D.

The article, which is a horrifying indictment against the illegal use of L.S.D., continues:

The staggering implications of the evidence gathered so far have added an enormous dimension to L.S.D., which already means different things to different people. To the chemist, the letters stand for lysergic acid diethylamide, the formal name for the powerful mind-altering drug, the manufacture and sale of which are now illegal in the United States. To the hippie, L.S.D. is "acid," "the chief," "the hawk," a droplet of which can take him on a mental "trip" in which he thinks he will experience instant euphoria. To Dr. Timothy Leary, the unfrocked Harvard professor who is high priest of the estimated 4,000,000 users in the United States, L.S.D. stands for League of Spiritual Discovery, a new religion he has founded, which uses the drug as a "sacrament". But to the medical scientists now studying the effects of L.S.D. on the human body, the three letters invoke a threat of deadly damage now and appalling defects for generations yet unborn.

The report, having referred to an estimated 4,000,000 users of L.S.D. in the United States, continues:

The new research, begun only this year, is unfolding one horror after another before it is even out of the preliminary stages. The Oregon cases evolved at the University of Oregon Medical School, Portland, where eight young men, L.S.D. takers, volunteered blood samples for microscopic studies. Six of the eight were found to have damaged—broken—chromosomes. And two of the six—the two who were by far the heaviest users of L.S.D.—have the chromosomal abnormality that seems to be identical to one seen only in the first irreversible stages of leukemia. This form of leukemia is so rare that if the abnormality had shown up in only one of the volunteers, it might have been considered a coincidence. But when it showed up in two, the drug became the prime suspect.

Dr. William A. Frosch of the New York University Medical Centre reports that more than 200 patients a year are being admitted to the Bellevue Hospital psychiatric wards, suffering various grades of L.S.D.-induced paranoia and schizophrenia. "Some cases are so bad," says Dr. Frosch, "that we have had to transfer them to State mental hospitals, and the patients are still committed there after more than a year."

The report, emphasizing the dangers of L.S.D. to the American community (dangers that obviously exist to a certain degree in the Australian community) then refers to a girl who had taken L.S.D.:

Yvonne was a patient at the Neuro-psychiatric Institute for two and a half months. She was treated with heavy doses of the powerful tranquilizer, chlorpromazine, and was given daily psychotherapy until the nightmare subsided. When I saw her nearly two years later, she had not taken any more L.S.D. (the two doses that precipitated her psychosis were the only ones she ever had), but she was still trembling and still unable to work—

that is, two years after her last dose of the drug—

Few drugs have begun with greater promise than L.S.D. It was first synthesized in 1938 by Dr. Albert Hofmann, a Swiss chemist who was looking for a new drug with which to treat migraine headache. He ran a series of tests with various derivatives of lysergic acid, a component of ergot, a fungus that grows on rye. On the 25th try, he came up with the chemical combination that has now become famous as L.S.D. For 20 years L.S.D. remained relatively unknown to the general public, although it was being used here and there. In the late 1950's, for example—

a prominent U.S. movie star who, with a doctor, experimented with L.S.D., wrote glowingly about the drug. The report continues:

Then in 1962, Dr. Timothy Leary and his colleague in the Harvard psychology department, Richard Alpert, latched on to the drug. They had originally started experiments with the "mind-expanding" chemical psilocybin, a substance derived from Mexican mushrooms, which primitive Indian tribes had used as hallucinogens. But Leary and Albert soon

switched to the far more potent L.S.D. When they were fired from Harvard for holding candlelight drug parties for students, Leary and Albert embarked on a crusade to spread the word about L.S.D. through hippie colonies and a series of private organizations, the latest of which is the League of Spiritual Discovery.

As a result of their studies the University of California at Los Angeles experts also believe that even carefully controlled scientific experiments with L.S.D. are dangerous. Dr. Ungerleider told me of a young psychologist who was screened carefully for mental stability and who was given only small doses of the drug in a federally licensed hospital experiment. One day the psychologist was found sitting in his underwear in the electroencephalograph room of the hospital, in a stupor, staring at the brain-wave machine. He was treated with tranquilizers. But when he recovered he left his job and joined a beatnik colony. Today the number of Government-supported research programmes using L.S.D. on humans has dwindled to five. There are about 50 other approved projects, many of them investigating the possibilities of L.S.D. damage to the body and to the unborn. "In fact," says the National Institute of Mental Health's Dr. Cole, "we're so concerned about what's been turned up so far that we're encouraging new research in this area."

In the first of a projected new series of Government-sponsored animal studies to determine the effect of L.S.D. on heredity, Dr. Robert Auerbach and James Rugowski at the University of Wisconsin gave minute quantities of L.S.D. to pregnant mice. Dr. Auerbach told me, "We got horrible malformations and brain defects in virtually all of the baby mice—so horrible, in fact, that we're running the entire experiment all over again, to be sure we haven't made a mistake." While the world of science is expressing deepest concern over the new findings on L.S.D. the world of the acid-heads, apparently, couldn't care less. It simply moves on to bigger and better hallucinogenic drugs. Recently, for example, a new hallucinogen called S.T.P. by the hippies (after the powerful oil additive for automobiles), turned up in great quantities on the West Coast. In a two-week period dozens of victims showed up in Californian hospitals suffering the effects of S.T.P. which is perhaps four times more virulent than L.S.D. One of the patients nearly died. He had taken chlorpromazine, normally an antidote for L.S.D. However, chlorpromazine actually intensifies the reaction to S.T.P. and can cause respiratory paralysis, convulsions and possibly death. Drug experts have identified S.T.P. as a combat weapon designed to incapacitate enemy soldiers, developed for the army under the label JB 314.

The article contains much more information that is far more horrifying than the information I have read to honourable members. However, I believe the excerpts I have read prove that the latest unfinished research by American experts has shown that L.S.D. is indeed a dangerous drug. Not only can this drug derange the mind but it can break the chain

of chromosomes and cause deformations in the unborn. The article estimates that in America there could be 4,000,000 users of L.S.D. and that many of those people would certainly suffer mental and bodily damage as a result of the drug. The article refers to an even more potent hallucinogen that is estimated to be four times as strong as L.S.D. It is this sort of progression that has alarmed the Australian community. The number of drug users is growing all the time and now an even stronger drug has been discovered. Both L.S.D. and the other drug could cause immense harm to the community and to those as yet unborn. The front page of today's *News* states that four people have been held as a result of a drug raid. I have not had time to read the article.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It does not do much for your argument.

Mr. HALL: I do not know why the Treasurer is trying to deride my argument. As I could not offer proof about the danger of L.S.D., I have quoted a report of experts. The *Advertiser* of September 4 contained an article which showed that people are taking this drug in South Australia. The Treasurer has promised to bring down some sort of report on the matter. So far, he has said that in his opinion the State has the necessary powers to deal with the matter.

Mr. Hurst: Read the report in the *News*.

Mr. HALL: If the Government has taken some action on the matter, then I am pleased; members on this side have been asking for action for some weeks. The Treasurer said that power existed to prevent the use of L.S.D. outside psychiatric hospitals. However, I have spoken today to draw urgent attention to the matter. The article in today's *News*, drawing attention to further illegal use of the drug in another State, emphasizes the need for the Government to take action so that people may be prevented from perhaps trying this drug for a thrill. From the report I have read it can be seen that one dose of the drug can do irreparable harm to the mental and bodily health of certain types of people. I urge the Government to take the action necessary to ensure that the State has power to combat the entry, sale, manufacture and use of L.S.D. and any other associated drugs for any purpose other than properly controlled psychiatric treatment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I entirely support what has been said by the Leader on this matter. When it was last discussed last week, I said that to me drugging was one of

the most repellant malpractices imaginable and that I could not understand the Treasurer's attitude on the matter. I wonder whether it is the attitude of all his colleagues.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You are being stupid again.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suspect it is the attitude of the Minister of Lands because of the way in which he sneered at me on that occasion. I hope it is not the attitude of all members opposite because this, to me, is a matter of the utmost gravity. It is something that I should have hoped was beyond Party politics. I should have hoped that the Government would be prepared to take some positive action before the end of the session. Last week, when the Treasurer was asked about the matter, he said (and this was not dissimilar from the tenor of his replies on other occasions):

As the Government does not intend to rush into ill-considered legislation, the whole matter is being considered properly by the department.

I do not want the Government to rush into ill-considered legislation but I point out again (as I pointed out last week) that we have about a month more to sit and then the strong chances are that this Parliament will not be convened again; it will not be until after the next election that the South Australian Parliament will sit again. Therefore, it will be about six months at least before any legislative action can be taken on this matter. Much harm can be done in that time if we are left in the situation in which we are now (even if the Treasurer is right in what he says). I do not think we should end this session without having on our Statute Book some positive prohibition, with heavy penalties, against the manufacture, sale, gift or use of this drug. I said that before and I say it again. Nearly a week has passed since I said it and still there is absolutely no sign of action by the Government. Last week, in reply to a question, the Treasurer referred to section 15 of the Police Offences Act, saying that this provision was sufficient and that we had legislation in this State to protect us. He chided the member for Rocky River with not having read this provision, which states:

Any person who, without lawful excuse, carries any deleterious drug or article of disguise shall be guilty of an offence.

Why on earth the two are put together, I do not know. That is the only offence to which the honourable gentleman can point as covering the situation in South Australia. Before a prosecution could be successful, the court would have to be satisfied that this was a

deleterious drug. At the moment this is merely a general offence under the Police Offences Act: it is not a specific offence directed at this drug. I think there should be a specific prohibition on the use of the drug, L.S.D. What is the penalty for this? A mere \$100 or three months' imprisonment. That is the only penalty laid down for the offence which the Treasurer says it would be if a person was caught with L.S.D. in this State. That is an inadequate penalty for such a revolting and disgusting practice as making or using L.S.D. The Treasurer can scowl in disbelief if he likes, but it is my conviction that it is a revolting and disgusting practice. Whether he agrees or not, I do not know. The Government has done nothing in this regard. The Treasurer has said we already have legislation, but if it applies at all (and this would have to be established in a court of law first) the penalty is inadequate. Only this morning I received an anonymous letter on this matter. Normally I entirely disregard such letters and do not refer to them.

Mr. Langley: It all depends if it suits you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This letter is of sufficient relevance for me to refer to it, and I think it will have at least some effect on the member for Unley, who seems to share the view expressed by the Treasurer and the Minister of Lands. This letter enclosed a cutting from the Melbourne *Truth* of September 23, headed "Peddlers push L.S.D. on girls. Hippies deliver to kids trying it for kicks". I will not read the rest of it, but it is just as disgusting and terrifying as the extract the Leader of the Opposition read out earlier. That is the sort of thing that is going on in Melbourne, according to this newspaper.

What do we see in this afternoon's paper? All members have a copy of it and will have seen on the front page what has happened in New South Wales. A special magistrate in Sydney said, when sentencing four people charged with selling L.S.D., that he would have sent them to gaol for 18 months if he could, but the Act did not enable him to do so because legislation being put through in New South Wales had not yet been put into force. Yet the Treasurer points to a section in the Police Offences Act and says the maximum penalty of three months' imprisonment is sufficient.

I must go on, otherwise I shall be chided by members if I do not refer to the next paragraph in the magistrate's statement. Today's *News* reports the special magistrate, Mr. Lewer, as having said that the four were

unbelievably fortunate that the New South Wales law had not yet been amended or that they had not committed the offence in South Australia. Obviously, the learned special magistrate made a mistake, and meant Tasmania, because in that State the law has been amended so that severe penalties are now provided for these offences. He would have given these people 18 months' imprisonment if he could have, yet here (if the section applies to L.S.D.) the maximum penalty is three months' imprisonment. The Treasurer is apparently putting off any action until it is too late to do anything this session. I have already said this afternoon, and on other occasions, what I believe should be done: a specific offence of making, selling, giving or using this drug should be created and heavy penalties, both pecuniary and of imprisonment, should be imposed.

In my view this is the only way to discourage the growth of the practice in South Australia. The Treasurer says he does not want to rush into hasty or ill-considered legislation: neither do I. However, it would be better to have something on our Statute Book. Then, if we find the legislation is insufficient or in some way unsatisfactory, we can amend it next session. At present we have no protection at all in this State. This is an alarming situation as we come closer to the end of the session. I hope the Treasurer, when replying on his motion, will say that the Government intends to make a decision in time to act this session. We do not ask more than that. We have got nothing from the Treasurer as day succeeds day, and we get closer to the end of the session when it will be too late to take action.

Preventive action should be taken to ensure that people know how serious the effects of this drug (both morally and physically) can be. In reply to my question the Minister of Education said last week that the matter had been discussed and that it was thought that attention would be drawn to the problem by having lectures in the schools, but I cannot agree with that. Already sufficient attention is being drawn to this matter, both in the newspaper (this afternoon's paper being an example) and on the radio. However, the publicity this drug is getting now does not disclose its harmful effects, and these must be made known to the public. This can only be done coolly and calmly by someone explaining in a proper way the effects of this drug and what is likely to happen to persons taking it. Although this aspect is not as urgent as the

question of legislation (it is an administrative act that can be carried out at any time), and although we are coming to the end of the present school year, I believe that such action would be worth while. I hope that the Government is taking this matter seriously, in spite of the doubts experienced by members on this side who have spoken on it.

There is another matter on which the member for Torrens, the member for Alexandra and I have asked questions. I am sorry that the Minister of Works is not here at the moment because this concerns him in particular. I refer to the experience the Electricity Trust had a few weeks ago when serious trouble developed in one of the new boilers at the Torrens Island power station. We on this side have repeatedly asked for a report on the estimate of the damage done on that occasion and the reasons for it, but every time we have done so the Minister of Works has replied that he has not received a report. One finds this increasingly difficult to accept as time goes on. I have no doubt that this matter has not been taken lightly by the Electricity Trust, and I hope the Minister has not taken it lightly. There has been plenty of time for the preparation of a report, and I wonder whether the honourable gentleman is hoping to see the session out without having to give it to the House. I hope he will present that report because this is a matter of public interest, of importance, and about which members of this Chamber should be informed.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I touch on this matter of the Torrens Island power station now because there appears to be no other opportunity to do so during this debate on the items of expenditure. We on this side have repeatedly asked for estimates of the damage and cost involved in the accident that occurred on August 16 (six weeks ago) but no estimates have yet been given. The Minister of Works gave a report in this Chamber on August 29 (almost a month ago) explaining what had caused it. On that very day, and since, questions have been asked by the members for Alexandra and Mitcham and by me about the cost involved. At least twice I have asked for a report. The Minister said it was expected that this plant would be in operation about six weeks after the date of damage. This House should be given an estimate of the cost of the damage. This is one of the most serious accidents that has ever happened to any public undertaking in South Australia, and it happened at a time when we were expecting to

generate for the heavy winter load. We are entitled to the relevant information. The Minister said that there was a cover of insurance—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much discussion going on in the Chamber. The member for Torrens.

Mr. COUMBE: Thank you, Sir. The Minister pointed out that the Electricity Trust had an insurance cover for its plant. The questions immediately raised in the minds of members (which were not touched on by the Minister when giving his report) were whether the manufacturers of the unit had completed their commission, whether this unit had been handed over to the care and control of the Electricity Trust by the commissioning agents, and whether it had been handed over verbally or in writing. In other words, was it the responsibility of the Electricity Trust or the commissioning agents? That is not explained by the Minister in his report. It is an important facet in the insurance of these units. We have asked that the cost of the damage be given to this House as quickly as possible. At least three members have asked for that information in the last month.

A further matter on which we sought information was this: with No. 2 unit out of commission through damage at a time of major winter load (the greatest output of the Electricity Trust in any one year has always been in the winter-time), what is the extra cost to this State of generating electricity from the other power stations operated by the trust? We are fortunate in South Australia in having other power stations to take up the load—the Osborne A and B stations and the Port Augusta Thomas Playford power station. In particular, Osborne A and B stations are operating much less efficiently than the unit that has just gone out of commission on Torrens Island. Only with the assistance of a number of major industries in this State have the Osborne power stations been able to get coal from the suppliers of coal, because the Electricity Trust told the coal merchants that it would not require much coal in the future. This highlights the fact that these older coal-burning stations operate much less efficiently than the unit now out of commission. How much extra is this costing the State? That should be clarified. The Minister should present a second report to this House elaborating on his first statement, which explained how the accident occurred, and touching on the points that the member for Mitcham and I have raised, particularly about costs. We all

agree it was an unfortunate accident and we were lucky to get out of it as we did. This House is entitled to know the cost to the State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): This afternoon we have heard members opposite suggest that there is a desperate situation with the drug L.S.D. In fact, this matter has been under review for some time by the Public Health Department. We are satisfied that we have legislation sufficient to cover the situation. The member for Mitcham has charged us with not having done something sooner on this, but there has been a great deal of legislation before the House and the L.S.D. situation in South Australia is not, so far as can be determined by reports from the Police and Public Health Departments, something that demands that we put all legislation aside and go into some emergency activity on this. The matter can be dealt with before the end of the session provided honourable members opposite will not take up the remaining time of the session reiterating what they have said before at some length.

The member for Mitcham considers there would be a greater deterrent if greater penalties of imprisonment were involved, but that is a matter for argument. The honourable member is so capable of clear-sightedness and lack of hallucination that he can determine what is in the mind of the magistrate in New South Wales who has commended our law, and the honourable member has decided to tell the people of South Australia that he knows better than the magistrate what the magistrate was talking about; but, in fact, the magistrate was talking about something else. The honourable member always knows better than any other person versed in law. However, I assure him that this matter is being considered and the alarmist statements that the honourable member has seen fit to make are not in present circumstances necessary. We shall have some action about this after mature consideration has been given to it by the officers of the relevant departments. If it is then found that we should take some action, it will be taken. The honourable member has doubted legal opinion that the relevant section of the Police Offences Act covers L.S.D. I assure him that before making statements in this House I obtained the opinion of senior medical staff in South Australia as to the evidence to be given that the drug was within the terms of the definition of the section, and the answer was that that evidence was clearly available.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

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

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

Miscellaneous, \$507,532—passed.

MINISTER OF WORKS

Minister of Works Department, \$22,492.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The lack of water supply at Neale Flat is causing concern to a number of small farmers in the area. I know that the Minister is interested in the scheme and that he will accede to the request made by the farmers if he can do so. In response to my representations, I received from the Minister a letter dated August 21, in which the following report by the Director and Engineer-in-Chief was quoted:

The extension referred to by Mr. Freebairn, M.P., has been closely examined on the field and questionnaire answers given by the farmers concerned indicate a lack of unanimity among them, also that little increase in productivity would result. A detailed estimate has not yet been prepared but indications are that the minimum likely cost would be in excess of \$22,000 and that the likely revenue return would be well below that which could be recommended . . . However, the investigation will be shortly finalized and a decision then made.

It seems that the department is taking a long time to finalize the investigation of this relatively small water scheme and, in view of the urgency of providing water for farmers in this area, I ask the Minister whether he will expedite the department's investigation.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): Unfortunately, the matter is similar to many other schemes that are desired, such as the scheme in which the member for Onkapinga (Mr. Shannon) is interested and which is just as urgent as the Neale Flat scheme. The economics of all schemes must be considered and complete investigations made. The Adelaide Water District can subsidize country districts to only a certain extent. Every scheme receives full consideration and we confer with the member for the district about proposals. We shall continue to do that in the hope of getting something done.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When does the Minister expect the comprehensive report of the Electricity Trust about the failure at the Torrens Island power station to be presented?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Electricity Trust is not before the Committee at present.

Mr. Coumbe: The Minister is the Minister in charge.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This is the line for the Minister of Works. The Minister has promised to ask the trust for a report. Many questions have been asked by members but, unless special arrangements are made by the Government for a discussion of this incident, it seems that we shall not have an opportunity to discuss it before the adjournment. This is one of the greatest dislocations that has ever happened in regard to electricity supply in this State. We do not know the total cost of the damage but we do know that extremely serious damage has been done. The Minister, in a rather brief report on August 29 in reply to a question I had asked, said that the trust was insured against damage exceeding \$100,000 but he also pointed out that the cylinder and shaft of the damaged turbo-generator would have to be returned to England for repairs. I have been told by people who know something about these matters that the tremendously fine process involved in the construction of turbo-generators makes it somewhat doubtful that the turbo-generator will be repaired effectively. I should like an assurance about that, and also about the cost.

It is hard to imagine a matter more vital to members. We ought to know how the accident occurred, whether it was caused by negligence, or whether through bad luck a series of incidents allowed this to happen. If one person was responsible, should that person have been in charge of the equipment? How could so much damage have been done by a failure in which rapid cooling was caused by an excess quantity of water being pumped into the boiler? Can such an accident happen by one error of turning on a tap at the wrong time? Should there not be more safety devices to ensure that these accidents cannot occur? What provision will be made to ensure that they do not occur again?

The liner *Canberra* was damaged about three years ago as a result of a person's making an error in throwing the wrong switch, which caused a much worse fire than a normal ship fire. Much research was done after the accident so as to prevent a recurrence. Are we to get a report about what will be done in this case? If we do not get such a report, the Minister leaves himself open to criticism for taking a rather easy-going attitude, and it may be thought that he is waiting for Parliament to adjourn so that the matter can be forgotten as soon as possible. These

matters should be treated seriously by everyone, not forgotten.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I should appreciate your guidance, Mr. Chairman, in respect of this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: This line relates to the Minister's department, so it is the appropriate time for the matter to be raised.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member will appreciate that this matter is subject to investigation, possibly litigation, because there is an insurance policy. The last thing the honourable member would want would be to prejudice in any way a case that might be heard. Nevertheless, my secretary was told last Friday that a comprehensive report would be available in a few days, and I shall then be able to provide information to members. We are not trying to hide anything, and we want to be just. I do not know at this stage how members will discuss it; of course, information may be obtained at Question Time. I assure the honourable member that I shall not take any steps to prevent discussion.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I refer to a press report of an announcement on water rationing which was said to have come from the Minister's office. As the report has not been contradicted I assume it is correct. I agree with the Minister that, if possible, legal restraints on the use of water should be avoided and that the public's co-operation should be sought. Requests for co-operation are less irksome and better received by the public than are legal restraints. However, I was surprised that the report stated that each household was to be requested to save 50 gallons of water a day. Such a saving by all households would enable the necessary saving of water by the community as a whole.

However, I point out that a pensioner might have been using only the minimum quantity of water prior to the request for co-operation. Further, another householder might have an extensive garden and he might use three or four sprinklers. All he has to do in order to save 50 gallons a day is to turn the sprinklers off for 10 minutes. However, it is a different matter for a pensioner who is already using only a small amount of water. The request does not seem to be the best way of sharing equally the responsibility to save water. I should like the Minister to explain how this decision was arrived at and whether the press report was correct.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Neither I nor my department ever suggested that each

individual should save 50 gallons a day: it was a deduction made by a press reporter. If an old couple came from the country to the metropolitan area they would automatically save water because they would know its value. It would be ridiculous to ask such people to save 50 gallons a day. The suggestion is that we should try to save 8 per cent of the water we normally use. As the honourable member said, a pensioner would not use much water at all, but a person with a spacious garden should be capable of reducing his consumption by 8 per cent.

Mr. Hudson: In most cases such people could well reduce their consumption by more than 8 per cent.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: We can only talk in general terms; we cannot talk about individual cases. A lady who had heard the announcement about saving water telephoned to say that in December she would have in her home some children from institutions and that she would then use more water. All we can expect is that she use it carefully.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I make a plea to the Government to give early consideration to the extension of the Pata water scheme. The Minister, when replying to a question, stated that this matter was receiving departmental consideration. There is no provision in this line, so I ask him that the scheme be considered as soon as possible. The main would go from Pata to Veitch and Pyap West. It is a pity that, in a year like this, the scheme has not been completed. Because of dry conditions it is difficult for these people to grow lucerne to feed to their stock. The proposed restrictions along the Murray River will seriously effect irrigation areas, but now the city is becoming involved. In 10 years, because of the increased quantity of water used by industry many of them will be forced to close because of the lack of water, unless a supply is assured. For example, the welding industry uses a large quantity of water and plans should be considered to build a storage system, perhaps in the park lands, to enable these industries to use a circulatory system that would enable them to use the same water repeatedly. Whyalla, which uses a large quantity of water, is catered for by the Morgan-Whyalla main.

Something must be done to agree to construct the Chowilla dam, because the supply of water should be the No. 1 priority in this State. At this stage it seems that no progress is being made, and now we have to wait until the River Murray Commission works out alternative costs, which then have to be considered.

The longer it takes to reassess the costs the greater the costs will be. Near Swan Hill, in Victoria, the Barr Creek drains into the Murray River, and much concern has been expressed at the salt content of the water from this tributary. The commission should have powers over these tributaries so that salt slugs can be controlled and this would help not only South Australia but also Victoria. The slug increases in density as it flows down the river: people are concerned about it and are asking when a flow of fresh-water will be allowed to dissipate this slug. The spray system of overhead watering, when the water has a high salt content, affects the leaves of trees and the crop.

I doubt whether we should build a natural gas pipeline without the surety of a water supply for industry. The pipeline will cost much money to build, and so will Chowilla dam, but the dam is the most important project. Without water, natural gas would be useless to many industries, and providing a water supply in this State, particularly to the city, should be considered as urgent. I urge the Government to ask every department concerned with the construction of Chowilla dam to consider seriously the costs involved to see whether some reductions can be made.

Mr. RODDA: I agree with the remarks of the member for Ridley, and with what the member for Flinders said recently, that the most urgent need is to ensure that this State has an adequate water supply to enable industry to expand. The Chowilla dam project should be considered fully but, apparently, the Prime Minister considers that the matter should be deferred until the feasibility study has been completed. I, with many others, hope that that study is undertaken soon. The South-East, which normally experiences an abundance of water, has a valuable drainage system diverting water into the sea. It seems that, with water the lifeblood of this State, the waste that occurs in the South-East could be examined with a view to storing water to advantage. Unfortunately, the local topography does not permit the water that is at present wasted to be stored in the area. This whole matter must be examined, including the importance of proceeding with the Chowilla project. The report that work on the Keith main will be proceeded with is wonderful news. However, the deferment of the Chowilla project is unfortunate, and I know that everybody wholeheartedly supports the resumption of work on that scheme.

Mr. COUMBE: The Kangaroo Creek reservoir, which is important to the future

water supply of the metropolitan area, has been the subject of protracted investigations. Some years ago the Public Works Committee investigated and reported on the project, and work was subsequently undertaken on constructing a scenic road around the site of the proposed reservoir. However, it was then found on investigation that the rock face into which the dam wall was to be secured was faulty, and geological surveys determined that a better site existed downstream from the original site. The Public Works Committee having made a further investigation and report, this project is being delayed and delayed. At the time the original report was made it was stressed that the reservoir would play a significant part in establishing, conserving and augmenting the future water supply of the metropolitan area, especially the north-eastern section.

I was therefore disturbed at the report last week that work on the dam would be further deferred and that tenders that were to have closed last week (I believe it was) would be further extended. Will the Minister explain why the tenders that have been called (presumably by the Supply and Tender Board but under the auspices of the Minister's department and, I presume, as a result of a decision of the Minister) have been further extended? How much longer will it be before the dam is likely to be completed?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The deferment occurred so that contractors could be supplied with further particulars. We believe that the particulars for which they asked were justified and could result in an earlier completion date.

Mr. Coumbe: Did they all ask for them?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I understand the publicity that has been given outside to the matter and to the answers of the Minister, we have to reduce by 8 per cent our total water use in the metropolitan area in order to get through the coming summer. I am accepting here the Minister's calculations and not those to which I referred in my question last week: it seemed to me that the reduction should be rather higher than 8 per cent. Will the Minister say whether he is directing the present campaign of voluntary restriction to industry using water in its processes, and not only to householders?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The appeal relates to all sections of the community. The results we are getting from industry generally are pretty encouraging. Some industries are

considering the recirculation of water and have approached the department with a view to co-operating in this regard. We have no complaints about industry.

Mr. Millhouse: I didn't mean to imply a complaint.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: We appreciate the co-operation that we are receiving from industry. I believe that the time will come in this State when industry, either on request or possibly on demand by way of legislation, may have to recirculate water in order to cut down on its use.

Mr. Clark: That could be a saving financially to industry.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes; that is something for the future. If all sections do not co-operate, we will have to determine a quota for industry which is something we do not want to do. It is important to the economics of industry and of South Australia that industries use only the water they need and do not waste it.

Mr. CUMBE: I have read that in America much research is done into the use of brackish and effluent waters and that good results have been obtained. When the Public Works Committee reported on the Bolivar sewerage scheme it suggested that an expert committee made up of representatives from the Minister's department and other departments be set up to advise on how that effluent water could be used. What has been done about the effluent water at Bolivar, and what investigations have been carried out by the department regarding the use of waste waters in the community?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Chemistry Department is continually conducting investigations at the Bolivar treatment works. I should be happy to arrange a visit by members to see the work being done there. At present, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, in conjunction with the Crown Law Office, is preparing an agreement, which will be signed by a substantial firm, for the use of effluent water from Bolivar for irrigation purposes. Other firms are also interested.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What will be irrigated?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Lucerne for fodder.

Mr. Hall: Will the charges made be substantial?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, and they will make a good contribution to the finances of the State. However, I do not know whether they will fully return the sums

spent on the work. Eventually we hope to be able to use all of the water.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The growing of lucerne is probably one of the best uses to which the water can be put. However, beef measles resulted from the use of green fodder from the Islington sewage farm. I take it that in this case the lucerne will be turned into hay or pelleted, beef measles no longer being a problem. At Werribee sewerage farm there are about 20,000 cattle that are slaughtered under supervision. I understand that after a beast reaches a certain age it throws off the beef measles symptoms and can be offered for human consumption. Although I have been told that effluent water is not used for irrigation forestry in Australia, I believe certain types of deciduous hardwood trees will grow at a fantastically fast rate under these conditions. As irrigated forestry in other parts of the world produces a remarkably heavy yield, perhaps the Minister could inquire about its use here.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I was informed this morning that the lakes were high and that a large quantity of water was still flowing over the barrages into the sea at Goolwa. Is the water now being supplied (when we do not require it) part of the allocation of 291,000 acre ft. made to this State by the River Murray Commission? This afternoon I asked the Minister under whose authority undertakings that water would be provided for irrigation purposes had been given. As the Minister's reply was not clear, could a further explanation be given so that people would understand what the future procedure will be? Last week, by resolution, the position regarding the lower portion of the Murray River was altered. People in that area are in a different position from those living in the upper reaches of the river, because until now they have not had to seek an assurance that water will be supplied; as no restrictions applied in the area, they were free to purchase plant and establish an irrigation system. They have all had undisputed riparian rights in the lower end of the river since the State was founded. Last week we changed that position and now they will not be given an assurance. Another organization up the river that has been subject to control has made an application and has been told that water will be available to it and that it will get a licence. However, a landholder on the lower end of the river may well be refused a licence.

Some time ago, in the television programme *The Premier Speaks*, it was announced that much water would be available in the upper river for an American firm that was undertaking a big developmental programme. The firm was not going to do the work itself but was going to develop the area and lease small portions to people for purposes such as fruit growing. The individual was not going to use the water but we were to have an overlord landholder who would have water provided to him and who would then sell the water rights to tenants. When I asked the Minister about that matter, it was obvious that he did not know anything about the proposition and had not been consulted on it. That is reported in *Hansard*. I want to know whether water will be made available to this large foreign company that will re-let it to people who will be virtually tenants and who will pay for the water rights. I should also like the Minister to say whether the water going over the barrages comprises part of our 291,000 acre feet for this year.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Emu Bay and Wisanger district of Kangaroo Island, which is one of the oldest settled coastal districts and one of the best barley-growing areas, has no water supply. About 20 farmers along a distance of seven to 10 miles need water as much as do any other people on the island. They applied for a water supply but the Government was not able to go far with the project until the main scheme was completed. However, the dam and the trunk part of the water system are nearing completion, and it is time for the Government to investigate other extensions. Will the Minister consider whether areas along the north coast, west of Kingscote as far as Wisanger and Emu Bay, can be considered for early reticulation of water?

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

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: During the adjournment I ascertained that no water was running over the Goolwa barrage at present, and had not been for some time. Up to the present no-one has been granted a licence for extra water, although the interdepartmental committee is considering cases where people were given an undertaking that water would be available and had spent considerable sums. I repeat that any person on the lower part of the river now irrigating river water will be granted a licence. New applications will be considered on their merits but, in a year without restriction, a temporary licence will be

issued, although it can be withdrawn at any time. The question of subsidiary mains is being considered.

Mr. RODDA: Because many working people living on the upper reaches of the river have invested large sums their position should be considered by the Government because their present outlook is bleak.

Mr. HALL: I understand that bores are to operate to supplement the metropolitan water supply. Several of my constituents in the Virginia area are alarmed, because they believe that these bores draw from a common aquifer and a decreased supply will be available for market gardeners in the Virginia area. Also, what will be the cost of carting water in road tankers to supply Kimba if the dry season continues until the end of summer?

Mr. RODDA: Am I correct in my understanding that American interests are being granted licences for considerable quantities of water?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It will cost between \$250,000 and \$300,000 to supply Kimba with water from Iron Knob. In reply to the member for Victoria, no licences have been issued to any applicant since May, although all applications are being considered.

Mr. McANANEY: I understand the Minister said that no water was running over the Goolwa barrage. Water has been flowing over this barrage in the last month or so, particularly with the lake at its present level and when a northerly wind is blowing. I have been told that 2in. of water has been flowing over the spillway between the islands and escaping to the sea. Although I have asked many questions I have not been told why water is released from storages in the upper reaches of the river. It seems that a certain quota of water is allowed to South Australia and that is released irrespective of the needs and prevailing conditions. I deny that excessive quantities of water have not been allowed to run over the barrages, particularly when there has been a north wind. Having previously asked why this has happened, I have simply been told how it has happened or what has happened. It should be explained why this waste occurs.

Line passed.

Engineering and Water Supply Department, \$12,977,910.

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister explain the reason for the decreases concerning foremen, mechanics, and storemen, etc., under the items "Adelaide Water District", "Adelaide Sewers", and "Tod River Water District"?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This relates simply to accounting methods: there is no suggestion that maintenance work has been reduced. It is only logical to assume that, with services being extended, maintenance undertakings must also be extended.

Mr. Hall: Why is a reduction shown?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It is shown only for certain classes of employee; it is not an overall reduction.

Mr. HALL: The reduction must arise either as the result of an alteration in the system of accounting or in a reduced effort in this regard. However, I will not press the Minister, because he does not know any more than I know. I now refer to the former Liberal Government's intention concerning a water supply for the Two Wells area via Gawler and the supply of water for domestic and stock purposes to the Virginia area.

The CHAIRMAN: To which item is the Leader referring?

Mr. HALL: I believe "Barossa Water District" would cover it.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee is considering salaries and contingencies. The Leader cannot deal with Loan expenditure.

Mr. HALL: Having ventilated this matter on other occasions, I will not transgress your ruling; I will obey it.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Will the Minister explain the increase under the item "Murray River locks—proportion of lock-keeping cost in South Australia and other States"?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: A provision was requested by the River Murray Commission to cover the sum that will be called up during the year to meet maintenance and administration expenses.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: It doesn't specify which lock?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No.

Mr. SHANNON: Will the Minister say whether the steep increase of \$93,000 in the vote for "Purchase of office machines and equipment" relates to the future purchase of equipment by the department?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This sum is to provide for the purchase of typewriters, calculating machines and other office equipment, the individual cost for which is expected to be over \$100. I think it is reasonable to assume that computer machines are included in this provision.

Mr. HALL: Some people have bought small properties in the Two Wells area. One person has purchased 10 acres on which he wishes to develop a poultry run. However,

because of the overloaded condition of the water main, he is unable to obtain water from it. I realize that the major scheme to overcome this problem cannot be discussed as provision for it is made from Loan funds. However, is there any likelihood that minor works will be carried out to connect prospective users?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As expenditure for this work is from Loan funds, I do not have particulars with me. However, I will have the matter investigated and inform the honourable member in due course.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The present arrangement is for the payment of accounts quarterly. I have received some complaints about this, one of which was made to me this evening by a man who wants to pay his accounts annually. Can this be done?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Accounts can be paid annually provided that, on receiving the quarterly account notice, a person makes a declaration, and provided he pays in advance.

Mr. McANANEY: The Auditor-General has referred to the Morgan-Whyalla main and the Iron Knob water supply. The charges for water paid by Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited are at rates reducing from 23.33c a thousand gallons to 20c a thousand gallons according to the quantity supplied. I believe this charge is below the charge in other parts of South Australia to which the cost of pumping would not be as high. The Auditor-General also states that the quantity of water being taken from the main is considerably less than the quantity forecast by the company when the second main was put in. Has the Minister considered the Auditor-General's Report with a view to taking some action to counter the loss being made in the provision of this water supply?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Could the Minister enlarge on the nature of the declaration which must be provided at the end of the first quarter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Let us take my case: I informed the department that I would pay annually. I multiplied the quarterly amount by four and posted a cheque covering the total amount. If I use excess water, I will get an account for that.

Mr. Millhouse: Are ratepayers notified about this?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, with the account a slip is sent to them about this. In reply to the member for Stirling, the price of water is determined by the B.H.P. Company's

Steel Works Indenture Act, which was passed by the Playford Government.

Mr. COUMBE: I take it that the line "Development of Interior" deals not only with water supplies to the remote parts of the State but also with road works undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department on behalf of the State. Is it a fact that the Highways Department will take over much of this work? If that is so, will this provision be decreased considerably in future?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: On January 1, 1967, the Highways Department took over roads previously maintained by the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr. COUMBE: If that is so, other items must be affected because only a slight variation is shown under the line to which I have referred. In fact, for salaries and wages there is an increase of about \$1,800 with a modest increase provided for the cost of materials.

Mr. McANANEY: The agreement to which the Minister referred in relation to the B.H.P. Company was entered into in 1958. Since then the Government has gone to considerable expense to provide the extra main, the cost of supplying water being 69.26c a thousand gallons. Surely it would be appropriate at this stage to approach the B.H.P. Company (which is a reasonable company having paid reasonably small dividends so that it could make investments for the good of Australia) to have some review made of these commitments. Of course, I do not suggest that the contract should be repudiated. Also, as the company makes quarterly payments some payments are not paid until after the end of the financial year. Matters such as this could be cleared up. Some effort should be made to correct the position. Until recently country extensions or extensions adjoining country towns were approved if they showed a return on capital of 8 per cent. However, now the department or the Minister requires that the line show a return on capital cost of 10 per cent. Although it may be necessary that a line pay its way, it should be remembered that people already on the line enjoy a much lower rate than 10 per cent and, in addition, that capital has already been expended on the line in relation to reservoirs and pumping stations. Therefore, it should be possible to provide extensions without requiring a return on capital of 10 per cent.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: It is on capital works, not revenue.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the member is speaking on capital works, he is out of order.

Mr. McANANEY: I am dealing with the loss entailed in running expenses and the return on capital outlay.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that we are discussing expenditure, not revenue.

Mr. McANANEY: We are dealing with extensions. A line will not be extended because—

The CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member is discussing revenue, which is a different matter from the Estimates of Expenditure that the Committee is now discussing.

Mr. McANANEY: I do not agree with you, Mr. Chairman, but I must obey your ruling. At what other time in the Budget debate can we speak on a major item of waterworks?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member knows that it has been laid down many times that, when we are dealing with lines, an honourable member must speak to a line. If the honourable member wishes to speak about something entirely different, he should do so on a different matter.

Line passed.

Public Buildings Department, \$6,972,142.

Mrs. STEELE: I refer to the provision of \$11,000 in relation to office expenses, maintenance, minor improvements, minor equipment and sundries at the cemetery at West Terrace. Last year \$7,000 was voted for this item and the actual payment was \$3,380. The amount being voted this year is \$4,000 more than was voted last year. Can the Minister say what minor improvements, minor equipment and sundries are?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The provision made for the maintenance, minor additions, alterations, etc., in relation to education buildings is \$30,547 less than expenditure last year. I should like an explanation of this from either the Minister of Works or the Minister of Education. The Government has cut down in relation to all Government buildings, but the most significant reduction is for education buildings. No cleaning of windows is obviously one of the economies. When I say "obviously", I assume that it is. Every year we add to our stock of buildings and each building has to be maintained. Therefore, one would expect that this item would increase. However, this year we are providing for education buildings less than we voted last year.

We know that the Government is cheese-paring. There can be no other explanation.

The Minister of Education is not having any of his windows cleaned. Heaven knows how they have got through this winter. We know that people such as teachers and children have been decent enough to clean them. Last week we had the example given by the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) of one headmaster, I think, getting the children to rub down the desks to keep them in order. I should like information about how the Government is economizing on this item and about how it can save more than \$30,000 on expenditure last year, when that expenditure was about \$30,000 less than the amount voted for last year.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Obviously, the honourable member is still living in the dark ages and has not realized that modern construction methods have reduced costs. He has not heard that aluminium windows do not require as much painting and repair as other types and that, therefore, we can save money. Charges for the West Terrace cemetery—

The CHAIRMAN: Honourable members have asked for information, yet when the Minister is giving it they are laughing and talking amongst themselves. I ask members to observe Standing Orders and to refrain from interjecting.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: These charges are to meet maintenance on the cemetery including the cost of repairs to roadways but excluding salaries and wages.

Mr. LANGLEY: The member for Mitcham is quick to say that this Government does nothing, and he never gives praise when it is due. Many works have been carried out in his district, particularly the renovation of the toilets at the Westbourne Park school. The member for Mitcham should visit the school to see how they have improved.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I give full credit to the Government for what it has done to the lavatory block at the Westbourne Park school. However, many old buildings have to be maintained and our capital investment in buildings for education increases each year. The only way this line can be reduced is by economizing.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Is it wrong to do that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No: I have not said that it is. It is notorious that the Government is doing its best in every way to economize, but I suspect that it is in ways that are not appropriate. Cleaning of windows is an example. I ask the Minister how the Government is cutting down this line by over \$30,000 on what was spent last year.

The CHAIRMAN: Public Buildings Department, \$6,972,142—that this line be passed?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister merely moved in his seat. I think the Committee deserves a reply on this important matter. A considerable saving has been involved, and we should know whether the capital assets of the State are being properly maintained. Will the Minister please say how it is that he could reduce this line and the other three lines, as he has?

The CHAIRMAN: Public Buildings Department—that this line be passed?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think we should let this pass with the Minister sitting in silence. The only construction one puts on his silence is that either the Minister does not know the answer or he does not want to give it because of the unfavourable publicity that it will get outside. Will the Minister be kind enough to answer the question?

Mr. McANANEY: Was the expenditure on the toilets at the Westbourne Park school from Loan funds or from the Estimates?

Mr. RODDA: I appeal to the Minister, on behalf of the member for Mitcham. The honourable member asked a civil question and is entitled to a reply.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He received a good one.

Mr. RODDA: I have not heard it, and the Committee is entitled to a reply to the question.

Mr. McANANEY: I should receive a reply to my question whether the money for the toilets was allocated from Revenue or Loan Account. Perhaps the Minister will provide the information later.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The money for the toilets came from Loan funds.

Mr. HALL: I am interested in the present design of Samcon construction schools. I understand that the Samcon building at Millicent does not have the full air-circulatory system that other Samcon buildings have: Will the Minister say whether this omission will be continued, or is the Millicent case an exception?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although no lines exist for this matter, I am prepared to reply to the Leader.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I understood the Leader was discussing the planning and design of certain buildings.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: He related his remarks to Samcon buildings. The planning and design of buildings is met out of Loan funds.

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader's remarks are out of order.

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister explain the meaning of "planning and design"?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It relates to renovations and alterations of existing buildings.

Mr. HALL: The item "planning and design" refers to "Assistant Director, Principal Architect, and Principal Engineer, etc.", the salaries for whom total \$1,142,580. I simply do not believe that all these people are engaged in maintenance and alterations. I should think that "Principal Architect" meant just that. Will the Minister say whether more Samcon buildings, which are designed by these people, will be erected without a full air-circulatory system being provided?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: There are three types of air-circulatory system, one of which is chosen to suit the locality. In order that the Leader may be fully informed on the matter, I will obtain a report.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister say whether the Government intends to replace the shockingly outmoded city morgue in order to cut down on maintenance and to provide the city with a more modern service, a matter on which the Public Works Committee has reported favourably?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, the present morgue is a fairly antiquated place, and a new one is warranted.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It's only happened in the last two and a half years!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It has been old for the last 30 years. We were negotiating some time ago to transfer the West Terrace cemetery to the Adelaide City Council but the council became aware of the difficulties associated with the cemetery. The Government is concerned about this cemetery and is doing its best in the face of a pretty difficult problem.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can see that I shall not get an answer from the Minister. I am surprised that that courtesy on which he prides himself has deserted him on this occasion. I intend to pursue the matter in other ways, because I think it is something which we ought to know and which the people of this State are entitled to know. I am disappointed that the Minister is not prepared to give any information about it this evening.

Line passed.

Public Stores Department, \$327,300.

Mr. COUMBE: For many years it was the policy of the previous Liberal Government (and I hope it is the policy of the present Government) that, in considering tenders

called in the regular manner, preference should be given first to items of South Australian manufacture, secondly, to Australian manufacture and, thirdly, to British manufacture, this policy being designed to assist local industry. Can the Minister assure the Committee that the policy has been continued for the purposes I have outlined?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Not only can I give an assurance that that policy has continued: the preference shown for South Australian articles is probably greater than it has ever been.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$159,313.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Will the Minister say whether the Advisory Committee on Country Sewerage Schemes (for which \$1,000 was voted last year, nothing having actually been spent, and for which nothing is voted this year) is still functioning?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That committee is now defunct, having been replaced by the Drainage Co-ordination Committee.

Mr. COUMBE: I take it that the \$1,000 under "River Torrens (Prohibition of Excavations) Act and River Torrens Protection Act—administration of" relates to the River Torrens Improvement Committee, which has been set up to investigate the conditions in the river and to make recommendations accordingly. I assume also that, under "River Torrens improvements—subsidies to councils" the sum is to be divided equally between the councils concerned for beautification schemes within their own districts. Will the Minister say whether my premise in each case is correct?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although I am confident that it is correct, I will obtain a report.

Mr. RODDA: I refer to a new provision for "Investigation into deep bore disposal of irrigation seepage water". Where are these experiments being made and have they been successful?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Investigation has been carried out into seepage problems along the Murray River, but the Minister of Irrigation informs me that there are no results as yet.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have a special interest in irrigation seepage, because this problem is becoming evident at the Cadell Training Centre. Will the Minister ask the Minister of Irrigation to obtain some information about it?

Line passed.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND MINISTER OF
ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Minister of Education Department, \$17,606
—passed.

Education Department, \$49,492,130.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the necessity in South Australia to do more to teach Asian languages. As I understand the situation, South Australia is lacking in the teaching of Asian languages, particularly such languages as Malay, Japanese and Chinese (I suppose that, of all the languages spoken in China, Mandarin would be the most useful to a foreigner). I suppose that we are doing even less than is done in other parts of Australia, although I do not believe enough is being done anywhere in Australia. It is hardly necessary to stress the utmost importance to Australia of Australians being able to speak to their neighbours in the near north. As we are geographically an appendage of Asia, there is no doubt at all that our future lies with Asia, yet hardly any teaching or preparation is being done for that future. One of the best ways to begin to understand our neighbours is to learn one of the languages. Also, from the strictly utilitarian aspect of trade it is essential that we should be able to converse with our neighbours.

I believe the only course being taught in the teachers' colleges is a Malay language course being taught at the Adelaide Teachers College. Some years ago it was announced that it was intended to train teachers and that these languages should be taught. On checking with the Public Examinations Board, I have found that no examination is available in South Australia in any Asian language at this level. I think I am right in saying that neither of our universities offers any course in an Asian language. The Adult Education Department at the university has a course in Malay: it has a first-year class but the second-year class has not been filled. There were less than 20 students in the class and those who wanted to go on to the second year had to pay an extra fee because the class was not big enough to make it an economic proposition. The third-year course that was proposed has disappeared altogether. A little teaching of some Asian languages may be done in some of the independent schools and I know that a couple of private academies teach Japanese. However, in the departmental schools little indeed is being done. I am glad to say that one of the few schools teaching anything in this line is the Mitcham Girls Technical High School where there is a course in Malay at the fifth-

year level. However, this is not a matriculation subject and anyone in South Australia wanting to matriculate or to take any language at matriculation level has to do so in another State.

I think that Malay is probably the best of the Asian languages with which to begin because, as Indonesian is similar to Malay, it is not difficult to make the change from one to the other. Examinations in Malay should be offered by the Public Examinations Board and we should do more to train teachers to teach Malay or whatever other Asian languages (and I hope there will be a number in due course) it is desirable to teach in our schools. The Minister may well say that the Public Examinations Board is an independent body, but, as he has representation on it, I think he is the appropriate person to take the lead in this matter. I hope that he will be prepared to do this. Regarding Asian languages, what does the Minister intend to do to co-ordinate what is going on now and to increase the effort? Is it intended to do anything at all to train more teachers in Malay or in some other Asian language?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): Some of our schools are teaching Malay. I believe the honourable member said he thought we compared unfavourably with other States; from that I adjudged that he did not know. I have not made an exact comparison about it, and I doubt that the honourable member has. However, knowing the calibre of our educational staff, I venture to say that we are probably doing as well as, if not better than, any other State. While I agree that we need to learn more about our Asian neighbours and to promote a study of their languages, I think it most unwise to rush into the teaching of these languages without knowing why we are teaching them, whether the students will make use of them, and whether we are teaching the languages in such a way that the students will be able to make use of them. Many thousands of children learn French and German for long periods at school but do not use the languages and are never able to speak them fluently. People who have done a good French course at school have been told in France, "If you would only speak English, I would understand you better." One has to be sensible when talking about the languages.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am disappointed about the Minister's attitude to my suggestion and about his view of the teaching of languages in general. He is rather out of tune, I think, with

the views of our universities, because the Flinders University has started Italian and Spanish courses. I suggest that, from a utilitarian point of view, an Asian language would be of much more value to an Australian than Spanish or Italian. I do not agree that it is usually useless to learn German or French. I studied French at school, as did the Treasurer. I think it has value as a general educational exercise and as a mental discipline, and that it also has practical advantages when one travels. A man I know wanted to learn Malay so that he could teach it, and he has written to me as follows:

Just personally I have found out by correspondence with other universities that unless I go and reside in the Eastern States, when I would be allowed to attend courses and submit for examinations, the only method by which I can do it . . .

He is speaking of Malay—

. . . is through the correspondence section (external students) of the University of London.

Therefore, he has written to the University of Malaya in Kuala Lumpur to see whether he can go there. He concludes by saying:

If South Australia is to have any Asian languages, then it must be possible for people in South Australia to do courses or attain qualifications without going to reside in another State.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member is talking about languages at the universities. He put his question on the line regarding primary and high schools. That has nothing to do with universities or institutes of technology, and I think the honourable member should speak to the correct line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I made clear that we should train teachers so that they could teach in our schools. They must be trained at tertiary level and that is the point I was making. However, I am not going to pursue it if the Minister is going to get heated as soon as I speak.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: There is no provision in the line about tertiary education.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall not argue with you, but I was linking it up with primary and secondary schools.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to keep to the line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have said enough.

Mrs. STEELE: I refer to the item "Audio-visual Education Centre" under Technical Schools and wish to make a suggestion to the Minister. When I was overseas in Edinburgh I called on the Scottish Division of the Commonwealth Institute, which has its headquarters

in London. The Director of the institute was interested when he knew I came from Australia, because part of the institute's funds come from grants by Commonwealth Governments including Australia. This Commonwealth Institute was originally known as the Imperial Institute and was founded in 1887. Its purpose is to foster the interests of the Commonwealth by information and education services designed to promote among its peoples a wider knowledge of one another and a greater understanding of the Commonwealth itself.

The institute receives from Commonwealth countries film strips, tapes and recordings covering all aspects of culture and education in these countries. These film strips and tape recordings are lent to many schools throughout Scotland. I asked the Director, Mr. Beresford, whether his library of audio-visual aids included contributions from South Australia. He said that it did not, although he showed much interest in the suggestion I made that on my return to South Australia I would make an approach to the Minister of Education asking that consideration be given to such a gift. I, in my turn, was interested in a document Mr. Beresford had prepared giving much factual information about all the States of the Commonwealth and which has been distributed amongst Scottish schools. As this is a Commonwealth-sponsored institute and as the Scottish branch has promoted a film strip loan service and an experimental new lending library of Commonwealth tape recordings, I wondered whether the Minister would consider, after consultation with his audio-visual section, sending to the Commonwealth Institute in Scotland film strips and tape recordings that would disseminate information about South Australia.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to have the suggestion considered. On this line there is a substantial increase of \$301,480 this year, and that covers a range of matters.

Mr. COUMBE: I assume that the total provision for salaries and wages includes the cost of the Government's equal pay decision affecting women teachers in the service, which decision is to be implemented progressively over a five-year period. Of this sum for which approval is being sought, can the Minister indicate how much is the result of that adjusted pay and how much it is likely to be in a full year?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Out of a total of \$40,013,420 the implementation of the second stage of equal pay for women teachers amounts to \$340,000.

Mr. Coumbe: When does that operate?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This is the second year of its introduction. That covers the full year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the line "Northern Territory Schools and Commonwealth Schemes—Teachers and Staff—\$1,249,200". One matter revealed during the unhappy Murrie case was the looseness of the arrangement between the Commonwealth and South Australia for the staffing by South Australian teachers of Northern Territory schools. The original arrangement was made between the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford and the late Mr. J. B. Chifley when he was Prime Minister of Australia. I understand that doubts have arisen about the legality of our having members of the teaching profession in Northern Territory schools, and whether they can be paid out of South Australian funds for services performed outside South Australia. Nobody wants to disturb a system that has worked well for over 20 years, but has this matter been considered in the last few months? Is the Minister satisfied with the legal arrangements whereby we undertake the staffing of Northern Territory schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have never questioned the legality of the agreement. I do not know that putting it on a more satisfactory legal basis would make any difference to the situation. I am not questioning it, and I do not know of anybody else who is questioning it, from the point of view of the payment of salaries. We have paid them for many years. This arrangement was entered into by a Liberal Government. No-one has questioned the payment of salaries. The salary payments handled by the Education Department and recharged to Commonwealth funds for staff, including Northern Territory schools, Commonwealth scholarships, Commonwealth migrant classes, Commonwealth free milk schemes, Commonwealth social services and Commonwealth reconstruction training schemes, amount to \$1,249,000. Whilst it is working well, I consider that South Australia is put to considerable disadvantage over this agreement. We train all the teachers; virtually no student-teachers come from the Northern Territory. It is a drain on the students in South Australia to supply teachers for the Northern Territory. We carry the responsibility for the teaching staff and get no advantage. The

Commonwealth Government trains no teachers for any of the places for which it has to provide them. From the point of view of convenience, we could be well out of the scheme. Nevertheless, we have not objected to it and certainly its legality has not been questioned.

Mrs. STEELE: Do many accidents occur at schools and how many of them are serious? How much is allocated for payment of medical and incidental expenses arising from such accidents?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall obtain information for the honourable member about the payment of damages and costs on account of a special payment for a child injured at school, and shall also obtain details of the actual expenses arising from accidents at schools, generally. Accidents are not numerous but, occasionally, a serious accident occurs. Teachers take care of the students during recess periods but, with many children running around, an occasional accident is bound to happen.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I heartily agree that departmental officers should travel overseas in order to keep in touch with educational trends. What officers are to make overseas visits this year?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Generally, the Superintendents of High and Primary Schools. One officer is Mr. L. Dodd, Superintendent of Primary Schools. It is important for officers to be fully conversant with the latest overseas practices so that we can take advantage of new ideas.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: An increase of \$63,437 is no doubt justified for the running expenses of buses to transport students, but some bus owners consider that they are entitled to an increase in the allowance. Buses used in the country are driven over many bad roads and deteriorate rapidly, and with the present allowance the owners are unable to repurchase a bus that meets the department's requirements. As these owners render a valuable service to the department, to parents, and to children, will the department favourably consider an increase in the mileage rate?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall consider this question, but adjustments are made from time to time, and I understand that depreciation of buses is properly accounted for in the fee paid for carrying students. We provide 615 transport services throughout the State: 307 contract services, 55 subsidized services, and a fleet of 253 departmental buses. Provision has been made for new services and

extensions to existing services by the increase of \$63,437.

Mrs. STEELE: The department pays two-thirds of the cost of a fleet of taxi-cabs that bring handicapped children to special schools in the metropolitan area. This service is greatly appreciated by parents and contributes much to the smooth running of the schools, because handicapped children are able to get to their schools on time. This service relieves parents of a considerable financial burden because, normally, the cost to parents would be fairly heavy. Individual applications have to be made by the school, on behalf of newly enrolled students, to a transport committee which considers whether transport should be provided. Recently, a practice has developed of holding applications of children until several have to be considered. In one instance, after the advisory panel had confirmed that a child should be admitted to the Oral School, an immediate application was made for transport. A month elapsed and still no approval was forthcoming, even though the principal referred the matter to the committee several times. This is a pity, because children should enter the special schools as early as possible, as undue delay can retard their future development. It seems a pity that a child's entry is delayed for, say, a month or six weeks, simply because no other applications are forthcoming. Will the Minister inquire whether, once the advisory panel has approved the admission of a child to a certain school, the matter cannot be dealt with expeditiously so that that child's education is not hampered in this way?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall have that matter examined.

Mr. COUMBE: I take it that the scholarships under "Contingencies" are secondary and technical scholarships issued by the department to students who attend technical and general secondary schools and also, I presume, a teachers college, and that they are separate from the Commonwealth scholarships issued in a similar respect. The item includes bursaries and scholarships concerning this type of activity, and is apparently separate from the scholarships and bursaries, which are given to the universities and which are shown subsequently. Is that a correct premise? As I note that the sum voted this year is similar to the sum spent last year, does the Minister expect that the number will remain constant, even though costs may be increasing? Does he expect that this number is likely to increase in the next few years?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: True, the item refers to scholarships in connection with the areas of education mentioned, that is, primary and secondary, and the recruitment and training of teachers. It refers to the standard scholarships in those particular fields. I think the number of scholarships is likely to remain stable for a while, unless new ones are introduced. The honourable member will notice that we provided \$140,000 on last year's Estimates and spent \$160,000, and he will recall that we introduced special scholarships for the students at our teachers colleges, amounting to \$200 for students about to enter a college; 100 of those were introduced, as well as 100 scholarships of the same value for those students who had completed a year at the college. Of course, that sum is payable every year while the student is at college. Those scholarships have been successful in encouraging students of a higher calibre to enter our colleges.

Mr. COUMBE: I have no doubt that the department previously estimated the number of students likely to undertake the new matriculation course that has succeeded the old Leaving standard of matriculation. Can the Minister indicate how the numbers undertaking this course have coincided with the departmental estimates? I understand the new matriculation course is of a rather higher standard than some students and parents expected, and it has been put to me that the number of students concerned may not have reached what was estimated by the department and may not have reached what the Public Examinations Board hoped it would reach. As this matter vitally affects the intake of universities and institutions of advanced education in the next few years, has the Minister any information along these lines?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As I do not have the figures with me, I will obtain them for the honourable member, so that we may have the full picture in front of us.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Regarding the manning of Northern Territory schools, I was interested in the Minister's comments and in his account of the arrangement. My original question was whether he was satisfied about the legal validity of the arrangement made. He said this had not been queried but, of course, it was queried during the hearing of the Murrice Royal Commission. Can the Minister tell me the exact nature of the arrangement? Is it contained in letters between the former Prime Minister and Premier, is it oral, or where precisely does one look for the agreement that is the basis of this arrangement?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is merely based on letters that passed between the parties concerned.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The next matter I desire to raise comes under the line "Technical schools". I have been approached by a young married teacher at a girls technical school (I think in the District of Gawler), who has drawn my attention to an address, which was given by the Director-General of Education (Mr. Walker) and which appears in the *Teachers' Journal* of August last. I guess the address was actually delivered in July to the Adelaide Rotary Club, and in the course of that address Mr. Walker said:

The acceptance of trained married women is an essential part of the teaching force.

Dealing with material changes in the Education Department, Mr. Walker said:

A policy providing for *accouchement* leave for women teachers will be announced soon. So far as I know, that form of leave has not yet been announced, and this young woman has told me that her baby is due in March but, because she will not be able to teach at the beginning of the first term in 1968, she is obliged at the moment to resign at the end of 1967. That means that she loses a number of benefits; she receives no pay during the holidays; she is afraid she will have to pay back half her bond; and she complains bitterly about these deprivations that she must suffer merely because of her pregnancy. It seems to me that the policy to which Mr. Walker referred in July should cover this matter when it is introduced. Will the Minister therefore say when it is intended to announce this policy and whether it will come into operation at a time that will make it appropriate for this young lady to take advantage of it?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director-General and I have an arrangement in which, after having come to a determination of policy in regard to a matter of this sort, we agree that we should discuss the matter with the Institute of Teachers before a final pronouncement is made. Now we are at the stage when this is about to be done. I cannot give the honourable member a precise time when we will be able to implement this matter, but it will be soon. These changes of policy cannot be made to fit every circumstance: someone will not be able to come within the benefits of a particular policy. We have been trying to finalize this matter as quickly as possible. I am sure the honourable member also realizes that these matters require much consideration and cannot be undertaken hurriedly. When

this policy is announced I am sure that it will be satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Regarding the line "Free text books for primary schools, \$260,000", this is a scheme that has been brought into operation for the first time in 1967, and while it is rather difficult to tell at this stage how it is working I think the general experience of those in schools from whom I have heard is that it is working reasonably well. However, there are a couple of matters I wish to raise. As the Committee will be aware, in secondary schools a monetary grant is given for books but the scheme in the primary schools is for the physical distribution of the books themselves. I understand that this involves much clerical work and looking a long way ahead. For example, a school is requested to order at the beginning of the year the books it will need 12 months later, so that schools needing books for 1968 will have to nominate in the first term of 1967 the books they require. This cuts down the flexibility to some extent. In addition, I understand that a list of available books is distributed and that the schools must stay within that list if they are to benefit from the free books scheme. This is not often burdensome but I think I am correct in saying that for some of the private schools, which regard themselves rightly or wrongly as being rather more adventurous in their experimentations in syllabus, it means that they are to an extent restricted, because unless they bring themselves within the books on the list, they are "out" and the books must be paid for as there is no payment of cash in lieu of books. If the books on the list are not taken, the school does not obtain the benefit of the free books scheme. This can act as a brake on the flexibility that the schools previously had in respect of unfettered discretion as to the books ordered.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: He who pays the piper calls the tune.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and this could lead to an undesirable degree of standardization in books. Can the Minister say whether he is satisfied with the arrangements I have outlined? If he is not, does he propose to make any particular changes in them? The sum proposed for this year is much less than half the sum spent last year: \$260,000 as against \$585,687. No doubt this is because it is expected that a good proportion of the books will be returned after use by the children in sufficiently good condition to be reissued next year, but as one schoolmaster has put it to me, it will not be until the end of this year that the crunch will

come and the schools will be able to estimate how many of the books are fit to be re-used. Does the Minister think he has not taken a rather too optimistic view in providing so much less for this line this year than in the previous year?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Answering the last question first, no, we have made allowance for all those contingencies and I feel sure that the amount will be adequate. The honourable member must remember that while it is believed that virtually all the books will last two years, many of them, such as atlases and dictionaries, will last the whole time the student is going through the primary school. It is not a question of total replacement, say, every two years and I am satisfied that the amount allowed this year will be sufficient; in fact, compared with a monetary grant we have saved \$560,000. The first year we saved \$240,000 by comparison with what we would have paid by way of the grant to cover the normal retail cost of the books.

The honourable member has raised the question of extra clerical work because of the estimation of the books required, but the total clerical work at a school as a result of the system is less than it used to be. The teachers no longer have to worry about collecting money during the first two or three weeks of a school term. This is often a difficult process. All this has gone by the board and it outweighs any extra clerical work in estimating book requirements. In fact, the paper work by the school staff is less than it used to be and the time spent by teachers collecting money at the beginning of the term is saved. The Government arranged for the books to be handled by the Public Stores Department. The books were parcelled up into easily handled parcels; this had never been done before. Previously, in the bigger schools the books were dumped in big packages at the front door of the school and had to be unpacked, whereas now they arrive at the school in easily handled packages. Last year, almost without exception, most of the books were in the hands of the school prior to the last term. There was no delay.

Mr. Millhouse: Any problem of storage?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: No. The Public Stores Department deserves commendation for the manner in which the deliveries of books were made. Last year the schools had a choice of 63 books. There has been no interference with the work of the curriculum board and I have heard no complaints that the private schools have not had the same degree

of choice they might have had if they had bought their own books. Curriculum committees and boards are constantly revising the books: in fact, we have already changed some of the books from those on the first list in order to bring the list more up to date. There will be no interference in the choice of books by the curriculum committees and board.

Line passed.

Libraries Department, \$908,680.

Mr. HALL: In the amounts provided under the Libraries (Subsidies) Act, is provision made for an additional subsidy to the city of Salisbury towards establishing a free library at Para Hills?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As I do not have all details with me, I shall get the information for the Leader.

Mrs. BYRNE: An increase in expenditure for "Divisional librarian, librarians, etc." of \$39,942 is proposed. I presume this is because, with the opening of the State Library, additional librarians are to be engaged. Is that the position and, if it is, how many additional librarians are to be employed?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I do not have any information about additional librarians. The existing staff at present classifications totals 235 officers. The cost of the total wage rise included in the provision for salaries and wages was \$12,580. The total increase over the last year for salaries and wages was \$40,931. I will obtain the information requested by the honourable member.

Line passed.

Museum Department, \$182,350; Art Gallery Department, \$91,807; Department of Aboriginal Affairs, \$1,626,952—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$12,196,584.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I refer to an allocation of \$400 for the South Australian Division of the Arts Council of Australia. I had a letter from the Barossa Valley branch of the Arts Council of Australia asking me to support representations made by the South Australian division of the council to the Government for an increase. I believe the grant has been \$400 for several years. Unfortunately, the letter to which I have referred reached me some time after the Budget had been introduced so that I could not make any representations to the Minister before the Budget was introduced. The Arts Council exists to encourage an appreciation of the arts in all their forms and to encourage artistic expression among the people of South Australia. I understand that 11 branches have been formed in

South Australia and, with the exception of one, they are all in country towns. The following are the branches that have been formed: Central Branch, Barossa Valley, Clare, Gladstone, Loxton, Millicent, Mount Gambier, Peterborough, Port Pirie, Salisbury and Whyalla. I understand that others are likely to be formed at Yorketown, Pinnaroo, Kadina and Port Lincoln.

The work of the South Australian division in country areas is done voluntarily by committees, and it is through the work of these committees that music, drama and art are brought to country towns. I understand that the South Australian division made a request for a grant this year of about \$7,000 but unfortunately there has been no increase. I believe that in 1965 and 1966 the South Australian division sponsored the South-East Drama Festival, which it will again sponsor this year. The Director-General of Education in New South Wales (Doctor H. S. Wyndham) apparently greatly appreciates the work being done by the New South Wales division of the Arts Council, because he gives the following glowing report:

Figures indicate that upwards of 100,000 pupils, some two-thirds of total attendances, annually enjoy Arts Council performances. It is obvious that the council is playing an important role in education and it is a matter for congratulation that it is growing so surely in strength and influence. The department will take pleasure in continuing to co-operate with an enterprise which contributes so much to the cultural welfare of the State.

I understand that in New South Wales the annual grant has been \$31,000 and that the Queensland Government makes an annual grant of \$10,000 to the Arts Council. Has consideration been given to the request of the South Australian division for an increased subsidy this year? Why was the request not granted in view of the work the association is doing?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I considered the application of the Arts Council for further assistance in common with a number of other bodies under "Miscellaneous". I regret that I do not have funds available to increase the sums for many of these organizations. As a nation, we are not taking a sufficiently generous attitude towards the importance of education by providing funds. Many organizations in this list could well be helped further in the valuable work they are doing: they should have more assistance. The allocations for most of them have had to remain at a standstill this year simply because we have not had sufficient funds to provide increases.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I refer to the Institute of Technology. I have been told that teachers of domestic science in the domestic arts section have not been trained as teachers; they are specialist teachers in domestic arts, and they have been told by the department that within, I think, two years they must complete their qualifications as teachers. Several of these people are senior women, and they are concerned that they may not be able to pass this examination and so lose their status. Will the Minister consider this matter and let me have a report later?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have not heard about the matter, but I shall get a report.

Mrs. STEELE: I thank the Minister of Education for the increased grant of \$2,400 to the South Australian Oral School. This school has been treated generously by the Governments of South Australia over the years, and it appreciates that. With the increase in costs to go with specialized teaching methods, together with the specialized equipment used, particularly in education of the deaf, any help given by the Government is a great service.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For "University of Adelaide, additional purpose grant" \$7,330,000 is proposed, and for "Flinders University of South Australia" \$2,414,000 is proposed. The only significant increase in charges made by the Government in this Budget is in university fees. This is what the Treasurer said in his Financial Statement:

Approval is contemplated for the universities and the Institute of Technology to make some increase in fees operative in 1968 as a part-contribution towards the cost of increased staff salaries.

A couple of days before the Treasurer read this speech it was revealed by a reply to a question asked by the member for Torrens that it was not so much a matter of contemplating approval as of a letter to the universities suggesting that they should increase their fee. I do not criticize that procedure, which I understand has operated for some years under the Playford Government and under this Government. However, the sentence I have read hardly rings true in view of what has happened. We know, as a result of the reply to an inspired question asked by the member for Glenelg, that the increased fees will bring in almost \$300,000. This, apart from gun licences or something, is the only increase in charges being imposed in this Budget.

I consider this item a most unfortunate one in respect of which to make an increase.

This Government has rightly said much about the importance of education. We agree about the necessity to increase standards in Australia and in this State in particular. Yet, this is the only area being hit in the Budget. A few days after the announcement, the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science (Senator Gorton) visited South Australia and, in an address to the Graduates Union of the University of Adelaide, said that, even though this Government has said that the Commonwealth Government was better off by giving increases in academic salaries and then raking in the increased income tax, there was of course another way in which the Commonwealth Government contributed to this payment of increased fees, namely, through the scholarships granted by that Government. Of course, as soon as fees go up, the cost to the Commonwealth Government of scholarships goes up as well. On the Minister's own calculations, this meant a contribution of about \$150,000 by the Commonwealth, and he and the Treasurer have not bothered to point that out to the people of this State.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That is not correct.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is. I have read carefully all the statements the Minister has made about the matter, and there has never been any acknowledgment of that payment by the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth Minister has also made the point that, whenever fees are increased, because of the proportion of \$1.85 to \$1, when the component in the \$1.85 increases, the component paid by the State Government decreases. So, the increasing of fees assists the State but does not affect the Commonwealth Government's contribution. Senator Gorton made the perfectly valid point that, if fees are increased, people well below or just below the standard must experience more difficulty in attending the university. I am referring to those who do not get Commonwealth scholarships and would have to pay their own way at the university. Yet, most of these people are valuable citizens and would be more valuable if they received training at a university.

However, the Government has seen fit to increase these charges. It is rather ironic that the previous Treasurer (Hon. Frank Walsh) obviously agreed with the views expressed by Senator Gorton, because in December last year he said that his Government would rather go further into debt than raise university or hospital fees. However, his successor, himself a graduate of the Adelaide University, after

being in office for a few weeks caused the fees at both our universities to be increased. Of course, the Minister of Education could not resist replying to Senator Gorton by means of a reply to an inspired question by the member for Glenelg. That is at page 1822 of *Hansard*. In his answer he trotted out what is obviously the case, that the Commonwealth gets back in income tax a good proportion of the increase in academic salaries, but he did not point out that unless we are to pay fairly substantial or generous academic salaries we shall not get staff in our universities. This is a matter of world-wide supply and demand. It is difficult enough in Australia to keep our own academic staff and to bring people from overseas. Unless the salaries we pay are comparable with those to be earned overseas, we shall not get the right people, so there is really no alternative to raising these salaries. The same is true for other sections of the community.

After the Minister had answered the question from the member for Glenelg, I asked him (because he had referred to the special relief granted by the Government, following the lead of the Playford Government, to students who could not meet their financial commitments at the university) what proportion of students who would have to pay the increased fees were likely to qualify for that assistance. He did not answer that question (nor did he offer to get the answer to it) but he gave figures showing that the amount spent by the Government in the last few years was mere peanuts compared with the fees now proposed for the students.

The Government pays lip service to education, but has not done very much for tertiary education. The Minister can laugh—I hope he will answer me in due course. In fact, I shall be glad of his answers to a few things I have to say, because they may show that I am mistaken. We hear a lot about the previous Government. It is a pity that the member for Unley, who is a member of the Council of the Flinders University, does not acknowledge—

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he is restricted to discussing university grants.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know how far he is going into policy, past and present, but he is restricted to the lines and the amounts set out for the year 1967-68.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you. My point is that these amounts are not enough. I hope I have made it clear.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has made it clearer now than he did just now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was about to develop the point that the Playford Government made a magnificent beginning to the Flinders University. This has been acknowledged by the Australian Universities Commission, which refers in complimentary terms to the way in which the Flinders University project was begun by the Playford Government. It is, of course, notorious that Flinders University is the only new university in Australia that has had a proper and well-planned beginning—indeed, a copybook beginning, all done under the Premiership of Sir Thomas Playford. Where is the hall of residence? We could have applied for assistance from the Commonwealth Government through the Australian Universities Commission, provided we had been prepared to match the grant. We were not, and we know that the plans for the hall of residence at Flinders University are in somebody's drawer there because the authorities cannot go ahead: they have not the money and we lost the opportunity to get it in this triennium.

The position of the University of Adelaide is worse than at Flinders University. I do not know whether the Minister receives the Adelaide University Graduates' Union *Gazette* or, if he does, whether he has read the issue for September, 1967, because therein appears an article headed "Notes on the University's financial position", written by the Registrar, Mr. V. A. Edgeloe. This is what he says about this triennium—and the lines we are considering are for one-third of the triennium:

It is, of course, generally known that the university has entered upon a three-year period of financial stringency. But it would appear that, even within the university, the extent of the recession in the university's growth and development is not fully understood and appreciated. The purpose of these notes is simply to state the figures and the facts.

For the 1964-6 triennium the university submitted a minimum programme for North Terrace and the Waite Institute because it appreciated the heavy demands that would be placed upon the State's resources in providing for the new institution at Bedford Park, then part of the University of Adelaide and now the Flinders University of South Australia. Consequently, there was considerable backlog to be taken into account when the submission for the 1967-9 triennium was being considered.

The Australian Universities Commission recommended a capital programme of

\$7,120,000 plus \$300,000 for the computer, for North Terrace and the Waite Institute; the amount finally approved was \$2,968,000 of which \$1,972,000 had already been committed on the law school, the teaching area in the dental hospital, and the C.D.C. 6400 computer. Only two new buildings can be begun during the current triennium, and each must be only a small part of a larger concept to be achieved later.

Then later he said:

Projects recommended by the A.U.C. which have had to be completely set aside for the current triennium are a new floor on the organic chemistry building, extensive alterations in the mathematics building, extensions to the union buildings and the facilities of the sports association, a new block of laboratories at the Waite Institute, extensions to the central animal house, and the bringing of Martindale Hall into operation as a residential centre for schools, seminars and field work and as a camp site.

But perhaps the greatest loss to the university as a whole is the extension of the Barr Smith Library for which the A.U.C. had recommended \$2,000,000. What the library will get from the various make-shift arrangements made or planned for it is probably less than 10 per cent of the accommodation that had been recommended for it.

The next heading is "Revenue". I propose only to give the main points to show what is happening at the University of Adelaide.

The Registrar's report, under the heading "Revenue", stated:

The Commission recommended a total income from Commonwealth and State grants and fees of \$28,198,000 for the triennium; the sum approved is \$26,120,000.

According to the Registrar, two decisions had to be made:

They were (i) that the existing staff establishment should be maintained and existing staff-members' reasonable expectations of promotion provided for, and (ii) that the necessary cuts be made in non-human items of expenditure.

The report continued:

Two other staff matters also had to be provided for: substantially increased salary scales for ancillary staff as a result of court awards relating to the basic wage and margins, and achievement of "equal pay" in 1971 by an initial instalment in 1967 followed by four more each of \$100 a year beginning in 1968. The great cuts were made in the budgets for building repairs and maintenance, for equipment and furniture, and in research. The figures for building repairs and maintenance had been \$239,000 in 1964, \$222,000 in 1965, and \$235,000 in 1966. The figure budgeted for 1967 is \$150,000. Similarly for equipment and furniture: \$417,000 in 1964, \$285,000 in 1965, \$265,000 in 1966, and \$197,000 (estimate) in 1967.

That is the position, and I remind the Committee of figures quoted 12 months ago of

the total to be taken up by this State, in comparison with other States, in the present triennium. They show that South Australia is doing less than any other State: capital expenditure in South Australia for 1964-66, in the approved programme, was \$11,366,000. The recommendation for this triennium was \$17,290,000, and the proposed programme was \$8,206,000, of which the Commonwealth Government was paying half. Our proportion is about half of the recommended proportion, but the other States are much higher in proportion to what was recommended, and in every other case higher than the actual approved programme in 1964-66. Yet, this is the only area in which the Government increased charges in this Budget. The situation shows that, whatever the Government states about its interest in tertiary education, it is not prepared to help when the need arises.

How many members have studied the Commonwealth Government's Universities (Financial Assistance) Act, 1966? If members consider the Fifth Schedule they will note that the sum allocated to South Australia for teaching hospitals is significantly less than that given to any other State in this triennium. The Minister could say that the amounts recommended by the Australian Universities Commission are those given, but we know that unless an application is made to the commission it does not consider the matter. The Fifth Schedule contained in this Commonwealth Act of Parliament shows that in this triennium for New South Wales, \$900,000 is the maximum Commonwealth contribution on a \$1 for \$1 basis; in Victoria the total is \$673,300; in Queensland, \$269,300; in South Australia, it is a miserable \$92,500; in Western Australia, because that State is building a medical school, it is \$795,000; and in Tasmania it is \$780,000. All those figures have to be matched on a \$1 for \$1 basis. We know that all the States are in financial straits but our sum is significantly less (absolutely as well as comparatively) than that of all the other States.

There may be some good reason why no application was made in this triennium for the commencement of the teaching hospital at the Flinders University, and I am open to information from the Minister on that. However, in view of the answers given by the Minister this afternoon on the position in the medical school at the Adelaide University where for many years, the Minister told me with some glee, half the applicants have been turned away, one would have thought that rather earlier than this the present Government

could take some steps to get a bit of dough from the Commonwealth Government for teaching hospital purposes. Money is available, and I have no doubt it would have been available had the application been made. But no application has been made in this triennium, and that is the excuse given. Yet the total sum South Australia is getting from the Commonwealth for teaching hospitals is mere peanuts compared with the sums being received by the other States. I protest most vigorously at the way in which this Government regards the universities of South Australia.

This Government inherited a pretty satisfactory situation: we had the model down at Bedford Park (as it was then called), and all this Government has done is to pass the Act that made the Flinders University separate, something with which I agreed, I may say. All the hard work had been done and the money spent by the time this Government came into office. This is a sorry state of affairs and I therefore protest most emphatically that this is the only area (university fees) in which the Government has seen fit to raise charges in this Budget.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The member for Mitcham has made a long speech along precisely the same lines, of course, as other speeches he has made within the last fortnight. The matter of teaching hospitals having been dealt with adequately by the Treasurer, I do not intend to traverse it tonight. The honourable member outlined the position of the Adelaide University but he failed to wind up his remarks with what would have been a most appropriate statement: if he had been politically honest, he would have said that all the States found themselves in difficulties about providing sufficient funds for education; and (again, if he had been politically honest) he would have gone on to say that this situation clearly showed the need of the States for further assistance for education from the Commonwealth Government. The honourable member by simply separating the universities as he has done and treating them in isolation instead of viewing them in conjunction with all the other costs of education is putting only one side of the picture.

I believe he is well aware that in this State since 1945 the enrolments in schools have increased by 198 per cent, which is double the increase in New South Wales and compares with the Australian average of 117 per cent. This has largely come about because we have accepted a far higher proportion of migrants to our population than has any other State—15

per cent, whereas we have only about 9½ per cent of the Commonwealth's population. That, combined with the greatly increased retention rate in the secondary schools, has placed an enormous strain on the resources of the Education Department. It is nonsense to talk about universities in isolation as if they had been badly treated. In fact, the increase in running expenses for the tertiary institutions in South Australia from 1962-63 to 1967-68, as proposed, is about 110 per cent, whereas for the Education Department itself the increase is only 69 per cent.

So, by comparison, the universities have been particularly well treated. I am not saying that they have had anything like sufficient funds, but it is obvious that the State, which is now spending 24.9 per cent of its total financial resources on education, simply cannot go any further and take money away from other departments. The honourable member knows this perfectly well. He is just putting up a lot of political propaganda, knowing that he will get a good report in the press tomorrow. This is the usual thing that goes on in this sort of situation. He is not prepared to face up to the full situation and be politically honest. If the honourable member and his friends in the Opposition were prepared to face up to the situation they would have been behind me last year when I was waging a campaign with other interested bodes for further assistance from the Commonwealth Government for education. That campaign has now begun to bear fruit, but all I got at the time from members of the Opposition, such as the member for Mitcham, were sneers and criticism.

Mr. Millhouse: No.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: In fact, one Commonwealth member went so far as to say of the honourable member's Party that South Australia was not pulling its weight in proportion to its budget for education. When I had the figures checked by the Treasury officials (the same ones who served the previous Government) and when they were taken as a proportion of the Budget, our expenditure on education was the second highest in Australia. We are certainly pulling our weight. The Ministers of Education have been meeting over the last two and a half years, and at the meetings I have attended the emphasis has all been on assistance from the Commonwealth Government in regard to teacher education and tertiary education and all the Ministers have been unanimous that the policy of having to provide \$1.85 for each \$1 that the Commonwealth Government provides is nonsense. It

is like offering a small boy 50c when you know he has only 5c in his pocket, provided he can find \$1. It is equally ridiculous, and the member for Mitcham knows it.

Mr. Millhouse: It's recommended by the Universities Commission.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: If the honourable member cares to talk to the university officials, including the vice-chancellors, in South Australia, he will find that they are completely in accord with what I am saying: they agree that the policy of matching grants to which we are now tied is completely unrealistic. I challenge the honourable member to get the opinions of the two vice-chancellors here. I suppose he presumes to be speaking for the universities this evening.

Mr. Millhouse: No.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: He is completely out of line with their viewpoint on this matter. He had a lot to say about the increase in fees. He suggests we are unsympathetic to university students. Let it be made clear that the proposal to advance the academic salaries came first from the Commonwealth Government, the State taking the view that if all the other States fell into line so would this State. We never had a reply to that point from the Commonwealth Government. At the time, I again raised with Senator Gorton the question of the State's being obliged to find \$1.85 for every \$1 that the Commonwealth provided for a current expenditure. I also had no reply to that. In other words, the State was faced with greatly increased costs in regard to academic salaries.

The honourable member knows full well that last year, when all other States raised the fees of university students, this Government refrained from doing so and, by our action, we not only helped the students but we also helped the Commonwealth Government incidentally because it did not have to cover the increase in fees in the Commonwealth scholarships it provides. I do not think the honourable member will contradict that. He tried to present a case suggesting that we are unsympathetic to the students: I believe what I have said shows that we were sympathetic to them.

I remind honourable members that, when it came into office, this Government approximately doubled the amount available to students under the fees concession scheme, which came into being under the Playford Government. What is more, we made a concession to students from country areas to offset the disadvantage they faced in having to come

to the city, yet members opposite profess to always represent the people in country areas. In 1957, the previous Government increased university fees by 90 per cent in one hit; in 1960, it increased them by 30 per cent; in 1963, by 33 per cent; and in 1965, by 33 per cent. We refrained from increasing fees last year when we would have been well justified in doing so on the economic situation. Now we suggest an increase of 15 per cent compared with previous increases by the honourable member's Party of anything from 33 per cent to 90 per cent; yet the honourable members has the gall to suggest that we are unsympathetic to university students.

The honourable member also had some sarcastic remarks to make about what he had said to me concerning the proportion of students to whom we gave assistance under the fees concession scheme. Contrary to what the honourable member suggested, I had taken the trouble to ascertain the relevant information, but of course the honourable member did not have sufficient patience and had to indulge in his usually sarcastic comment before I had a chance to give him the information. However, we are accustomed to that style. In fact, in 1967, 220 full-time students out of 1,412 full-time students paying their own fees were granted assistance. This number represents 15.6 per cent of the full-time students at the university paying their own fees. The honourable member knows perfectly well that the fees concession scheme applies to full-time and part-time students at the three tertiary institutions who do not get assistance by way of Commonwealth scholarships or from industry or some other organization that assists students to go to the university. In other words, all the students that do not get help of that kind are eligible to apply to the fees concession scheme for help.

Let us see what is the means test in regard to that scheme to see how many students are being prevented from going to the university because of increased fees. It is about time we had a realistic look at the situation instead of listening to all the poppycock voiced by the honourable member. For metropolitan students maximum assistance is given when the adjusted family income is \$2,000 a year or less. As the adjusted family income increases above \$2,000 the fees concession decreases in direct proportion until no concession is given at an adjusted family income of \$4,400 or more.

For students from the country a concession of \$200 is given when the adjusted family income is between \$4,400 and \$5,000. For an adjusted

family income between \$5,001 and \$6,900 there is a proportionate reduction in the \$200. When the adjusted family income is less than \$4,400 a year the concession is \$200 on account of country home residence plus the proportion of the balance of his tuition and general service fees to which the student would have been entitled if his home residence had been in the metropolitan area. I suggest that, under this and all other schemes for assisting students by scholarships and other means, few students are prevented from going to the university by their financial circumstances.

Mr. Millhouse: There should not be any!

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That may be so, and if the honourable member thinks that perhaps he can explain why his Party slapped the fees up by as much as 90 per cent in one hit.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I regret the heat with which the Minister has answered me, and I also regret his unpleasant personal references to me. There are just two points I desire to make in reply to him. He should know (and I think it only fair that he should acknowledge, because of his strictures on the Commonwealth) that the Commonwealth in this triennium is increasing its assistance to the universities of the States by \$120,000,000.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I am well aware of that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a pity that the Minister did not say so.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I have said so publicly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That was not the tenor of the Minister's remarks a few moments ago when he was critical of the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It still isn't enough.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Commonwealth has increased its grants to State universities to \$512,000,000 in this triennium, and that amount is only \$56,000,000 less than the total recommended by the Universities Commission. That should be borne in mind when the Minister attacks the Commonwealth on this issue. It is easy for this Government to blame the Commonwealth Government for all its financial difficulties. There is no-one here to reply on behalf of the Commonwealth, but these figures speak for themselves. What also speaks for itself is that South Australia has taken a smaller proportion of the amounts recommended by the Universities Commission than has any other State.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You have said that already.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and that speaks for itself. The Minister cannot get around it. Every other State was able to do much better than South Australia did this year, and that is the comparison that counts. The Minister has said, as he has said before in Parliament, that the basis of contribution of \$1.85 by the State and \$1 by the Commonwealth is absurd. However, that is the proportion recommended by the Universities Commission, as shown in the report of October, 1960. I understand that this is still the proportion recommended. I do not blame the Minister for wanting more, because everyone wants more. However, whether one is right in wanting more is another matter. If the Minister considers that this proportion is wrong, let him recommend a change to the Universities Commission. This is what the commission says in chapter IV of its report:

The total of the first and second level recurrent grant recommended for each university is uniformly in the ratio of £1 from the Commonwealth to every £1.85 received by each university from fees and State grants. That, of course, is only recurrent expenditure. We should emphasize that the Commonwealth already pays \$1 for \$1 on capital grants.

Mr. McKee: It should pay more.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For some things there is no requirement for a matching State grant for recurrent expenditure. The Minister does not know about that because we have not a hall of residence for Flinders University since this Government was not prepared to provide anything to build one.

Mr. COUMBE: If we can get more money from the Commonwealth, well and good. If we can improve this subsidy of \$1 for \$1.85, it will be worth while. It is the Australian Universities Commission, not the Commonwealth Government, that does this. However, I am led to believe that this ratio may be bettered soon. Because of that, we should acknowledge what the Commonwealth is doing this year, especially the increase over last year. We should like to see more, but at least let us be grateful and acknowledge the increase granted by the Commonwealth, because some schemes undertaken in this State last year and presently being undertaken and planned would never have got off the ground if the Commonwealth had not aided us.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I have publicly acknowledged that.

Mr. COUMBE: These comments are being made here this evening. I draw attention to

the fact that this acknowledgment should be made publicly and that not only the Minister but also other members opposite should stop sniping at the Commonwealth. The member for Port Pirie is probably the most vociferous member in this regard. The question of fee increases has been raised. These were proposed by the Treasurer because of the increases that were to take place in academic salaries. Obviously, if the fees are to be increased, the grants to the universities should be adjusted. They will get a greater income. Why is it that the general purposes grant for the University of Adelaide is not increased by the State for this year? I understand that the Flinders University grant must increase because of the greater activity there at the moment, with increasing numbers of students. The University of Adelaide will have greater income because of the fee increases. The Minister has announced the amount. Is there some reason why the general purposes grant to the University of Adelaide this year is about square with what it was last year (it is increased by only \$16,525)? I assume that there are increases apart from the academic salaries, which would be of some magnitude. Why has this line not been increased?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Flinders University is to receive a substantial increase, because it is a young and growing university. The amount finally allocated to the universities results from a conference between officials of the universities and the Treasury, and after considering the sum available. The details are fully discussed before a final decision is made.

Mr. Coumbe: The Treasury says, "That is all we have, and that is all you can get"?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That is so. That is what any responsible Government would have to do in this situation. We have been told that we should publicly express our appreciation of the Commonwealth Government's action. Recently, I said that I appreciated what that Government had done and that I thought the 1966 campaign was bearing fruit. The Commonwealth Government is providing this State with \$3,200,000 for teacher education in the next triennium, and this will enable us to have the Northern Teachers College two years before it would otherwise be available. If all honourable members believe in education receiving what it requires, they cannot be content with the present situation. No-one has complained about the percentage increase of expenditure on education that has been made available in these Estimates.

However, that increase will meet the normal growth only; it will not do the things that all members want done. The member for Mitcham has complained that school windows are not being cleaned, but he does not suggest other economies that he would rather have, because he is not game to suggest them. He wants us to spend more money, but he would complain if the State had a larger deficit. Every member wants more money allocated to education, and rightly so, but whence is the money coming? We are spending one-quarter of the State's total finances on education, and we cannot do any more without being utterly ridiculous and spending less on something else.

Mr. COURCE: Last year \$7,390,000 was allocated to the Adelaide University but the actual expenditure was \$7,346,525. Apparently, the university was told that it could not get new equipment and could not expand. Is this the result of the conference held between officers of the Treasury and the university?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Not having taken part in the conversations, I cannot answer the question but what the honourable member has said is probably true in this respect: the university has had to curtail some of its activities. That is obvious, and it is all the more reason for supporting the ideas I am advancing this evening: that we need more money and must get it from elsewhere. If honourable members are honest about wanting these things for the universities, let them say how the money can be obtained elsewhere.

Mrs. BYRNE: Referring to "Miscellaneous", I ask the Minister of Education how the department came to be associated with making grants of \$160 and \$300 respectively to the J. M. Reid and J. D. Brown playgrounds.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This relates to special circumstances in which we have the use of these playgrounds because the school-grounds are insufficient. We contribute towards the playgrounds because we use them to provide additional space.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister chided members of the Opposition with not acknowledging the fact that we are spending more and more on education. I remind him of the figures given by the Auditor-General at page 68 of his report concerning tertiary education: in 1966-67 we spent absolutely less than we had in 1965-66. That is not a matter for congratulation. The 1964-65 figure of \$11,758,666 relates to the year partly in which the previous Liberal Government was in

office. In 1965-66 the figure rose to \$13,873,072, and then it went down to \$11,133,789. Taking the Commonwealth's share out of that, one sees that the figure dropped from \$7,633,308 in 1965-66 to \$6,752,395 in 1966-67. These are not matters and figures for congratulation: rather, they are the reverse.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF LABOUR AND INDUSTRY

Department of Labour and Industry,
\$481,560.

Mr. HALL: I refer under "Inspectorial Branch" to the Chief Inspector of Factories, etc., and also to industrial safety. A gentleman came to my office this morning, referring to a personal situation not for his own benefit but because his case, if properly taken to heart by the department, might prevent further illness occurring in his particular trade. The gentleman was a joiner, having spent the whole of his working life, from the time of his apprenticeship, in that trade. Over the last several years, he developed a bad lung complaint and an allergy, was severely ill for over a year, and he was told that, if he did not leave his trade, he would not live much longer. His doctor has written a report saying that he has an allergy to wood dust and to the gaseous materials generated from the heat emanating from wood-working machinery. This has developed over probably 10 or 15 years and has left him seriously ill for a considerable period.

This man maintains that the woodwork factories in South Australia, in common with many others throughout the world, some years ago were using large machines that had full pneumatic disposal systems for wood dust and any gaseous material, but in the last 15 years or so many new machines have been brought into use. One man attends one machine. The machines are smaller and more convenient but many of them do not have dust disposal units. This man believes that a new danger exists for employees in a number of joinery factories because of the use of this modified machine. It takes many years for the allergy and illness to develop. This man states that after a long time in the trade others will be affected unless more stringent precautions are taken. I ask the Minister to take up this matter with his colleague.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$15,490—passed.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF
FORESTS

Minister of Agriculture Department, \$20,959—passed.

Agriculture Department, \$2,396,805.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Today's *Advertiser* contains a letter setting out the heavy cost that has been brought about in the egg industry from the use of compulsory containers. The article states that the increased cost a dozen is 3.8c of which the consumer is obliged to pay 3c and the producer .8c. What is the purpose of developing an industry if steps are taken to make it unprofitable and to make its produce beyond the purchasing power of consumers?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hughes): To what line is the honourable member speaking?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If I can have a few minutes, I shall find the line.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: About seven months ago, I asked the Minister to make a statement on the results of a survey being conducted by the Director of Agriculture, under the instructions of the Minister, into the poultry industry. When I asked the Minister for a report from the Director, he could not reply. However, during the recess I received the following letter which the Minister wrote to me but which he attributed to the Director:

The poultry section and the agricultural economics section of this department commenced a poultry farm management study on July 1, 1965. It is not a survey of poultry farms. A survey would require a far greater number of farms and the method of selection would be on a different basis to the method used in this instance. This is the first study of its kind conducted in South Australia. Its aims are to obtain economic data on the operation of specially selected farms, compare management systems and the related efficiencies. Ultimately the information obtained will form the basis for sound extension work. A total of 12 farms is under study. Figures derived during the first year's operation have been analysed and a comprehensive report is expected to be available about the middle of 1967. Being an initial attempt, several problems have had to be ironed out and as a result of the lengthy, exacting compilation required the publication of the results has been delayed.

The Director said that the report on the poultry industry would be released about July, 1967. The report has still not come to hand. The Minister must take full responsibility for the conduct of his department. The egg industry is one of the most important aspects of his portfolio. However, he is not taking interest in the survey and does not seem to want to make the results public. I suggest that he his shielding

behind the Director and trying to slide out from under the egg industry. I think he realizes that he has made such a mess of the egg marketing policy decisions that he has taken during his Ministry that he is deliberately stalling publication of this report. What other reason could there be for delaying the publication for so long?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the member for Gumeracha, I point out that I have looked at the lines and, if he wishes to continue in connection with the item regarding the Director of Agriculture on page 77, he may do so.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall first hear what the Minister has to say.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): The member for Light has indulged in quite a display of histrionics. It seems that he is an impatient young man.

Mr. Freebairn: Why don't you issue the report?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: If the honourable member is patient, I shall tell him. I have never hidden behind anyone in my life and I shall not do so on this matter. Much more may be involved in this report than the honourable member realizes. The report will be released soon but the honourable member has no need to carry on as he has done tonight. I think he is insolent. If he wants assistance from me I am happy to give it, but I do not appreciate the attitude that he has displayed tonight.

Mrs. STEELE: I consider it proper that some tribute should be paid in relation to the work done on behalf of country women throughout South Australia by officers of the Women's Agricultural Bureau. I think I can almost claim to be a member of the bureau, because I have been associated with it since 1948, not in the capacity of a country woman but as one who has spoken at its annual conferences and been associated with the organization in other ways.

During the years I have observed what the bureau has done for country women in developing their capacity for leadership and in giving extension courses that have been of much value on the farms. The knowledge they have gained through regional conference has been of much help to their husbands. The annual congresses, with which the present and former Ministers of Agriculture have been closely associated, have been a credit to the organizational skill of the extension officers. I have been associated with four of these officers. They are Miss Gardner, the late Miss Marshall, Miss Hastie, and

the present officer, Miss Jean Wood. It is right that someone should pay tribute not only to the officers of that department but also to the many country women who have come to the fore as a result of their association with the bureau and established themselves as leaders of the community in the districts in which they serve.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Forestry should be encouraged on private farm land. We have discussed this matter previously in the Loan Estimates to the extent of my questioning the Minister about some aspects of finance for private forestry, but we have not discussed it from the point of view of the Agriculture Department. Forestry in good conditions can produce so much that it would almost exceed the production of any kind of grazing land. Many farms are situated in areas where forestry would be suitable, where varieties of trees are available in respect of which we know the techniques of planting and growing. In these circumstances, farms could well be encouraged to grow pine trees or some other type of tree of economic value. I know there are some objections to this—for instance, that income tax becomes a problem if a person plants trees and harvests them all in one or two years. Other problems concern probate and allied matters. However, if a farmer sets out to establish forests by increasing the number of trees on a yearly basis by some planned schedule, he can in time become a farmer of trees just as he would be a farmer of other products. Then, the effect of income tax being levied in one year would be eliminated by the fact that in time the forests would become harvested regularly, too. There is nothing new about this. There should be an aggressive advisory system to put these facts before the farmers to help them make up their minds to indulge in forestry on land suitable for trees and not necessarily suitable for normal farm production. Under most conditions steep country will grow trees as well as level country will grow them, but it is inconvenient for normal farming. Some farmers are planting pine trees in order to build up a permanent forest so that the next generation will harvest and replenish it, but farmers doing that have been trained either in forestry or have had an occupational association with it. We should introduce a proper forestry advisory service so that a farmer could obtain from the Woods and Forests Department much information about the suitability of soils and other necessary details: this service is available today, but we

should improve it, and tell farmers that it is available. We lead the Commonwealth Government in forest-growing techniques, but we need more forestry production and should expand our advisory services to farmers, preferably in the Agriculture Department.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Auditor-General's Report states that last year the Egg Board received 1,818,000 dozen more eggs than it received the previous year, and that the total number of eggs delivered was 9,687,000 dozen. According to the report, Australian sales dropped by 10 per cent to 6,722,000 dozen eggs, despite an increase in sales by the board of 16 per cent. The sum required from the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities plan for reimbursements towards losses on local pulp, export sales and freight, etc., rose to \$1,099,900, compared with \$538,600 in the previous year. In other words, the losses under this scheme have doubled in one year, largely because of a sharp fall in sales. In those circumstances, is it appropriate to increase the cost of a dozen eggs by 3c through the marketing policy of providing a container that no-one except the Egg Board seems to require? Why does the Egg Board demand an expensive container that no-one wants?

Further, although producers and storekeeper agents have not been required to do so, producer agents are still required to pay the levy which, according to the Auditor-General, was not less than \$59,000. Therefore, the board's surplus was completely provided by the levies paid by producer agents. Will the Minister explain these matters?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Although there is no line in the Estimates for the Egg Board, I will answer the queries. The Egg Board is a statutory board over which the Department of Agriculture has no control. No officer of the department is concerned in running it. The board has its own producer-elected members, who constitute a majority. If the producers do not want the non-returnable containers they should so instruct their representatives on the board.

South Australia was the only State without the non-returnable carton, which has been accepted by every other State on health grounds. Some of the returnable cartons have been returned in a filthy condition and some have even been used in the feeding of animals. The sale of eggs is an important part of the poultry industry, but there has been a decline in the egg market, possibly because of the way in which the eggs have been presented for

sale. A campaign to sell more eggs has been commenced, and the introduction of non-returnable cartons is one aspect of it. This matter will be kept under review to see how it works. The whole purpose of this measure is to bring this State into line with other States on the recommendation of people who should know.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister indicate the composition of the Egg Board? He maintains that there is a grower majority on the board, but I understand that this is not so as the Chairman, who is appointed by the Government, has a casting vote.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Egg Board has three producer members, one member representing the grading agent, and one representing the resellers. The Chairman is appointed by the Governor. To the best of my knowledge, the Chairman has never exercised his right to a deliberative vote. Because of that, the growers have a three to two majority on the floor of the board; surely that means they have a majority on the board.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Minister did not represent the true position. He said that three members of the board are elected by poultry farmers, but only one member is, in fact, elected by the poultry farmers, the other two members having their terms of office arbitrarily extended by the Minister, supported by members of his Party. I recall that last year Opposition members vigorously opposed this arbitrary way of extending the term of office of two members of the board, but the Minister, because he had the weight of numbers behind him, carried the day. Therefore, only one member of the board can be said to have a democratic basis of election.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: That is a misrepresentation of the truth, and the honourable member does not know what he is talking about if he talks in that vein.

Mr. McAnaney: Nor do you.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This provision was requested for the producers by all the organizations associated with the industry.

Mr. Freebairn: Which ones?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member knows that I refer to Red Comb Egg Co-operative Society Ltd., the Australian Primary Producers Association and the hatcherymen's association. These organizations were referred to when the legislation was before the Chamber. Also, this provision was not only carried by members of this Party but also by the Legislative Council which has

16 members of the Liberal and Country League and four members of the Labor Party.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister consider the suggestion I made just now about forestry advisory services for farmers?

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Yes.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I feel let down. Having submitted a proposal such as this and having had the Minister challenge my right even to discuss it, I am now given a one word reply, the Minister interjecting from his seat. Does the Minister mean "Yes" in the serious sense or is he trying to brush me off?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am not in the habit of brushing anyone off.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I refer to the provision for "Sims farm bequest—expenses of vermin and weed control". Although I appreciate that this farm has been a problem for the Government, it seems rather odd that the Government should have to bear the expense of vermin and weed control. As this property was leased, surely the responsibility for these matters could have been included in the terms of the lease.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is a term of the lease that the vermin and pest control is borne by the department. This is probably brought about because of the relatively low return made by share-farmers of the farm.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: A part of the farm is held by the Government as a reserve. Probably most of the expense is incurred there.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I refer to the provision for "Fruit fly control (including road blocks)". Last year \$34,280 was provided and \$46,425 was spent. This year \$37,000 is provided—\$9,425 less than last year's expenditure. Is it intended to reduce the number of road blocks, or to reduce the effectiveness of the road blocks? I should strongly oppose any reduction in the number.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The amount provided this year has been increased. The reason for the increased expenditure last year was that an outbreak that occurred at Devon Park on January 1 last involved extra costs and we had to get an excess warrant. This year we are providing about \$3,000 more in connection with administration, road blocks, etc.

Mr. NANKIVELL: For many years I have been concerned about the travelling expenses on all items except extension services. Last year the expenditure on the extension services

exceeded the amount provided but the provision this year is \$307 less than last year's expenditure. Constituents have told me that the services are necessary but that they are not obtained easily. Officers become centralized and do not frequently visit remote parts of their districts. When assistance is sought the people are told that an officer can go to the district concerned only when he has to see two or three people. Travelling can be costly but, while it is the accepted policy of the Government that these services are to be free, I am concerned about their curtailment.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The amount provided this year is about the same as that provided last year. There were added expenses last year, and these were met in accordance with the usual procedure. Only this year the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) in a question on notice asked me about the travelling time and the distances travelled; they were in excess of those for previous years. Some work needs to be done as regards extension officers and their travelling. Sometimes the type of call they get is unwarranted. There was once a request to go a long distance to inspect something that could have been inspected on a routine visit, and money was wasted. It was not an urgent case and could have been attended to when the officer was in the area. This sort of thing can easily be overcome by co-operation and common sense. An urgency call has never been refused. In fact, I have had to sign dockets after a case to give an officer authority to go there. I have never hesitated to do that.

Mr. NANKIVELL: An instruction is always issued to officers to keep their travelling to a minimum. This is nothing new, but this is a free service accepted by this section of the public. While it is free, it is almost impossible for private practitioners to enter this field. Although there are cases where travelling is unnecessary and some calls are not warranted, there are some cases of urgency that cannot be met. A few hundred miles may be travelled on a relatively unimportant matter, whereas in an important case an officer cannot make the journey because he is restricted to a certain mileage. If he has exceeded his quota for the month, he cannot go until the next month's mileage is available. A free service has to be adequate, or it should not exist as such.

Mr. McANANEY: As the mileage allowances payable to officers have been increased a little over the last month or two, will that

mean considerably less mileage being covered this year than last year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister says that, because of an outbreak of fruit fly last year, the extra money granted was to control that outbreak. If that is the explanation of the reduction this year, what is the item "Fruit Fly control" under "Horticulture Branch" where \$215,000 was voted last year, \$185,508 was spent last year and \$179,257 is proposed this year? Why is the provision for road blocks being reduced?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The allocation of \$179,257 for fruit fly control covers the completion of eradication measures in the Devon Park area; road blocks at Yamba, Ceduna, and Cockburn; lure traps; and salaries of inspectors at the airport and on railway services. The line "Fruit Fly Control (including road blocks)", proposed at \$37,000, covers eradication measures, following the outbreak on January 30, 1967, at Devon Park, to continue until September 29, 1967. It also covers the maintenance of road blocks and inspection procedures. The difference is between maintenance and payment of staff. The major portion of the allocation of \$179,257 is for payment of staff associated with covering road blocks, lures, and the depot at Glenside, in addition to inspectors employed at the airport and on railway services. It is a general administration charge. Two lines have always been included on the Estimates—one is for administration and the other for maintenance.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: What has been the incidence of pleuro-pneumonia in the last 12 months, and what progress is being made in the Australia-wide programme to eradicate this disease?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This is a joint scheme between the States and the Commonwealth, and each State contributes proportionately. One outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia occurred at Innamincka and the cattle were sold in Queensland markets. The case was proved and the cattle were quarantined, but this was the only incident that occurred prior to the current financial year.

Line passed.

Agricultural College Department, \$352,750.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister say whether the \$19,000 increase under "Salaries and wages" is the result of the filling of outstanding vacancies at the college or whether it represents an overall increase in the salaries of officers?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The increase applies to both.

Line passed.

Produce Department, \$662,487; Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation, \$171,493; Chemistry Department, \$207,368—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$1,418,063.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In 1966-67, \$10,000 having been voted under "Advances to Citrus Organization Committee", no actual payments were made, and \$25,000 is provided this year. Will the Minister say how that committee is to be financed on a permanent basis?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is intended that the committee be financed out of the sums collected from the industry itself. Although \$10,000 was allocated last year, the sum was not used because a record crop was experienced and that resulted in more income than was expected. However, as a light crop is being experienced this year, and as the income will therefore not be as great, the committee has asked that this sum be placed on the Estimates in case it desires to draw on it. It is a loan, and is returnable.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Will the Minister explain why \$3,000 has been provided under the item "Committee of inquiry into wholesale marketing—expenses"?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The committee was appointed by the Government to ascertain whether it was desirable for the wholesale fruit and vegetable market to continue operations at its present location. As there will be a need for interstate travel, the Government considered it desirable to provide for out-of-pocket expenses.

Mrs. STEELE: As no provision is made this year as a subsidy to the Volunteer Fire-fighters' Fund (\$2,000 having been provided last year), and as volunteer fire fighters perform a magnificent service, will the Minister explain the omission?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The fund was so buoyant that it was considered unnecessary to include the sum this year.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister say whence the money is now coming to subsidize councils in the control of weeds on travelling stock routes?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The sum has been transferred to an earlier line.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister explain how the \$50,000 allocated under "Bushfire Research Committee—demonstrations and research" is to be spent? The committee has had heavy allocations for several years. The committee has developed land and provided large scale demonstrations

of how land can be protected in the South-East and the Adelaide Hills.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It will be spent the same as in every other year. Publicity plays an important part in educating the public as to the danger of bushfires. The committee does experimental work, one of the most outstanding examples of which was carried out at Marble Hill. The money is spent on road signs, cleaning-up work and on educating people by posters, Smokey the bear and other promotional activities. After the recent bushfire in Tasmania we showed some Tasmanian people what we did. They were impressed and went back with ideas that they intended to carry out.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Regarding the line "Repairs to fishing boat slipways, ramps and facilities", \$700 was voted last year but only \$32 was spent; this year \$500 is proposed. One of the most important things we can do to assist the fishing industry is to keep maintained the facilities that have been established. The Marine and Harbors Department is interested more in providing harbours that are profitable than in providing facilities for fishermen which are not profitable and for which the collection of the dues is almost impossible. Many years ago the Government stopped collecting these dues because the cost of collection was more than the amount returned. The sum of \$700 proposed last year was small enough, but only \$32 was spent. This year, the Minister, who claims to be a friend of the fishing industry, has reduced the allocation to \$500. This reduction has been made despite the fact that the Fishing Select Committee recommended that fishing facilities should be improved.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Nearly a month ago I asked the Minister a question about cull oranges. On August 29 he gave a lengthy reply from the secretary of the Citrus Organization Committee the burden of which was that cull oranges were not available to retailers and that it was not intended that they should be available for retail sale in the community. I believe that is a shame. About a week ago I was given a cull orange by a retailer, the only thing wrong with it being a blemish on the skin. In the past these oranges have been popular and there has been a market for them. I cannot see why the people of the State should be deprived of the opportunity of eating them. Not to use the oranges and to deliberately prevent their sale to the community by retail is wrong. I ask the Minister to use his good offices with

the committee to make sure that the oranges are available on the market licitly, because I assure him they are now being sold illicitly, and this in itself is undesirable.

Mr. RODDA: Regarding the provision of \$10,500 for rain-making, can the Minister say where these operations are intended to be carried out? Aircraft would not be able to use Naracoorte airport, because it is in a bad condition.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The member for Gumeracha was being facetious when he referred to the provision of \$32 in regard to slipways. An amount of \$80,000 was provided in the Loan programme for the purposes that he has mentioned. The provision made in these estimates is for repairs to slipways for slipping boats used by commercial fishermen. Amounts are paid on application, and the only application made last year involved \$32. This provision is made on a \$1 for \$1 basis.

Regarding cull oranges, if the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) had read my reply, he would know that there is no provision in legislation for inspection of cull oranges. Usually the word "cull" means "to take out, not to use at all". I understand that the orange to which the honourable member was referring was not a first-grade orange but was not necessarily a cull orange. Most cull oranges are used for juice.

It is intended that cloud-seeding operations will commence in the Upper South-East and the Murray Mallee. The price quoted by the firm was about \$1,000 a week, subject to flying hours available, stand-by time, and so on. It would be impracticable to start this operation before the middle of April, because we would not want to damage fruit then on the trees. The provision is something of an experiment. The honourable member will appreciate that, if we have good opening rains at that time, it will not be expedient to go on with the operation. It would involve \$75,000 or more for a three-year contract.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: The Minister of Agriculture knows that all the tanks in the Kimba district are empty with the exception of the Bascomb Rocks tank. Previously, there was an excellent fire-fighting organization there. The only tanks that would be available for that purpose now would be those to which water would be carted by rail. Will the Minister give me an assurance that there will be water free of cost from those tanks for the fire-fighting units at Kimba?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will take that matter up and see what I can find out.

Mr. HEASLIP: Rain-making experiments are not new; we have tried them before and have spent much money on them. Nowhere in the world has rain-making been successful and I question the wisdom of spending \$10,500 on that in South Australia when Victoria is experimenting with much the same type of cloud as we get in the South-East. Victoria has been successful to the extent of 20 points or half an inch. How much of that was due to the seeding of clouds I do not know.

Mr. Shannon: It makes a 10 per cent increase in the actual rainfall.

Mr. HEASLIP: I know that that is claimed but I do not know that it can actually be proved that it was the seeding of clouds that brought it about. As Victoria is spending money on the experimental seeding of clouds, I doubt the wisdom of our spending money, too. It could be used more profitably in another direction and we could gain knowledge from Victoria's experiments. If they are successful, we can then follow suit.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I refer to the line "Fire-fighting equipment—subsidy towards purchase by volunteer fire-fighting associations". Last year an emergency fire-fighting service group in my electoral district bought a fire truck, at the time thinking, justifiably, that the subsidy rate on the vehicle would be 50 per cent. A letter subsequently said:

After the transaction had been concluded and the truck had been to two fires, the committee (the Equipment Subsidy Committee) forwarded a statement showing \$258 as still owing because of a reduction in the subsidy rate to 45 per cent. The amount represents two years' income for this group and it considerably hampers our future activities.

In a letter to me dated October 19, 1966, the Minister stated, in part:

Claims for subsidy on 1965 expenditure were more numerous and involved greater expenditure than in previous years. Because of shortage of funds, the committee has had to suspend temporarily payments of advanced subsidies. However, it is hoped that the situation will improve next year, otherwise it may be necessary to consider an increase in the contribution to the Subsidies Fund by insurance companies and the Government.

Has the present situation improved, as was hoped for in that letter?

[Midnight]

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Government and insurance companies contribute to a subsidy fund, and agreement between the underwriters and the Government would be necessary if the contributions were to be altered. An increase has been provided in

the allocation to help district councils operate and maintain fire-fighting organizations, and because of improved techniques and equipment the Government has to spend more money. In the case quoted by the member for Alexandra payment was made from the subsidy fund, and any alteration would have to be agreed to by the insurance companies.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Have you approached them?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No, but I shall consider doing that.

Mr. HALL: I support the provision for rain-making experiments. This year I spoke with Dr. Bowen in Sydney about this process and the previous attempt in South Australia.

I believe that experiments have proved that natural rainfall could be increased in certain conditions, which may apply in this State. I hope that experiments will be conducted and that, although success may not come early, we may establish a spasmodic pattern that may suit different seasons. Although the current season may offer little opportunity for cloud seeding, I believe that South Australia will benefit from this operation in the future.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.6 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 27, at 2 p.m.