

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

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

QUESTIONS

BANKRUPTCIES

Mr. HALL: In today's *Australian Financial Review* appears a report concerning bankruptcies in Australia, with particular reference to South Australia. The report states:

South Australia tops bankruptcy total. The regional recession affecting South Australia shows up clearly in the annual report on bankruptcy tabled in the Commonwealth Parliament yesterday by the Attorney-General, Mr. N. Bowen. More people were made bankrupt in South Australia in 1966-67 than in either New South Wales or Victoria, despite the disparity in population. In South Australia 694 people were declared bankrupt, compared with 670 in New South Wales and 559 in Victoria. Can the Premier see any improvement in the present disastrous figures for South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes I can, and I shall obtain details for the Leader.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Are the 694 bankruptcies an increase or a decrease in the number of bankruptcies in South Australia during the previous year? Secondly, what were the principal types of business in respect of which sequestration orders were made in this State? Thirdly, what factors would account for the marked difference between the number of bankruptcies in South Australia and those in New South Wales and Victoria, bearing in mind the disparity in population?

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

SALISBURY HIGHWAY

Mr. CLARK: For some time the Corporation of the City of Salisbury has been concerned about the delay in widening Salisbury Highway. It considered that this project had a high priority and, anticipating that finance would be made available by the Highways Department for this purpose this financial year, the council had already borrowed its contribution towards this work. The council is also disturbed because the project to widen Coker Road has been deferred—a somewhat similar situation. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads whether finance can be made available for these important projects?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

SUBCONTRACTORS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When I became Minister of Housing in this State I had a series of discussions with all sections of the housing industry and, in the course of those discussions, complaints were made to me by the Housing Industry Association and by building unions concerning amounts paid to subcontractors in South Australia. Certain complaints related to prices paid to subcontractors by contractors with the Housing Trust. I therefore directed (and announced some time ago that I had done so) the Prices Commissioner to investigate payments to subcontractors by contractors for the Housing Trust. The Prices Commissioner has now reported as follows:

1. The following matters have been investigated:

- (a) whether payments to subcontractors have been reduced over the past three years;
- (b) whether contract prices obtained by builders have, on the other hand, increased over this period;
- (c) whether contractors have received increased payments under a rise-and-fall clause in their contracts, because of increases in labour award rates, which have not been passed on to subcontractors;
- (d) whether subcontractors are working for less than award rates.

2. The investigation has revealed that:

- (a) Payments to subcontractors. Most, but not all, subcontract rates have been reduced over the past three years;
- (b) Contract prices. The claim by the Housing Industry Association that contract prices were increased over the same period that subcontract rates were reduced would be true only of small special building contracts. The statement is not correct insofar as large building contracts in the metropolitan area are concerned. In fact, tender prices have fallen over the past three years for houses of the same basic design and in some cases improvements, including extra cupboards, ceramic in lieu of plastic tiling and roofing tiles in lieu of galvanized iron, have been provided without any increase in the tender price.
- (c) Rise-and-fall payments. The further claim that contractors have received payments on account of increases in award wages and have not passed them on to subcontractors, is basically correct. This has been a feature of the industry for many years.
- (d) Subcontractors' earnings. In many cases, subcontractors are earning less

than the amount an employee would receive for performing similar work.

3. General Comments.

- (a) Notwithstanding the reduction in their rates about 48 per cent of the subcontractors interviewed were, however, still earning above award rates according to the information supplied. In this connection, award rates include provision for public holidays, annual leave, sick pay, long service leave, workers' compensation and other benefits enjoyed by an employee.
- (b) Earnings of individual subcontractors in the same trade vary considerably, partly because of varying rates paid by contractors but also because of difference in the ability of subcontractors.
- (c) Rates for subcontract work are fixed either following discussions between builders and their subcontractors or builders advise subcontractors what they are prepared to pay, and, where there is strong competition for the work offering, the rates have been reduced in these trades more than others.
- (d) Rates payable for carpentry and painting work, in particular, would return in many cases less than award rates.
- (e) Seventy-six subcontractors were interviewed in connection with the department's inquiries. They were found to vary considerably in their opinions regarding subcontract rates.
- (f) A majority of subcontractors, while considering that their rates should have been increased rather than decreased because wages have increased, are resigned to the position because of the slump in the building trade. Some are, however, quite satisfied and have no complaints.
- (g) A number of complaints were received regarding such matters as lost time between jobs, the requiring by contractors that extra work should be done without extra payment, the withholding of retention money by some contractors pending final acceptance of the work by the trust, the long Christmas and New Year break and similar not over-serious complaints, none of which, it is considered, call for action from sources outside the industry.
- (h) The following is an analysis of the information obtained from subcontractors:

Number of subcontractors whose hourly rates are less than \$1.50 (the minimum rate which this department considers that a subcontractor should earn)	33
Number of subcontractors whose hourly rates are higher than \$1.50	30
Number of subcontractors whose hourly rates could not be determined	13
Number of subcontractors interviewed	76

Thirty-eight subcontractors earned in excess of \$60 a week. (This figure includes eight subcontractors, who made up for lower than award rates, mostly small amounts, by working longer than 40 hours a week). Of the 76 subcontractors interviewed, 16 said they were satisfied and had no complaints, 57 complained at the rates or other matters, and three expressed no opinion.

- (i) The matter of rise-and-fall payments was discussed with the larger building contractors, and while they admit that there have been very few retrospective payments to subcontractors, rates for current subcontracts have in a few cases been increased. Increases in award wage rates are a factor taken into consideration when subcontract rates are reviewed.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Could you say whether all the contracts contain a rise-and-fall clause?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although I cannot say, I believe they do, but I will check on that for the honourable member. The report continues:

- (j) As payments under rise-and-fall clauses are designed to reimburse contractors for increased costs actually incurred, it appears that Housing Trust contractors, in claiming increased costs without passing them on to subcontractors, have obtained benefits to which they may not be entitled under the general intention of this provision. However, this has been a longstanding practice.

4. Provisions in N.S.W. for the protection of subcontractors. Under the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act, N.S.W., 1940, subcontracts relating to the various building trades may be declared void or be varied on the grounds that they are:

- (a) unfair;
- (b) harsh or unconscionable;
- (c) against public interest;
- (d) provide a total remuneration less than would be received by an employee performing such work;
- (e) avoid the provisions of an industrial award or agreement.

The practical application of these provisions in regard to Housing Commission contracts is ensured by clauses in the general conditions of contract which require that contractors shall ensure that subcontracts will provide a total remuneration not less than the employee would receive for performing such work under an award or agreement, including annual holidays and long service leave. It is the contractor's responsibility to ensure that these provisions are complied with. The Housing Commission of New South Wales requires that builders for the commission shall obtain the commission's approval before work is sublet. In the application to sublet, the contractor and each subcontractor is required to certify that the prices/rates agreed on will not be less favourable than an employee doing the work under award conditions would receive.

5. Protection for S.A. Housing Trust subcontractors. If considered desirable, provisions similar to those of the N.S.W. Housing Commission could no doubt be included in the terms and specifications for the Housing Trust's building contracts to ensure adequate minimum payments to subcontractors. Contractors could also be required to pass on to subcontractors payments received on account of statutory wage increases. Implementation of either of these matters could be effected by a Ministerial direction to the Housing Trust as against enactment of legislation. To ensure that payments to subcontractors are not less than those an employee would receive, it would be necessary that subcontract prices should be not less than the amount obtained by multiplying the award rate (including benefits) by the number of man-hours predetermined for the respective building trades.

As the Housing Trust, in conjunction with the building contractors, fixes standard working times (man-hours) for the various trades, it appears that the checking of subcontract prices for the purpose of ensuring that the above provision is complied with could be done without much difficulty or a great deal of additional effort.

6. Conclusions.

- (a) Payments by Housing Trust contractors to subcontractors are now generally lower than they were three years ago. The position varies fairly widely between the different trades and between the various contractors and their subcontractors and would have been influenced by the lower level of building activity.
- (b) Tender prices accepted by the Housing Trust are also generally lower than they were three years ago.
- (c) Many subcontractors are receiving less for their labours than the total benefits they would have obtained were they working as employees for wages. However, it can be expected that, as building activity increases, subcontract rates will improve.
- (d) Contractors receive rise-and-fall payments from the Housing Trust on account of increases in award wage rates but, except in a few cases, have not passed on any part of these payments to subcontractors. This has applied for many years.

After receiving that report from the Prices Commissioner, I approached the Housing Trust, which met yesterday to consider this matter and which has undertaken that it will now provide in its future contracts with contractors that the provisions in the general contract of the New South Wales Housing Commission will be included in South Australian contracts with contractors, and that it will enforce the provisions of those agreements to ensure that subcontractors in no case will receive less than award rates, as has apparently obtained previously. Housing Trust under-

takings in South Australia in this respect will consequently be covered. Concerning the remainder of the industry (and I am informed that these practices are not confined to contractors with the trust by any means), the Government will introduce legislation this session to ensure that protection is given those who subcontract to general builders outside the Housing Trust.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I listened with much interest to the Premier's statement and, as far as I am concerned, the principle involved in the Premier's intention is not disputed. However, it is true that a person who is self-employed and enters into a contract in the course of business events must sometimes lose—he hopes more often to win. I am concerned with what items are covered in the rise-and-fall provisions of the contracts. If my memory is correct, when I was handling contracts as Minister of Works, rise-and-fall provisions were limited to three items only: wages, as determined by appropriate tribunals (not necessarily over-award payments or matters of that type, or even consent awards), steel and cement. Can the Premier say whether the Housing Trust follows the practice of the Minister of Works in these matters (and I think I am correct in what I have stated)? Will he ascertain what is included in the rise-and-fall provisions of contracts with the Housing Trust and of the contracts of contractors with their subcontractors?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall obtain the information for the honourable member.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question also arises from the Premier's statement concerning the intervention by the Housing Trust at his direction in the arrangements between contractors and subcontractors. Because of the economic difficulties that subcontractors have experienced in the last few years—since the Labor Government came into office, I presume, from the time he mentioned—

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier said "three years".

Mr. Langley: He said "many years". You can't count.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whether any assessment has been made by him, or by the Prices Commissioner on his behalf, as to whether the arrangements now proposed to be made and the direction to be given by the Housing Trust will lead to any increases in building costs in this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not made an overall assessment of this position.

It may be that tenders to the Housing Trust will rise to a certain extent because of this. On the other hand, as the Prices Commissioner has shown, they have fallen. However, there will be no interference with the advantages to the trust of obtaining large-scale contracts and the economies of scale and consequence. I would hope that no member of this House would suggest that we should get housing in this State at the price of having men work for less than an industrial tribunal would say is the minimum that they should fairly be paid for the work they do.

Mr. LANGLEY: Having listened intently to the Premier's report concerning the condition of the building industry in this State and the methods used therein, and as many bankruptcies have occurred, will he ascertain whether one of the main reasons for the bankruptcies has been the non-payment by builders to subcontractors?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

FOSTER-PARENTS

Mr. McKEE: Recently, I was approached by a widow whose foster-son, aged 18, was fatally injured while working on a construction job. I have been advised that under the Workmen's Compensation Act his foster-parent has no claim. I ask this question because I am sure that many people with foster-children, having reared them from an early age and educated them, believe that, when those foster-children commence work, they are covered by the Workmen's Compensation Act. However, if these foster-children are unfortunate enough to meet with a fatal accident, the foster-parent has no claim on workmen's compensation. As the insurance companies accept the premiums from employers, can the Minister of Social Welfare say whether any action can be taken to ensure that the foster-parent has a claim on workmen's compensation if the legal parent cannot be located?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to take up the matter and ascertain the exact position. I go this far and say that a certain section of the Act excludes foster-children, in which case they would not be entitled to receive workmen's compensation. However, because of the importance of the question, which could affect many people, I shall be pleased to investigate the matter and bring down a report as soon as possible.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Will the Premier read the correspondence he has received from the Prime Minister relating to drought assist-

ance in South Australia, and will he also give the House the benefit of the correspondence sent by him to the Prime Minister setting out South Australia's detailed requirements for financial assistance to those suffering from the drought?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The letter sent to the Prime Minister is very long. I think that the best I can do is table the letter and the reply from the Prime Minister; then I can give the honourable member a copy.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: I should prefer it in *Hansard*, if you don't mind.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My letter is extremely long and includes various tables: it would take 40 minutes to read. I can only ask leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Can you read the reply from the Prime Minister?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

The SPEAKER: I do not think it would be in accordance with practice or with Standing Orders for the House to give permission to have the matter inserted in *Hansard* when honourable members have no knowledge of it. Permission can be given for a factual table to be inserted. Perhaps the Premier could give a summary of the letter and have the tables to which he has referred inserted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give a summary of the letter because it is very detailed. In the circumstances, the only thing I can do is to table the correspondence. A copy will be made available immediately to the member for Ridley and to the member for Gumeracha, if he wants it (I have extra copies here). Therefore, I table the correspondence.

Later:

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Prime Minister's reply to the Premier would seem to indicate that the Prime Minister feels that the scope of the drought requirements in South Australia is not as wide as was the case in New South Wales, where the Commonwealth Government provided financial relief. I point out that with the lack of spring rains in South Australia the effect of the drought is now much wider than it was when we discussed the urgency motion in this House some weeks ago, which resulted in the letter being sent by the Premier to the Prime Minister. Also, the Prime Minister apparently suggests that the Government of this State, if it can, should set out further details of the precise

amounts of money required to meet the assistance needed. Will the Premier send as fully and urgently as possible an answer to the Prime Minister, and will he give the House the information when he has it ready?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

ROAD GRANTS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Roads a reply to my question of September 21, concerning contributions toward road grants?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague submits the following statistics:

	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68 to August 31, 1967
1. Main roads:	\$	\$	\$	\$
Total amount of grants . . .	1,198,912	1,288,592	1,275,000	1,071,100
Council contributions	92,712	96,250	92,525	90,350
2. District roads:				
(a) Rural areas—				
Total amount of grants . .	2,100,220	2,055,069	2,491,985	1,887,080
Council contributions . . .	364,390	378,448	423,651	385,170
(b) Metropolitan area—				
Total amount of grants . .	67,710	63,590	44,282	41,800
Council contributions . . .	33,222	31,676	41,150	28,300
3. Grant-in-aid: *				
Total amount of grants . . .	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000
Council contributions	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil

* Excludes city of Adelaide roads through park lands

40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
--------	--------	--------	--------

Mr. McANANEY: I thank the Minister for the detailed information, and now ask him to obtain details of grants made for sealing district roads for two months of this year and for last year.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall do that.

INDUSTRY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Regarding the high rate of bankruptcies in South Australia, I refer the Premier to a news item which appeared in last Saturday's *Advertiser* headed, "Population Growth Drops in South Australia", part of which states:

The rate of population growth in South Australia dropped sharply in 1966-67 to 1.51 per cent against 2.53 per cent during the previous 12 months, according to figures issued by the Bureau of Statistics today.

The overall Australian rate of population growth is given as 1.82 per cent. The article later continues:

The sudden change in South Australia's position occurred after it had vied for years with Western Australia for top place in the rate of State population growth.

The article states that South Australia has dropped back to second to last in the rate of population growth, only Tasmania being below our rate. As that item was published last Saturday, the Government has had sufficient time to consider the rather perturbing trend

it shows. Can the Premier say whether the Government has examined the causes for this sudden reversal in the trend in South Australia and, if it has, can he say what those causes may be and whether they are concerned with the economic situation in this State? Further, can he say whether the Government intends to take any action in the matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The causes in relation to immigration are clear: there was a decline in employment in South Australia in the consumer durable goods area. This was the basic cause of difficulty in this State. The consumer durable goods industries throughout Australia were depressed through the Commonwealth Government's policy in deciding that, after the 1965 drought, when there was a cut-back in markets there would be no stimulation in the economy that would assist in the purchase of consumer durables. The Commonwealth Government's view was that it would take so much from the economy in defence expenditure overseas that the economy could not stand a stimulation in this general area leading to an improvement in the markets of consumer durables without undue inflationary pressures. As the honourable member must know, this State, more than any other, has its secondary industries centred upon the production of consumer durables or the supply of goods to the consumer durables industry. South Australia not only produces consumer durables such as

motor cars and home appliances but also supplies basic commodities to those industries in other States. In consequence, this State, more than any other, was hit because of the nature of our general investment in secondary industry. My pleas to the Commonwealth Government, the one Government in Australia that could stimulate the markets for our products (only 15 per cent. of which are normally purchased in South Australia) have fallen on deaf ears.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't think that any part of the responsibility rests—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: —with the State Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. In fact, the South Australian Government has done everything available to any State Government to stimulate production and industry in this State and to stimulate the markets for our products. If the honourable member suggests that we should have reduced expenditure, let him say so. I know that he has often suggested that we should have spent more and raised less, and by some strange sum have balanced the Budget, but I really do not think that Mandrake the magician proposal would have led to any sort of stability in South Australia or conviction on the part of South Australian industry that there was financial competence on the part of the Government.

We have not had co-operation from the Commonwealth Government in stimulating industry in South Australia. I shall give the honourable member one example of the sort of thing that has occurred. As a result of prospecting by the Mines Department and information given to oversea companies, a very large deposit of copper capable of economic exploitation was discovered at Mount Gunson, and every facility was given to the companies concerned, Austminex and Noranda (Australia) Pty. Ltd., by the Government of South Australia for the development of that area, including the building of industrial housing by the Housing Trust to have workers on the spot when needed, and the provision of other facilities of that kind that were required.

The one thing the firm was concerned about in completing the feasibility studies was the supply of electricity and water to Mount Gunson. In that area supplies of water and electricity are controlled by the Commonwealth Government, which has the pipeline and the powerline to Woomera, only 39 miles away. In consequence, I approached the Commonwealth Government about giving every facility for the

provision of water and power for this most important project in South Australia. The reply I received from the Prime Minister was that, in order to determine whether it could supply power and water, the Commonwealth Government would have to undertake feasibility studies estimated to cost \$10,000 and that, if the companies undertook to pay that sum to the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth would undertake those studies. I wrote to the Prime Minister expressing dismay and concern that, when a major development was possible for South Australia, the Commonwealth was charging the companies concerned a sum that would have been out of the question for this State to suggest to a company that it should pay for the supply of power and water.

I suggest to the honourable member that, instead of knocking this State's economy, he get on to some of his colleagues to get them into the act to ensure that they do something about this State, which the Commonwealth seems to have forgotten is part of this continent.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Obviously, from the Premier's remarks, a State authority did not investigate the feasibility of supplying power and water to the proposed mining venture and, apparently, the Premier thought that it was more convenient to drop the matter into the lap of the Commonwealth Government and so wash his hands of it. Before the Premier wrote to the Commonwealth Government did he investigate the physical and technical possibility of supplying this venture from the supply lines at Woomera? If he did inquire, did he not discover that the water main from Port Augusta to Woomera was already seriously overloaded in meeting the requirements of the organization at Woomera, so much so that within my memory Commonwealth officers were sent to Adelaide to interview officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to discuss action to be taken to augment the supply to Woomera through the existing main, and the solution was that an additional booster should be constructed on the main to increase the supply? The Engineering and Water Supply Department—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is going beyond the permissible leave to explain his question.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am sorry if I exceeded my authority, Sir: I thought I was explaining the question. The Engineer for Water Supply reported to me as a result of inquiries that the main would glow at night, because of the extreme pressure if

more boosters were added, and indicated that it would be impossible to get more water through the main. I do not know the capacity of the electricity transmission lines from Port Augusta to Woomera, but I understand that they are also overloaded. Can the Premier say whether, before writing to the Prime Minister, he made preliminary inquiries to ascertain whether it was physically possible for the Commonwealth Government to assist this industry?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did, but no conclusions could be arrived at without information from the Commonwealth Government.

HOLDEN HILL INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: On July 26, in reply to my question regarding the Highways Department's plans to make safer the intersection of the Main North-East Road and Grand Junction Road, Holden Hill, I was advised that, depending on the outcome of negotiations with the District Council of Tea Tree Gully regarding street lighting, thus ensuring the safety of the intersection, the work would be completed within two months. Can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, inform me of the outcome of the negotiations, if they have been completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be delighted to confer with my colleague and obtain the information.

IRRIGATION

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Minister of Works have a schedule prepared and made available to the House of the assurances that have been given of additional water supplies for irrigation on the Murray River for any area of more than 100 acres?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Definitely not.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand 291,000 acre feet is to be provided this year under the period of restriction, compared with an actual diversion that took place last year in South Australia (as quoted by the River Murray Commission in its last report) of 350,000 acre feet. Will this reduction of almost 60,000 acre feet in the quantity to be supplied result in a serious drop in the river levels during the year? Further, does the Minister expect that an increased problem of salinity will result? I point out that, when the river level drops, the water that has percolated out from the river is drawn back, and the salinity of the

river quickly rises as a consequence. Will a salinity problem result from the fact that the quantity of water available is not sufficient in view of the number of diversions that occurred last year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Salinity is always a matter of great concern and, with a reduction in the flow of water, the possibility of increased salinity always exists. Having been asked a question yesterday by the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott), I have ascertained that the present salinity problem has been relieved, and I am pleased to report that the water containing the saline slug recently reached Lock 9, the salinity having been reduced to 200-odd parts a million.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Is the river level expected to fall?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It is not expected that any significant falls will occur as a result of the restriction.

GRAPES

Mr. CURREN: One of the recommendations contained in the report of the Royal Commission into the Grape Growing Industry was that an advisory committee be set up. This was done during last year but unfortunately the committee has met only once. As there are many problems facing the grapegrowing and the winemaking industries, and as much more information is needed to enable them to continue to expand under orderly and economic conditions, will the Minister of Agriculture request the committee to consider the following points: (1) the grape varieties in short supply; (2) the grape varieties in over supply; and (3) the need for a crop-estimating service?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall be pleased to refer the questions to the Chairman of the committee so that he may call a meeting as soon as possible. Although the committee has met only once, the department's extension officers dealing with viticulture have been active and have brought down a considerable amount of information that will be of advantage to the committee when it meets.

GLENELG SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: As the Minister of Works will know, for some considerable time I have been pressing for work to be commenced on the rebuilding of the Glenelg Primary School. This work is vitally necessary because of the condition of the old buildings at the school and the temporary buildings. Furthermore, the rebuilding of the school will permit the complete rearrangement of the schoolgrounds.

so that an oval area of medium size will be available. Can the Minister say whether Cabinet has approved this proposal?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am pleased to inform the honourable member that Cabinet on Monday approved an expenditure of \$352,000 to enable the work to proceed. It is programmed to commence in 1968.

LAND TENURE

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I was interested to see in last week's *Murray Pioneer*, a newspaper circulating in the Murray River district and in my district, a report of a meeting held at Berri that was addressed by the Minister of Lands. The report states that the Minister spoke about land tenure and that he replied to related questions, and continues:

The Minister touched on acreages and water rights and said that there were moves afoot to increase the acreage that could be held under lease in a Government-controlled fruit settlement. At present this figure was 50 acres, but it was hoped that this would soon be increased.

Can the Minister of Lands say whether that statement indicates that the Government considers that present holdings are too small to be economical?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. This matter was drawn to my attention by the member for Chaffey, and has been investigated for some time. I hope that towards the end of the present session an appropriate amendment (in addition to others) will be made to the Irrigation Act to alter the situation. As the honourable member has suggested, because of the economic factor we consider that the limit of 50 acres now applying under the Act should be increased.

LICENSING

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say whether billiard saloons will be licensed under the new Licensing Act, or will they be controlled by the Places of Public Entertainment Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the interim they will not be licensed, but it is intended later this session to introduce an amendment to the Places of Public Entertainment Act to bring them under the control of that Act.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say when the Licensing Bill will be assented to, and can he name the personnel of the Licensing Court? If he cannot do that, when will he be able to do so?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Tomorrow in Executive Council it will be recommended to His Excellency that assent be given to the

Act. As soon as assent has been given, recommendations will be made to His Excellency concerning the personnel of the court. Obviously, it is not proper for me to announce the details before Executive Council has considered the matter.

Mr. HEASLIP: I understand that the new Licensing Act will come into force tomorrow and that the old Act will then cease to operate. Some clubs that have been selling liquor in the past without a licence will be in the same position for about the next month, because under section 40 of the new Act they will have to go through a certain procedure before they can obtain a licence. Can the Premier say what will be the position of these clubs during the period before they are able to obtain licences?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I would not think that during the settling down period there would be any alteration in the police activity or attitude towards these clubs. To that end, the Chief Secretary and I will consult with the Commissioner of Police this afternoon.

Mr. McANANEY: I believe that some hotels do not wish to stay open until 10 p.m. Are those hotels under any obligation to stay open until 10 p.m. tomorrow?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns the coming into operation tomorrow of the new Licensing Act. Obviously, some period of adjustment will be necessary. For example, some organizations have already been given permits under the old Act for functions that will be held after the new Act comes into operation. (I am thinking of one particular social event tomorrow night.) Those permits will, of course, have been granted under the old Act, which will no longer be in force. Whilst I think this is catered for under the transition provisions of the new Act, will the Premier make clear the policy of the Government and the police on permits that have been obtained under the old Act for functions that will take place after the new Act comes into operation and before it is possible to take any effective steps with regard to permits or licensing under the new Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is the policy that, where permits have been granted under the old Act and during the period before the time when it is possible for the tribunal to grant permits under the new Act, they will remain in force.

Mr. Millhouse: In other words, we will be working under the old Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In effect, yes.

OVERLAND

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Several recent announcements have been made on the Australian Broadcasting Commission's morning news service that derailments have occurred on the Adelaide to Melbourne railway line and that, as a result, the Overland would arrive late in Adelaide. This morning it was stated that a truck had been derailed, causing the Overland to arrive two hours late. Will the Minister of Social Welfare obtain from the Minister of Transport a report about the condition of this railway line and whether maintenance problems cause the frequent derailments?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall be pleased to obtain a report from my colleague as soon as possible.

COURT ORDERLIES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday, when replying to a question of mine on notice, the Premier was kind enough to give me information concerning the numbers in the Police Force. He also referred to additional duties that officers had been required to perform, one of them being that of court orderly. On September 14, during the debate on the Estimates, I asked the honourable gentleman whether the Government had plans to effect the announcement that the honourable gentleman made some considerable time ago that a special group of people would be recruited to act as court orderlies in order to relieve the police of this onerous and time-consuming duty. The honourable gentleman did not reply to my question during the debate but, from his reply yesterday, it is obvious that this duty causes a strain on the personnel resources of the Police Force. Does the Premier still have plans to provide court orderlies in order to relieve police officers of this duty?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I have. The Sheriff has investigated in other States the provision of court orderlies by an organization other than the Police Force, and a plan has been prepared for Sheriff's officers to be recruited to take over this duty in due course. However, this must be a phased activity. It would not be possible to bear the whole burden of the complete changeover in this financial year.

Mr. Millhouse: You will be able to get it started?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I hope to make a start on the project shortly.

WATER SUPPLIES

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It has been stated several times that the metropolitan reservoirs are at present holding 14,000,000,000 gallons. However, I was told this morning that that figure conveys an erroneous idea of the position, because it would be physically impossible to take that quantity out of the reservoirs. In fact, if one tried to do so the last of the water taken out would be very bad indeed. Can the Minister of Works say how much water could be used without seriously reducing the quality of water supplied to the metropolitan area?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Obviously, I cannot answer the question at this stage, for I have not studied that aspect. However, as it raises a matter of interest I will have an investigation made and bring down a report.

KINGSCOTE SCHOOL

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Kingscote Area School Committee is concerned at the lack of a fire hydrant in the school grounds. This matter was first raised with me in July last year, when I took it up with the Minister of Education. Over the intervening period there has been much correspondence, culminating in an inspection by officers of the Public Buildings Department. The Minister of Education was good enough to take this matter to Cabinet, and following that he recently replied to me in the following terms:

Cabinet decided not to adopt a policy of fixing fire hydrants at schools, and therefore it has been decided not to provide a fire hydrant for the Kingscote Area School as requested by you.

The school committee has now asked me again to take up this matter. When I asked the Minister earlier to receive a deputation, he pointed out that in the light of Cabinet policy it appeared that this would not serve any useful purpose. I agree with the Minister that it is no use asking the school committee to come over to meet him if there is no chance of that policy being changed. In his second letter to me the Minister said:

This Cabinet decision was in line with one made by the previous Government, and it is not intended to make any change in the policy at the present time.

The committee has appealed to me again in the following terms:

The fact remains that some 400 children are being housed in timber-frame buildings, and we have no adequate protection for them in case of fire. That the Minister could decide not to provide this, purely on the basis of Cabinet policy, seems to us to be a very unsatisfactory state of affairs, particularly when it is

referred back to the previous Government. Our circumstances here are rather different from those of most schools. We are wondering if you can suggest anyone else whom we could approach, through you, as we feel that we cannot allow this matter to be shelved.

Even though I have made only the most cursory inquiries, I am sure that many schools have fire hydrants in their grounds, and the school in question seems to be an outstanding example of one that needs such a facility. When I first raised the matter the hose lengths were not long enough to reach all the buildings, and I do not know whether that deficiency has been rectified. Can the Minister say whether anything further can be done in this matter, or whether the position must be accepted without further protest?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member has raised a fresh point, as he has suggested that he knows of schools where fire hydrants have been installed, but this is news to me. I have never asked specifically whether fire hydrants have been installed at schools, but I have been told that it has not been the policy to install fire hydrants, and I believe that to be correct. As the honourable member has admitted, the former Liberal Government declined to install these fire hydrants. These hydrants would cost a great deal of money, and to start installing them, when officers do not consider this to be necessary, is not reasonable. So far as I know, the fire risk in respect of these wooden buildings is extremely low. In fact, all the fires we have had have occurred when the children are not in them. There has been an odd case where a fire of no significance has occurred and where it has been immediately put out by the teachers there, but to my knowledge there has not been an instance (and I have inquired about this) of a wooden school building burning down while children have been at the school. Most of the fires occur as a result of vandalism that takes place after the children have left the school. In these circumstances, surely we must consider carefully whether we should go to the expense of installing fire hydrants in all schools. I will inquire about the honourable member's statement concerning the installation of fire hydrants and re-examine the matter.

KIDNEY MACHINE

Mrs. BYRNE: During last year's debate on the Loan Estimates I referred to the need for an additional kidney machine in this State, my remarks being based on information given me by a constituent who is being kept alive by such a machine. As these machines are

vitaly important in the saving of lives, will the Minister of Social Welfare ask the Chief Secretary whether the Hospitals Department intends to purchase an additional kidney machine, and will he also ascertain the cost of the machine?

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

TIMBER STOCKS

Mr. RODDA: I have been told that a bank-up of timber has occurred in the Government and private mills in the South-East which cut softwoods. As I note that about 200 houses are listed for construction in the major towns of the South-East, will the Minister of Forests ascertain whether imported hardwood will be used on those houses? Although I realize that some hardwood must be used, I should like to know whether the use of the excellent softwood article that is turned out by the South-Eastern mills will be fully considered. I understand, from what I have been told recently, that a movement of timber to Victoria is taking place and that is heartening to the industry. However, concern has been expressed at the bank-up to which I have referred.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As the question concerning a "bank-up" has already been asked by the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford), and as I promised to obtain a report on the matter (which I have not as yet received), I will in due course give the information to both members when it is to hand. I will ascertain the position concerning the use of imported hardwood in the construction of houses and see whether the problem (if one exists) can be overcome.

POONINDIE ROAD

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question about the Poonindie road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the survey and land acquisition on the Poonindie to White Flat road (portion of the Louth-hundred of Mortlock Main Road 323) have not yet been completed. Minor alterations are necessary to the survey which was previously undertaken, and land acquisition has not yet commenced. The time required to acquire the land, together with the time required to undertake extensive alterations to Postmaster-General's Department services, will dictate the date of commencement

of roadwork. Tentative financial provision has been included in the Highways Department's current works programme in anticipation of work commencing later this financial year.

HOUSING FINANCE

Mr. HUDSON: It has been suggested to me that the private savings banks and the Commonwealth Savings Bank operating in this State may not be putting back into home mortgage finance the same percentage of deposits as is allocated in this respect in the other States. Will the Premier, as Minister of Housing, obtain the appropriate figures concerning the South Australian deposits on home mortgage lending for each of the private savings banks and the Commonwealth Savings Bank operating in South Australia? If these figures show that the percentage of deposits lent on home mortgage finance in this State is below the Australian average, will the Premier take up with the management of the banks concerned the desirability of effecting a rapid expansion of their lending within the State so that the return to South Australia from deposits held at these banks is commensurate with the return obtaining in other States?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

REGIONAL OFFICE

Mr. BURDON: I understand that for some time the Woods and Forests Department has had plans for the construction of a regional office in Mount Gambier and that they provide for the building of this office on land held on Casterton Road, in front of the present car park. Can the Minister of Forests tell me whether it is intended to proceed with this office and, if so, whether the work is intended to be carried out in the current financial year?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The answer is "Yes" to both questions. It will be commenced possibly towards the end of this year and work will proceed immediately. It is hoped, too, that this building will be made completely of the softwood *pinus radiata*.

PORTRUSH ROAD JUNCTION

Mr. RODDA: My question concerns the junction of Portrush Road and Payneham Road. It is a shock to anyone who looks at it. One cannot describe it otherwise—a bending road coming on to a busy intersection. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain whether the Minister of Roads knows of any improvements in hand to make this a safer traffic junction?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall find out for the honourable member.

BRUCE BOXES

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some time ago I raised the question of Bruce boxes, which are being supplied to the citrus industry in South Australia and which at present are, or until recently were, made from imported timber, mainly from the Philippines. I asked the Minister of Forests some time ago whether it would be possible for an investigation to be made to see whether South Australia could supply the timber for this type of box, as it was apparently being used here, and whether South Australian timber could be used for that purpose. The Minister said that some investigations would be made but that the problem was not without difficulty. Has he made any progress in this matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Some progress has been made, though not as much as I should have liked. At the moment investigations are being made to see whether a lathe can be produced capable of turning the *pinus radiata* into the veneer required by the industry. These investigations are still current. I hope something may be devised because of information I have that this could come about. However, it is a little early to give a detailed reply on this matter. Last Saturday evening I happened to be at Williamstown, in the district of the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne). Some little time ago at the request of the honourable member I spoke to some of the private casemakers in that area who were then worried about the situation. However, on Saturday I was informed by some of them that they had been busier recently than for a long time—in fact, than for several years. They had had quite a demand for cases made of the *pinus* timber they were using previously. So it does not seem that all is lost.

KEITH WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: I was surprised to read in the newspaper of a change in Government policy in relation to the Tailem Bend to Keith main because of representations made by two Ministers. I felt that public pressure and representations made in this House might also have had something to do with the decision. In view of the change in policy, can the Minister of Works say when it is now expected that work will be resumed on this project?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall not say that it was because of me; I do not want to claim all the credit for this. I just wanted to do the fair and proper thing, with Cabinet

support. Work has already commenced but the date for supplying the pipes is not definite because the suppliers are not yet determined. However, it is expected that we shall finish the work in less than three years' time.

MAGILL SCHOOL

Mrs. STEELE: My question concerns the Magill school and the rather involved situation there. The Magill Primary School is to get an extra classroom. However, in the meantime, students from that school are occupying a classroom in the infants school, which means that an infants school class is utilizing the activities room. In an infants school the activities room is in constant use. I understand that the delay has been occasioned primarily because land was to be acquired to the east of the primary school on which the extra classroom was to be built. Then, of course, the class would go from the infants school into the new classroom and the infants school resume occupation of the activities room. This classroom was promised for the June intake so that when the children came to enrol in June the infants school would have full use of its classroom.

Some hitches have obviously occurred and I believe the most important of these has been the difficulty of surveying and paving the playground. This has delayed the erection of the new classroom for the primary school. Of course, as the Minister of Education well knows, the infants school is a demonstration school and is attended by many student teachers. The demonstration staff is very keen and is anxious to have full use of its classrooms. Will the Minister call for a report on the matter as to the cause of delay and as to the earliest possible time at which the new classroom will be available?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will get a report.

BEER GLASSES

Mr. McANANEY: The other day the Premier did not reply to my question about a restrictive trade practice under the provisions of the Licensing Act.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will ask his question; he cannot comment on another question.

Mr. McANANEY: What I was saying was part of my question. I have read in the press that some steps are to be taken regarding the quantity of beer in a glass. Many suggestions about this subject have been made. A practice that has developed is that, when a glass of

beer is poured, a couple of ounces of froth is left at the top of the glass. Will the Minister of Lands (as the Minister who administers the Weights and Measures Act) see whether a more effective and correct measure can be provided for the public? What steps are being taken under the new Act to control this practice.?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I believe that possibly something can be done regarding wine and spirit measures; this was the matter referred to in the press. No suggestion has been made that beer glasses should be subject to any alteration. The statement has been made that wine and spirit measures, as used in hotels throughout the State, are inaccurate in that up to 30 or 31 one-ounce nips, or 60 or 62 half-ounce nips, can be poured from a 26-ounce bottle. Because of this, the measure will be controlled. At present, the matter is with the National Standards Commission from which we will obtain the requirements. Once that has been done, we will bring the measures under control by regulation. Then those people who pay for an ounce of spirits or wine will indeed receive an ounce and not part of it as is the case at present.

JUSTICES' HANDBOOK

Mr. CUMBE: As considerable interest appears to have been aroused in the new courses for justices of the peace, can the Attorney-General ascertain how many of the new handbooks have been sold by the Government Printer, and how many applicants for a commission of the peace have enrolled in the courses now being conducted?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Recently in Keith I was asked whether in future, when justices' handbooks were sent out, the amount charged could include the postage, instead of the justices being presented afterwards with a separate account for the postage incurred in posting out the handbooks. Will the Attorney-General have the matter investigated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly do so.

CHOWILLA DAM

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Under the River Murray Waters Agreement, the South Australian Engineering and Water Supply Department is the constructing authority for the Chowilla dam. As work on the project was held up recently for further investigations, can the Minister of Works say whether the investigations are

being made by the constructing authority? If they are not, by whom are they being carried out? Also, what is the nature of the investigations?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Investigations are being made into practically every aspect of the dam by a technical committee set up by the River Murray Commission. A report on the investigations is expected to be made available in this State in about the middle of December.

Mr. McANANEY: Yesterday the Minister of Works informed me about work carried out some months ago on the Chowilla dam by the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electricity Commission engineers. Was there anything in the report that caused the delay and the need for further investigations?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The commission, as I explained yesterday, submitted recommendations and advice to the constructing authority in connection with the construction, but not in connection with any delay to the project.

WHEAT HARVEST

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Agriculture tell the House the actual delivery quantity of last year's wheat harvest? Although I have given away all thought of getting a certain drink, I have some settlements to make if that drink is not forthcoming.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I do not have the final figure as yet, but the honourable member will get his drink anyway. However, I do not think he will win the drink because, on my observations, the figure will not be up to the record. I shall ascertain the final figure when it is available.

TILE INDUSTRY

Mr. McANANEY: Last evening I was talking to a gentleman about the new tile industry at Port Pirie. On his leasehold property, investigations into the suitability of the clay are being carried out. He was concerned with the position, as he used his own tractor in the work and did much of the work himself. Also, he had received from the Mines Department a rather large account for work carried out. Another problem was that the clay concerned still had to go to Italy to be examined. Can the Minister of Agriculture ascertain from the Minister of Mines whether the Mines Department has given any free assistance to this gentleman in trying to find the clay? Also, what is the nature of the work for which he has been charged?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall be happy to take up the matter with my colleague, but I point out that this could be a little difficult unless I know the name of the person concerned. I hope the honourable member will supply that information.

THE ESTIMATES

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 26. Page 2210.)

MINISTER OF MINES

Mines Department, \$1,980,966.

Mr. HALL: This department is of vital importance to South Australia's future. Other States are greatly prospering as a result of the increase in the amounts and types of mineral found and of their exploitation. I think this State's area is 380,000 square miles, a vast area compared with that of some other States, but much of it has not yet been explored for certain types of mineral. It seems strange that this Government should be so niggardly in its treatment of mineral exploitation and exploration in South Australia. It has attempted to draw public attention to certain reforms, but I imagine that it would not mention its treatment of this department with pride; indeed, I imagine that it would mention it as little as possible.

The total amount of expenditure for this department has increased by about .8 per cent of last year's actual expenditure, and the amount spent on geological and geophysical surveys has decreased by about \$40,000, that is, by 11 per cent. Why has the Government deliberately decided to go slow on geological and geophysical research in this State? Does it believe that this State is fully explored and that there are no further opportunities for major mineral finds? The Government has said, "We can afford over \$1,000,000 a year for an extra week's leave for public servants." If this is so, why has it at the same time reduced effective expenditure on the Mines Department? Have we such a quantity of other resources that we can afford to neglect our Mines Department and our mineral research? The answers are obvious.

We can see from happenings elsewhere how important minerals are to the economy of a State and of the nation. We are pleased to learn of the Japanese interest in the production of iron ore pellets in South Australia. Surely this should spur the Government to do more than it is doing in mineral exploration.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The production of pellets arose as a result of investigations made many years ago.

Mr. HALL: Obviously this Government does not consider South Australia's mineral resources to be important. The successes we are now enjoying are the result of basic work done in other years. If we are this year reaping the results of exploration done years ago, what will happen in 10 years' time? This is a demonstration of the Government's deliberate neglect of progress and development in South Australia, of its exclusive attention to day-to-day affairs and of its failure to face up to its responsibilities in respect of generations to come.

I do not want the Minister to give the excuse that we cannot afford to spend more money on the Mines Department. The Government has said that we can afford items such as an extra week's leave for public servants—a week in excess of the leave given in other States. If this is so, why can we not also afford proper expenditure on our Mines Department?

Mr. CUMBE: I support the remarks of my Leader; I have spoken on this subject on several occasions. There is a minimal increase in the total of \$16,442, compared with last year's total, in a sum of almost \$2,000,000—an increase of .8 per cent. Let us consider the wage item; there are increases in the administration, technical, mining, and survey sections, but a significant decrease in the practical side of drilling and mechanical engineering, which is the field work.

When we consider this matter in conjunction with the position put before us earlier this year in the Loan Estimates, we find there was a decrease there in this respect, too. In fact, after taking into account the recoup, which was the same as that of last year, \$41,690 less is being spent on capital equipment in this department. There seems to be a deliberate policy by the Government of restricting expansion in respect of both capital equipment and running costs. The amount provided for wages copes only with the normal increase due to increases in awards and costs: there is no increase as a result of expansion.

Members on both sides of the Committee are concerned that the Mines Department should carry out exploratory work; the department not only does work for other departments but also is essential to this State's development. The example just quoted of the sale of iron ore pellets to Japan is a perfect example. Work was carried out

some years ago that had the support of all members. The Mines Department conducted investigations in the Middleback Ranges, and the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Ltd. dealt with the beneficiation of this ore. We can now see the results. If the Mines Department is not carrying out basic work today, we shall not experience in future years the spectacular events that have occurred in the past. I plead with the Committee and the Minister in charge of this department to see that it gets a greater vote to enable more exploratory work to be carried out.

This department does much work in conjunction with the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories at Parkside; this was not done years ago. Since the establishment of those laboratories much work has been carried out in co-operation with the mining industry. There is a big scope for this department in the field today, and I contrast our position with that of other States. The Mines Department is one of the most vigorous departments in Western Australia. As a result of its co-operation and the initiative shown by private investors and developers, Mount Tom Price, Hammersley and other big projects are able to function today. Apart from attracting industries and a large number of people, Western Australia is recouping handsome sums in mineral royalties.

There has been a steady increase in production in iron ore fields that have already been proven in the Whyalla area. I plead with the Government to reconsider this point. Will the Minister take up the matter with his colleague to see whether more encouragement can be given to the Mines Department to expand its activities in co-operation with other interested parties to develop the State further?

Mr. QUIRKE: An immense amount of mineral wealth accrued to the State in the early days, when 55,000 tons of ingot copper was produced from the Burra mines, which paid \$1,760,000 on a share capital of \$25,000. That mine made South Australia solvent. Then the gold mines at Ballarat and Bendigo were established and the miners left Burra. As yet no-one knows how much mineral wealth remains to be discovered in South Australia. Possibly we have not as much as has been discovered in Western Australia, with its vast rugged range areas. We have the more weathered rough flat plains country here, but we have not carried out enough investigation. It seems a miracle of exploration to me that by 1860, only 30 years after the foundation of this State,

all the copper had been discovered in South Australia. The mines at Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta were established and the district was worked, and people who gouged around the State as far north as they could go without dying of thirst, found the known copper reserves of South Australia. Undoubtedly not all our reserves have been discovered; further extensive research could probably find more.

Our mineral reserves affect the economy of this State, because our industries rely on importing raw materials and exporting manufactured goods. This applies to home appliances: we obtain steel from outside the State, manufacture it here, and export the finished product. It will not be possible for this State to be among the great producing States of the Commonwealth until we can find some of the basic minerals necessary to maintain industry. I know that industries can make ends meet by importing cheaply and exporting on a costly basis; nations flourish that way. Japan is an example of this, because it imports raw materials from all over the world and exports manufactured goods. That country is among the leading exporters of manufactured goods. It lives on the difference between importing and exporting values. Japan imports iron ore mainly from Western Australia and South Australia, which is not expensive. When it is converted into manufactured goods it is able to make a good profit, even taking transport costs into consideration. Japan can sell its goods at prices even lower than ours, yet it no longer exports inferior quality goods.

Every part of this State should be searched and we should use every testing means at our disposal to find every conceivable type of mineral that the State can produce. We may be disappointed with the results, but we do not know. How remarkable it would be if we could discover phosphates here in some magnitude! We have not searched for them to any great extent. We will be a primary-producing country until we can get further industries started, and we are dependent on importing raw materials and exporting the finished goods. We are having a bad time at present, which shows how our economy can be affected when we depend on one form of production. I urge the Government to proceed with further exploratory drilling here. We have gas tucked away in the corners of the State, and how much of that remains to be found? It is extraordinary that Canada, which has natural gas and oil, has 1,000 dry bores for every flowing bore. If leases that

have been granted are not being worked, they should be withdrawn and given to someone who will work them. I do not know whether one drilling plant is drilling for oil in South Australia today, whereas we should have six plants operating. The operations are costly and perhaps inducement is needed to keep them going, but we ought to be able to keep at least one plant operating.

The discovery of oil or gas ultimately improves the cost structure generally if the industry is dealt with in the correct way. Those who have found the gas in South Australia will sell it and those who build the pipeline will charge a rental for the use of the pipeline. We must ensure that the cost of the gas in Adelaide is such that the gas is not too expensive to use. Of all the departments, the Mines Department is the most grossly neglected. I hope that the department engages in developmental expenditure and that we shall not always be dependent on the Murray River to keep the State booming industrially.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not know that I agree that the Mines Department has been grossly neglected. Perhaps there is not much to be seen from expenditure by the department. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) has boasted of the contribution made by the Burra copper mines in the early days and I consider that I ought to boast about the Kapunda copper mine, which spurred the development of other mining projects in South Australia and which led to the opening of the Burra mines. Copper was first discovered at Kapunda in 1843 and in 33 years the mine produced 3,500 tons.

Mr. Quirke: Kapunda was opened in 1841 and Burra in 1844 or 1845.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: That improves my case.

Mr. Quirke: The copper produced at Kapunda could be hidden in one back corner of the Burra mine.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I draw attention to the important step taken recently by the Commonwealth Government in granting permit privileges to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited to enable the company to export 9,900,000 tons of iron-ore pellets from Whyalla to Japan in the next eight years. A Tokyo report in the *Advertiser* of September 22, headed "\$89,000,000 Japanese iron deal for Whyalla", states:

Six leading Japanese steel mills have concluded a contract with the Broken Hill Proprietary Limited to import 9,900,000 tons of iron-ore pellets from Whyalla, South Australia, over eight years. The contract, valued at \$89,285,000, was announced today by the Yatawa Iron and Steel Company. It will be

signed here tomorrow and sent to Melbourne for signature by the Broken Hill Proprietary. The Japanese steel mills had requested the Broken Hill Proprietary to improve harbour facilities at Whyalla in exchange for their agreement to shipments of part of the contract amount on a c.i.f. basis.

All patriotic South Australians applaud that announcement, which highlights the great role that mining plays and must continue to play in the development of the State. The B.H.P. Company has done a magnificent job in this respect. The company's report for the year ended May 31, 1967, shows that it has 189,008 shareholders and 49,799 employees. This reveals the spread of ownership of this great Australian company, and we all can boast that we have a share in this tremendous enterprise. I know that the member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) is proud of the company's contribution. The activities of the company enabled the establishment of the electoral district of Whyalla.

About a year ago I saw the steel rolling mill at Whyalla, where large H building sections were being rolled for Manila. I was disappointed that the oversea orders held by the company were sufficient for the mill to operate for only one shift a day on five days a week. The expansion of oversea markets would provide great scope for increased industrial activity at Whyalla.

I shall now cast a reflection on the action taken by the Australian Labor Party in 1955 to torpedo the efforts being made by Sir Thomas Playford to establish a steel mill at Whyalla. The Australian Labor Party then was so ill advised as to attempt to nationalize the company. What a great blow it would have been to South Australia's hopes if it had been successful. Regarding the Japanese order placed at Whyalla, I was pleased to see that the Treasurer made quite a statesmanlike utterance in the press last Friday. Rather than run down the company as the Labor Party did back in 1955, he said:

The news of the contract was "terrific news" for South Australia. This means inevitably a boost to employment and industry in Whyalla, and everybody in South Australia must be delighted at this considerable breakthrough into the export field.

I am delighted to see that rather than torpedoing the efforts of the company the Treasurer is praising its work.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The first important matter I wish to mention is the curtailment of the activities of the Mines Department. The first prospectors to come to Australia were capable people who estab-

lished projects where the ore deposits were uncovered and, as a result of their work, many important finds were made. A large area of South Australia is sedimentary country. Seismic and other geophysical equipment is used to locate bodies of ore, which have been found in the past, and I am sure that with reasonable diligence by the Government these could continue to be found. In the last two years a dazzling transformation has taken place at Whyalla. The Mines Department did considerable work in discovering additional iron ore deposits, thus enabling the Government of the day to negotiate for the establishment of the steel industry. Indeed, without the department's work there would have been nothing to attract the great industrialization that has taken place at Whyalla. That is a good example of how important is the department's work.

Another example is the valuable work undertaken by the department in opening up the Leigh Creek coalfield. Another example is the valuable work done by the department in connection with the first investigation into the search for oil. The geophysical programme undertaken in that connection is something of which the State can be proud. A further example is the work the department has carried out at Broken Hill. Those projects are solid economic developments. The Estimates for this department now provide for a reduction in its work, particularly its field work. The department has done more than any other department in the development that has taken place at Whyalla, the development that will take place as a result of the gas pipeline from Gidgealpa, and the development that has taken place at Leigh Creek. What possible justification can the Minister have for this reduction in expenditure on something that has been shown to be so tremendously important to the State? I believe that seismic equipment costing about \$200,000 has been idle for at least 18 months, and I presume that the experts who were brought to the State to undertake this work have been scattered. How can the Government justify a policy that shuts down something that has been of such tremendous advantage to the State?

The negotiations between the South Australian and Victorian Governments on offshore drilling areas have been completely bungled. Victoria found large quantities of oil in Bass Strait. This find is of tremendous importance and it will have a profound effect not only on the economy of Victoria but on the economy of the whole country. Sir Henry Bolte, not to

miss any tricks, laid claim to a median line of demarcation between South Australia and Victoria. He had no justification to back up his claim; indeed, the then Premier, the Hon. Frank Walsh, had the complete support of the Opposition when he said that in no circumstance would South Australia cede to Victoria any of its rights to any of that area. We did not criticize his actions but, with a change of Premier and Treasurer the position was considered from a legal point of view. Mr. Wells produced a White Paper (and I am not discrediting his work), which stated that the legal position was obscure. The Government was so disinterested in this State's rights that it sent Mr. Wells, not a Minister, to Victoria to get some agreement on something, and that was what he did. The agreement gave away the potential oil-bearing area outside the meridian line.

To have that area acknowledged as South Australian territory all we had to do was to sit tight and Victoria would have had to come to terms. It had immense proved resources in Bass Strait, but could not do anything about them until it came to terms with South Australia. The Commonwealth Government would not have arbitrated in this matter. By sheer bungling we have given away what could have been a tremendous asset to this State. The Treasurer said that we would be given the opportunity to debate the matter, but now it will come before us as a general agreement that cannot be amended. That is a breach of confidence by the Treasurer, who had given an assurance that the question of the demarcation line between South Australia and Victoria would be debated. Since then, he has done his best to ensure that no opportunity existed to debate it. Every person in the State will know that we have given away unnecessarily a portion of possible oil-bearing territory for no purpose: we received no return for it, either.

In the original charter of this State the meridian line was marked as a boundary. What right has this Parliament, or the Government, to give away what could have been one of the greatest assets of this State? All we had to do was to follow the policy enunciated by the Hon. Frank Walsh who said, "Over my dead body will we give this area away." But a change of Treasurer brought a change of attitude. Although the legal position is obscure, the political position is not so obscure: we had every ace in the pack, because until Sir Henry Bolte obtained an agreement with South Australia no uniform legislation would

have been introduced. The Opposition strongly supported the policy of the Hon. Frank Walsh, who was civil to Sir Henry Bolte when he came to South Australia, but who said that he was not interested in any alternatives suggested by the Victorian Premier.

The Bass Strait fields indicate that within 10 years Australia will be exporting oil: with that prize why should Sir Henry Bolte be allowed to enforce something to which he had no right? We did not even send a Minister to negotiate in the matter. Although I have great respect for Mr. Wells, I repeat that we gave the whole thing away for nothing, and it could well be that future generations will hold us responsible for doing so. South Australia is not potentially rich in mineral deposits. The border between the two States was defined in the original charter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The borders were not set out in that way.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer knows that what I am saying is true.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What the honourable member is saying is complete rubbish. Where was it ever set out in a charter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Wells said that the position regarding ownership of the area outside the three-mile limit was obscure. One aspect on which I do not think the Treasurer came out particularly well is the fact that to a certain extent we sheltered behind Mr. Wells. The Treasurer was a member of the Hon. Frank Walsh's Government, which came out strongly, without any equivocation at all, on the subject. In fact, Mr. Walsh said, "We will not cede one inch of this." Mr. Walsh was right, and he had the support of the Opposition in his stand. However, the present Treasurer wanted to muddle or meddle (however one likes to put it) in something, so he proceeded to get a White Paper and then give away what could be a very valuable asset to South Australia.

When I asked whether we could debate the matter in this Chamber the Treasurer agreed that we could. However, when I raised the question later we were told that the debate could take place on the general Bill. Of course, we cannot amend that Bill because it will be legislation uniform to the Commonwealth and to all the States, and we can only accept the whole thing or reject it. The entire Opposition publicly supported the statement that was made by the Hon. Frank Walsh on this question of the boundary.

I am disappointed that the Mines Department, which in recent years has played such a conspicuous part in developing the industrial capacity of this State, is one of the departments that has been drastically curtailed in its activities. The field work of this department has been seriously interrupted because its two seismic teams are no longer operating. This valuable equipment is laid up, and work of that character is no longer being done in the field. Without Parliament's even being given an opportunity to have a free debate on this matter, the Government entered into an agreement with Sir Henry Bolte to give away forever what could be one of the potential riches of this State. I am most disappointed with the way these two matters have been conducted.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I have listened to the member for Gumeracha speaking on two matters, one of which I thought was not particularly applicable to this debate. No doubt the Treasurer will reply on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Minister that the member for Gumeracha was perfectly in order in dealing with the matters to which he referred.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that it is not applicable to this debate.

Mr. Millhouse: That is the same thing.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No, it is not. The Treasurer brought down a White Paper on this matter and promised, as the member for Gumeracha said, that this would be open to debate.

Mr. Millhouse: When?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member is always asking "When" or "Why"; this is always his cry, and it becomes sickening. Members of the Opposition have pointed out that there has been an increase of only .8 per cent in the spending of this department, but they are not taking into account the \$50,000 shown on the previous Estimates for expenses of the natural gas pipeline engineering consultants.

Mr. Coumbe: We are aware of that.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am pleased about that. It is pretty obvious that members opposite overlooked this amount when they talked of the percentage increase. Had this extra amount been shown on the Estimates for this year rather than last year, the percentage would have been completely different. The member for Gumeracha, referring to the line "Geological and Geophysical Survey", said that only one team was operating at the moment.

That is because of the shortage of trained personnel, a factor that is well outside the control of the Government, the Mines Department, or anyone else. Had two teams been available, more money would undoubtedly have been provided. There are two seismographic machines in operation: one with Delhi-Santos and the other with the Continental Oil Company. The machine now with the latter organization will become available to us soon, and the Mines Department will use its own team to operate that machine. We have lost trained staff, and the department has only one team that can be employed in this way. The cost of operating the machine is about \$6,000 a week.

Another reason for the reduction in the line is that money spent last year on replacing an obsolete machine will not need to be spent in that way this year, because the machines are in good condition. Provision is made for the travelling and other expenses incurred in undertaking surveys of the mineral resources of the State, including the continuation of seismic services in northern areas of the State (involving one party), a geological survey of the Mount Davies and Musgrave Park areas, the printing of geological bulletins, and other incidental expenditure. The whole attitude of the Opposition is one of sour grapes. What would the Opposition have done had it been in our position with a shortage of staff?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: (Premier and Treasurer): I come into this section of the debate to reply to the extraordinary and irresponsible speech made by the member for Gumeracha.

Mr. Millhouse: It was a good speech.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was a good speech in the honourable member's judgment and that in itself is sufficient reflection on it.

Mr. Millhouse: Discourtesy won't get you anywhere.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Mitcham would be an excellent judge of that; he is making himself a laughing stock throughout the State by the way that he carries on in this place and publicly. The member for Gumeracha has made a whole series of complete mis-statements this afternoon. He said he had carefully read the White Paper prepared by Mr. Wells: having listened to his speech, all I can say is that he either has not read it or has not attempted to understand it. The honourable member has suggested that this State has ceded something to Victoria. If he read the White Paper

he would know perfectly well that the letters patent founding this Province and the Colony of Victoria provided that the borderline stopped short at the Southern Ocean, not at the three-mile limit, and that there was no border offshore whatever between this State and Victoria.

The honourable member says that we should stick fast on a certain line; we are holding all the cards; we don't have to cede anything! One cannot cede what one does not have, and we did not have it. There were two alternatives open to South Australia in refusing to come to an agreement, and we had been threatened with both of them. One alternative was that the Commonwealth, since the whole of the offshore oil legislation would have fallen if agreement was not reached, would step in and legislate regarding the oil field. The Commonwealth expressed this threat to Sir Thomas Playford's Government, when it was in office, at an Attorneys-General Conference held in this State. If the honourable member considered the advice tendered to his Government on this subject by his legal officers, he would know how significant, in fact, that threat was.

Secondly, Victoria could then have chosen to grant leases itself in the disputed area, and what power would this State have had then to enforce its control of leases there? The most we could have done then was to go to arbitration. If the honourable member looked at all the precedents of arbitration and at the decisions of the International Court on this matter, he would see that we could have lost the lot. That is the position in which the honourable member has asked me to put this State.

Mr. McKee: He's disappointed you didn't make a mistake; that's his trouble.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When this State manages to get an agreement in relation to this disputed area which gives us the major benefit, the honourable member says that we have given away this State's rights. The honourable member has asked us to risk placing this State in the position that we could not have had control in this particular area—that we could have lost it entirely in the disputed area. Sir Henry Bolte asked us to go to arbitration, because he knew what the result would be. This State was not willing to go to arbitration, because we knew what we were facing.

Mr. Hall: You were scared.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was scared of the result of an arbitration, and if the

Leader has any responsibility or knowledge at all on this subject (and apparently he has not, from the interjections he makes) he would bother to do his homework. If he looks at the precedents, he will see why Sir Henry Bolte wanted us to go to arbitration on this issue. But we did not; we sat pat for a while until the other State concerned was willing to resile from the position it had taken, and it did resile. We got the major benefit.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: We got everything inside our territorial areas, anyway.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The member for Gumeracha has suggested that we could have said, despite these threats hanging over our head, "Sir Henry Bolte is interested in getting something for himself." He got a good deal for himself, because he managed to get an agreement with the Commonwealth to get certain things done offshore in his State to which none of the other States was prepared to agree. He was sitting reasonably pretty because the companies knew that there he could get sufficient support from the Commonwealth for what he was trying to do; but the rest of us were trying to hold out for better terms for our Governments; we were trying to get exploration in our offshore areas in which there are no proven oil-fields (certainly not yet within the South Australian boundary) and, in order to ensure that we got this, we had to be able to offer surety of title. In giving that surety of title, we wanted to get as much as possible for the people of this State and we got a reasonable agreement for offshore legislation but if the Commonwealth had chosen to legislate for Sir Henry Bolte and then had legislated for the whole field of legislation for South Australia, the member for Gumeracha thinks that would have been of benefit to the people of this State. If he read the White Paper, he would see that the advice to this Government (with which I entirely agree, on legal grounds) was that it would have been utterly disastrous to adopt that course, that we could have put the whole future of the offshore oil area in South Australia in jeopardy. We did not do that. We ensured the benefits for this State and acted in accordance with the advice given to us by our advisers, advice that we examined and, having examined it, were forced to agree with.

The member for Gumeracha chides me for having sent Mr. Wells to Victoria to negotiate with the Victorian Crown Solicitor. This is not the first time that officers have had discussions on the matter. Mr. Wells was not empowered to make an agreement; he was

empowered to have discussions on the matter and to bring back the results of those discussions. The discussions were not short. Several propositions were put forward at first, which we refused. Finally, a proposition was put forward which, after considerable discussion, we decided was the best we could get, for it gave substantial advantages to this State. Given the other hazards of holding out, we thought it would be best for us to agree to that proposition. Let me not minimize the threats we faced from the Commonwealth. They were very real. As a consequence, this State made an agreement which was to the benefit of its people. All I can say about the remarks of the honourable member this afternoon is that I have heard some pretty shabby political speeches in my time, but that is one of the dirtiest.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer has dwelt on the theoretical side of this matter. The difficulty he has got himself into is that throughout Australia it is known that he is susceptible to threats. It is common knowledge throughout Australia today that, if one wants to get an agreement with the South Australian Treasurer, threaten him and he will cave in; he will always give way on something but not on everything. The member for Gumeracha asked why he retreated from the position held by his predecessor. This the Treasurer did not answer.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It is the same Cabinet.

Mr. HALL: Yes, and before the Treasurer assumed his present position of leadership Cabinet had a different view. I have seen this develop at first hand. I have observed Sir Henry Bolte's attitude.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: He mesmerized the Treasurer.

Mr. HALL: I have seen Sir Henry Bolte three or four times in the last 12 months. He is a very clever politician whom I respect. He is also one about whom I would be guarded if I was dealing with him. The first time I met him I asked, in private conversation, what his attitude was to the question of the South Australian offshore boundary. He did not have a line from which to operate, although he had a line from which to issue exploration licences. He had thought enough about it to issue exploration licences along the meridian line—and the Treasurer will not deny that. Sir Henry was most confident and assertive in his views on the offshore boundary.

The second time I saw him, nine months later, he wanted to know what was going on.

He was concerned because he had so much at stake. The last thing I thought I should hear in this Parliament was that the Government had given way in a situation in respect of which the Opposition had given it full support in this Chamber. Do we deal theoretically through the White Paper, through the written threat; do we accede to a threat anyway, or do we deal practically, knowing full well that we have more to gain and that Victoria cannot afford to stand off, as expressed in the attitude of its own Premier? This is the difference between the attitude of the Treasurer and the member for Gumeracha: it is a theoretical attitude as opposed to a practical one. In the Mines Department as in other departments it is considered that the practical attitude that has led South Australia for so long has been proved the right one.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall ignore the insulting personal references the Premier made about me. I know the honourable gentleman is under a great strain, which I am sure accounted for his outburst this afternoon. I listened with great attention to what was said by the member for Gumeracha and by the Treasurer in reply. I also read on other occasions (and I have again read today) part of the White Paper produced by Mr. Andrew Wells, and it is crystal clear from that paper (and I have made other inquiries from experts in this field) that there is in fact no legal solution to this matter. The member for Gumeracha made that perfectly clear. In his reply the Treasurer made one thing clear, too, by implication though not explicitly, that everything he said about South Australia and its difficulties was equally true of Victoria. It is so obvious, yet it was not said by the honourable gentleman. We were in no worse a position in this matter than Victoria, and it was in no better a position than we were, because the matter is entirely open and undecided.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Victoria had every incentive.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. Victoria had an interest in getting a quick solution. We had the advantage because we could afford to wait, but Victoria had to have a quick solution. All we had to do was to sit pat and do nothing.

I give full marks to the former Treasurer (Hon. Frank Walsh) on this matter. Although I have criticized him on other occasions for some of the things he has done, he did the right thing for the State in this matter because he did nothing. In fact, when Sir Henry Bolte came here to try to get an agreement,

Mr. Walsh did the right thing in refusing one. Yet, within a few weeks of coming into office, the present Treasurer gave away our position for no reason at all. Victoria had more at stake than we had and could less afford not to have an agreement. We came to an agreement, for what reasons I know not. The only thing I can think is that the Treasurer is not very good when it comes to negotiations, as we have seen time and time again in this place. He gives away far too easily in negotiation, and he did it to the detriment of South Australia in this case.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Minister of Social Welfare): When Sir Henry Bolte visited South Australia, I told him that this State would not give way on this matter. However, what has happened since then does not mean that there is a division in Cabinet on the matter. I give full marks to Mr. Wells for the legal negotiations he conducted. Having listened to what he presented to Cabinet, I had no option in the interests of the State but to change my previous attitude. There was no way out of the position with which we were faced. If we had sat pat, as I had previously suggested we should do, the Commonwealth Government could simply have decided that, as the States were not interested in coming to an agreement, it would take over. We had nothing to gain by not coming to an agreement. We must have legislation passed if we are to safeguard our position regarding royalties.

South Australia and Victoria were previously the only two States that had not reached an agreement so that legislation could be introduced. According to the information presented by Mr. Wells, no international authority could have dealt with this matter; nothing positive could be established regarding the legal position. This was not a case of one country against another country; although it could have been one State against another State, no provision existed to cover that case. Therefore, there would have been no point in taking the matter to international law. In Cabinet, the Minister of Mines and I were the most stubborn when it came to accepting the case put forward by Mr. Wells, after his conferences over many weeks with the Solicitor-General of Victoria that resulted in the compromise presented in the White Paper. I do not want people to think that I held one view and that then, because I was no longer Treasurer, I accepted another view. I had to do what I considered was in the best

interests of South Australia, and I believed that the best course was to have an agreement whereby the State's interests in relation to oil exploration and boundaries were protected. All members of Cabinet share the views expressed by the Treasurer.

Mr. CUMBE: Some of the comments made have reinforced my view that considerable misunderstanding exists on this matter. Nobody disagrees that the White Paper sets out the position regarding South Australia and Victoria. However, the only contention at which it arrives is that negotiations should take place. The point at issue is that, negotiations having taken place between the two States, why is the line drawn in its present position? A map was displayed in this Chamber that indicated where the proposed boundary would be. Regarding the boundary on the land, subject to the letters patent between Victoria and South Australia, the eastern boundary is the 141st degree east longitude. I understand that this line extends to the water's edge. Apparently a line was agreed by representatives of the Victorian and South Australian Governments. According to what had been shown on the map displayed in this Chamber, the agreed line deviated at an angle to the meridian, but not in a straight line; it had a small dog-leg in it, and the angle subtended into what we would normally imagine to be the South Australian segment of the ocean. When this map was displayed I asked the Treasurer the following question, which is reported on page 1424 of *Hansard*:

Members would be assisted if a simple report were obtained explaining how this new boundary line was drawn by surveyors. I presume that the new boundary is supposed to be an equal distance from several points on the neighbouring coastlines of the States.

The Treasurer interjected:

Only beyond the 100-fathom line.

I then went on:

Yes. But in places the median line is inside the longitudinal line forming the boundary between the two States; then it is inside on the South Australian side, then it deviates. To help members understand it, will the Premier obtain a simple report and make it available?

The Treasurer replied:

The line that was drawn up to the point where the proposed boundary joins the median line at about the 100-fathom line resulted from negotiations directed to ensuring to the contending States certain portions of interesting oil exploration areas. Victoria's original proposals (even where they gave a little) gave us nothing like what has eventuated.

I then said:

This line was deliberately drawn?

The Treasurer replied:

Yes. It follows the meridian line to beyond the point where the meridian line would cross completely the interesting structure mainly centred on the South Australian side of the meridian line in which we are interested.

Apparently this line has been arrived at after negotiations. In the negotiations recommended in the White Paper, why has the line been fixed at this particular point? It is in this respect that we are seeking information, but no answer has been given. Why does the line not go straight out? It is not even perpendicular to the coastline, and it is not a continuation of the meridian. Why does it slope towards our State, and not towards Victoria? It could well be asked, "Has this line been arrived at by a series of bisecting equidistant points on the surrounding coastline?" The Commonwealth might have intervened legally but, irrespective of where oil is found in the disputed area, the Commonwealth will still receive its royalties.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Two lines were originally contended for: one was the South Australian viewpoint that the meridian should simply be continued seawards to the edge of the continental shelf. This would have run into areas agreed between Victoria and Tasmania, and a piece would have been taken from Tasmania.

Mr. Coumbe: I take it that it would be beyond the 100-fathom mark.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The other line, which was entirely to the west of the inshore line as at present drawn, was the median line contended for by Victoria. The median line is constantly to the west of the meridian line and it goes westwards to the inshore area at a fairly sharp angle to the shore.

Mr. Coumbe: It is almost at right angles.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, the median line is the line originally drawn on some maps. The question was: what compromise could be reached?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Why compromise at all?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows quite well why a compromise was sought; this has been explained in the House. He can put on his manufactured fury if he likes, but he convinces nobody, not even himself. What conclusion could be reached by the two contending parties? In any arbitration, by precedent we were at a disadvantage. In attempting to get the best we could get, we sought as

much as possible of the known oil exploration area—and most of the disputed area has been explored. The only two interesting areas for oil exploration are marked on the map. We managed to get the whole of the area close inshore, in which we were most interested; the major part of this structure is on our side of the boundary. However, there is a portion further out that is connected with a structure on the Victorian side of the meridian line; we got more than half of this.

Originally Victoria had suggested that we get the inshore area and that it get the whole of the outshore area. However, we got more of the bargain as a result of the way the line was drawn. In the circumstances this was the only way to do it; there was no means by which we could get Victoria to deviate on its side of the meridian line—there was neither practice nor any appeal to precedent. It was on that basis that negotiations proceeded—that in the disputed area we would get the best of the bargain, and we did.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer has overlooked three or four important things. First, what right had the Government to make this agreement as an administrative act? Why was it not presented to this Parliament, at least in the form of a resolution? Under what law did the Government make this agreement? The Government is relying on the fact that this will be included in a Bill—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is out of order in discussing the necessity for a Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not discussing a Bill, because there is no Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member said, "Why does the Treasurer not do so and so?" He mentioned a Bill. That sort of discussion is out of order.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer has no authority to conclude this agreement with Victoria without reference to Parliament. When I asked whether there would be a debate on the matter, the Treasurer said there would be. However, he made clear in reply to a subsequent question that the debate would be a closed debate, not an open one. Even the small matter of bringing the Murray River under control has to be dealt with by resolution of Parliament, but here we have a matter of outstanding importance and the Government arrogates to itself the right to enter into an agreement

for which it has no legislative authority. The Treasurer has not answered on that matter, and there is another matter to which he has not replied.

I have said previously that Mr. Wells is a man of great capacity and integrity, and anyone who knows him must admire him. I accept the position stated by Mr. Wells in his paper as being the legal position. It was clear that Sir Henry Bolte could not take us to arbitration, so why has there been talk about what we would have lost at arbitration? Mr. Wells makes clear that there is no legal authority that can settle this matter. There is no provision for arbitration, so why is the Treasurer bringing in the red herring that we would have lost at arbitration? Mr. Wells has said that the legal position is quite obscure. I understand that he has said that, unless agreement is reached, no-one will have an action at law. If that is so, the only solution is a political one, and that is what the Treasurer undertook, but how badly was it conducted!

Sir Henry Bolte had three proved oil fields at stake and we had nothing proved, and a comparatively small portion of ocean was in dispute in any case. For how long would Sir Henry Bolte's attitude have been sustained if the Commonwealth had said, "If you do not reach agreement, we will step in and take the lot"? Sir Henry would have given in. All we had to do was sit tight, as the Hon. Frank Walsh had been doing. We did not have to get a legal opinion from Mr. Wells, nor did we have to tell Mr. Wells to go to Victoria and compromise our position to get an agreement. How much more could a man be told to compromise an agreement? We know what the attitude of the Commonwealth Government was about mineral and offshore petroleum rights, and that attitude has changed. First, the Commonwealth said that the States had those rights and that the rights extended three miles out to sea. The Commonwealth had no objection to the States having the whole lot. However, when oil was discovered in Australia and B.H.P.-Esso found structures in Bass Strait, the Commonwealth said to my Government, "We will forget about the three miles and share the royalties right back to the coastline and out to the continental shelf."

Although the States were critical of the change in the Commonwealth's position, their argument was a losing one, because the continental shelf obviously embraced more than did the three-mile limit. The present Minister

of Mines strongly put the position that the States should have a better deal. The Commonwealth has now come down firmly about sharing. I do not consider for one moment that the Commonwealth would have arbitrated between Victoria and South Australia, because it would have been in political difficulty by so doing. The Commonwealth would have told Victoria and South Australia that it would not go on with the legislation unless there was agreement, and that was all we wanted the Commonwealth to say. Sir Henry Bolte is harnessing his oil and gas as quickly as possible, because he wants to collect revenue from those resources. However, he would have been unable to get anything until he came to our terms.

I do not know what this man Bolte has, but he blinds us with science every time we see him. He has upset us regarding the Chowilla dam and now he has upset us on this matter. Whatever else he is, he is a good servant for Victoria and a good negotiator, because without any cards, not even a pair of twos, he has called our bluff and won the jackpot! I do not know the value of the territory that he could not have got except by bluffing, and nothing the Treasurer says will alter that position.

Mr. HUGHES: I have listened attentively to the member for Gumeracha, who said that Sir Henry Bolte had blinded us with science and had bluffed us at various times. I wonder how the honourable member feels about the natural gas pipeline with which Sir Henry Bolte is dealing. Recently it was reported in the press that Victoria's \$18,000,000 gas pipeline was in a tangle, yet this afternoon we have been hearing about this wonderful man from another State. The Leader of the Opposition, after a visit to Victoria, told us that our State should be conducted according to the information he had got from Sir Henry Bolte. One of the greatest proposals ever instigated in Victoria is in a tangle.

I now deal with the line "Expenses of natural gas pipeline engineering consultants". This Government engaged one of the best group of consultants in the world in its endeavours to have the gas from Gidgealpa brought down to Adelaide. The Government has been under great criticism from the Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition members regarding the pipeline. The consultants surveyed the area and decided on the shortest route from Gidgealpa to Adelaide. I attended a meeting at Port Pirie earlier this year at which the Minister of Mines and the Director of Mines

were invited to discuss the matter with various people from Port Augusta and Port Pirie. I was invited to attend the meeting as an observer, as was the Mayor of Wallaroo. It was amazing to hear some of the statements that were made at that meeting. The only real submissions that were placed before the Minister and Director came from a representative of the Broken Hill Associated Smelters at Port Pirie.

That man was not quite sure whether he should support the shorter or the longer route from Gidgealpa. He voiced the fear that, in the event of his company wanting to use the gas it might be expected to pay the cost of the additional 30 miles to have the pipeline brought down on the western side. The Director of Mines advised the meeting that the demand for gas at Port Augusta was negligible, but a member of the Port Augusta council interjected and said that gas could be and should be used in the power station at Port Augusta. The Director was dumbfounded by the interjection, because he had been given to understand, as the Minister of Mines had been given to understand prior to going to Port Pirie, that any suggestion that gas was to be used in the power house at Port Augusta was to be disregarded. If gas were piped into the power house at Port Augusta—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot see that whether gas or coal is used in the power house at Port Augusta comes within this line.

Mr. HUGHES: I think, with very great deference to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, that I am speaking on the expenses of the natural gas pipeline authority.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have allowed the honourable member to proceed so far as the administration of the department is concerned. There is an item in the Estimates for a pipeline engineer. The point I am making is that the honourable member is not in order in discussing the use of natural gas or coal in the power house. That is the point on which I am ruling the honourable member out of order now.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Chairman, which I am prepared to abide by, as I always am. If the pipeline authority had suggested that the pipeline should come down on the western side of the ranges to take in Port Augusta it could be the means of throwing up to 200 men out of work. I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition is listening to me because he may learn something from my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow the honourable member to pursue that line of argument, as I have already pointed out.

Mr. Quirke: What about Leigh Creek?

Mr. HUGHES: That is a very good interjection. If the pipeline were brought down to serve the Port Augusta power house it would automatically affect up to 1,000 people engaged in work in connection with Leigh Creek.

Mr. Quirke: Leigh Creek coal is cheaper than gas.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not allowed to discuss that. It has been stated at various times that industries will follow the pipeline wherever it is built. It would appear that industries are going to spring up at Orreroo and Peterborough, and I hope that they do, but does the Opposition believe this?

Mr. HALL: The member for Wallaroo has been on the defensive since he supported the route that ignored his district. He has learned from his leader how to twist things, because at no stage did I say that natural gas should be used in a power station.

Mr. Hughes: You claimed it should go down the western route.

Mr. HALL: Of course I did, and I still claim it, but I did not refer to any power station. The Bechtel Corporation was directed to map the route to Adelaide by the shortest way.

Mr. Hughes: It was not.

Mr. HALL: The corporation did not make a free choice: it was a political decision in which the member for Wallaroo concurred. At no stage has the Government given substantive figures of cost calculations for the western route.

Mr. Hughes: What more detail do you want?

Mr. HALL: The corporation's report indicates that I am correct. The member for Wallaroo has taken a stand against the interests of South Australia and of the people of his district.

Mr. HUDSON: The Leader of the Opposition has made untrue statements. He said that the Bechtel Corporation was directed to report on the eastern route only, and that is untrue—he knows it is untrue. I spent two days with engineers of the Bechtel Corporation in San Francisco and questioned them about the survey of the route. They told me that they had examined both proposals in detail. The Leader knows this. Why does he say that the corporation was directed to recommend the eastern route, when he knows that to be untrue?

He also knows that figures of alternative costs were made available to this Chamber.

What sort of caper is this: how low can one sink in order to obtain a political advantage? The Leader knows that it is cheaper to bring the pipeline down on the most direct route, and then take branch lines off it. He has a responsibility to Parliament, to his Party, and to people in the gulf towns not to mislead them for purely political advantage. The members for Gumeracha and Mitcham did the same thing concerning offshore boundaries. Fancy the member for Gumeracha setting himself up as a person who never made an agreement without referring it to Parliament. What a joke! Mr. Wells's White Paper set out the position logically and with common sense, when it stated:

If a boundary line is to be fixed, it can only be by negotiation and agreement between the two States, and, in the resolution of their differences, the States can be guided only by the sort of considerations which an arbitrator would invoke if a settlement was left for him to work out.

Of course the States had an interest in an agreement on this matter. If there were no agreement the legislative scheme would collapse and other consequences would follow concerning the title and might follow with respect to royalties. If we followed the advice of the member for Gumeracha the Commonwealth Government would inform the States to claim all royalties with respect to offshore areas outside the three-mile limit. Where would we be if oil were discovered off Robe? Can anyone imagine what the member for Gumeracha would have said in those circumstances? When I returned from my oversea trip I read the speech the honourable member made in the Address in Reply debate. It was a speech of a very high standard.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hughes): Order! The honourable member cannot refer to an Address in Reply debate.

Mr. HUDSON: I merely wanted to say that it reflected great credit on the honourable member, and I think it is a pity he did not stick to that high standard this afternoon. Mr. Wells, in his very complete coverage of the subject, said:

It must be emphatically stated that it is wholly wrong to examine any suggested solution for the ostensible purpose of discovering whether either State has "given away" more territory to the other than is warranted. As has been pointed out above, no State has any territory in that offshore area to give away, and if rights only of exploration and exploitation are to be considered and apportioned, it is far from certain whether it is

the Commonwealth alone, the States and the Northern Territory alone, or all authorities conjointly, who is or are, in strict law, capable of exercising and enjoying those rights.

Yet the member for Gumeracha and other members opposite have been trying to suggest that in some sense the bluff has been called over the South Australian Government, that we have given the game away and therefore given territory away. They give great credit to Mr. Andrew Wells and they talk about his ability and his competency. However, they select only a little here and there out of what he has to say and ignore the guts of the conclusions in the White Paper. In the absence of an agreement the legislative scheme will collapse, and it could well be that no State would get any royalty. That could seriously affect South Australia's interests. Honourable members opposite would do well to study this White Paper a great deal more carefully. I can see somebody about to spring into action opposite.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I should think so.

Mr. HUDSON: I hope he will give a considered statement and not a further display of the worst and most vile kind of Party politics.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think we all imagined that the debate on the offshore boundary had been concluded, and no doubt the Treasurer thought that when he left the Chamber. However, the member for Glenelg has seen fit to raise the subject again. One thing Mr. Wells's White Paper shows absolutely crystal clear is that this is not a legal problem at all, because there is no law on the subject. He says it is a matter for negotiation. When we have two Governments negotiating, this is a political matter and not a legal matter. Our whole complaint on this side of the Chamber is that the Government has bungled the political negotiations.

Mr. Hudson: You have no basis at all for saying that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I have.

Mr. Hudson: Except trying to take the vilest form of political advantage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I always find (and I suppose it is common to people on both sides of the Chamber) that when a member or a Party is bankrupt of argument he or it resorts to the use of epithets. This is exactly what the member for Glenelg has done, and we had from the Treasurer, when he was trying to defend his actions, much the same sort of thing. This only covers the absence of logical

and rational arguments to support one's position.

I have the greatest regard for Andrew Wells, whom I have known for many years. He lives in my district; we go to the same church; I see him every day on the train; and we are members of the same profession. What he has done in his White Paper is to show that this is not a legal problem at all, because there is no law on the subject. The Opposition complains that South Australia has come out of this deal worse than it need have come out of it if we had stood firmly and done nothing and made Victoria dance to our tune because it had so much at stake.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Like the Hon. Frank Walsh was doing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. Apparently the Hon. Frank Walsh and the Minister of Mines were brainwashed by their Cabinet colleagues. It was the first time I had ever heard the deliberations of Cabinet discussed openly in this place in that way. Obviously, the seven prevailed against the two, but it is a jolly shame that they did, for South Australia is now the worse off, without our having an opportunity in Parliament to do anything effective. I hope that will conclude this particular matter, because all the afternoon I have been aching to raise a matter that arose during question time this afternoon. When I asked him a question about the perturbing decline in the birth rate in this State the Treasurer, rather extraordinarily, got on to something entirely different connected with mining. In his usual form he attacked the Commonwealth Government and laid the blame for our ills solely upon that Government. Then he gave an example in which he said the Commonwealth had been entirely unsympathetic in that it had refused to supply water and power to a mining venture in the north of the State. I did not catch the names of the settlements, but I gather from what he said that the mine was 39 miles from Woomera.

Mr. Hudson: He said the Commonwealth was asking for \$10,000 for a feasibility study. He did not say it was refusing to supply water and power to a mining venture in the north of the State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was about to compliment the member for Glenelg on being helpful. However, he seems now to want to try to take the speech out of my hands.

Mr. Hudson: You keep on distorting what other people say.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think that with these facts there is any dispute at all. The Treasurer said that the Commonwealth asked for \$10,000 for a feasibility study before it was prepared to put in electricity or water for this mining venture which, according to the Treasurer, would have been of the utmost profit to the State. He said it was an open and shut case. He used this as an example of the ill-treatment of South Australia by the Commonwealth. He disregarded the fact that subsequently came out in an explanation of a further question from the member for Flinders who, luckily for this Chamber and for the people of this State, happened to have some knowledge of the real situation.

Mr. Hudson: Will the honourable member answer this—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member cannot ask the honourable member addressing the Committee to answer questions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In view of the importance of this venture to South Australia, even though the Commonwealth was not prepared to play the game (which I concede only for the purposes of the question) why did not South Australia, to get this venture going, make available the \$10,000 so that water and power could be provided?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: That is not contained in the line. There is no suggestion of the feasibility study or of an amount of money being placed on the Estimates for a water and electricity supply. This is a matter on which the Minister of Mines has given me no information; I do not think I am in a position to answer anything along those lines.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you get it for me?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Recently, I received a letter from the Padthaway Progress Association stressing the need for a full investigation of the water resources of the area. The Minister knows as well as I do about the small seed industry associated with irrigation, the potential of that area for dairying development and the possibility of market gardening one day. We are aware of the district's horticultural and viticultural potential. This area has developed without anybody being certain of the source of the water or its continuity of supply. Land values have been based on the assumption that the water supply is unlimited and assured. When I forwarded this letter to the Minister of Mines, I received a reply indicating that no work could be done in this field because of shortage of funds. I have been advised subsequently that there has

been another discovery of water further north where some 18in. bores are being sunk; one already in operation has been tested to the extent of 700,000 gallons an hour. This prompts people to assume that it is an unlimited supply and that they can go ahead and develop irrigation projects. No-one knows whether it is linked with Padthaway or Bordertown water or what its source is. I should like this matter to be fully investigated. Will the Minister bring it to the notice of the Minister of Mines to see whether a full survey of this district cannot be undertaken to ensure that the people investing in it will not be investing money under false pretences?

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

Mr. McANANEY: Only three-quarters of the amount voted last year for "Underground water investigations, etc." was spent. However, I was informed in this place that money was not available to proceed with test boring in the Langhorne Creek area and that money for this purpose might be included in this year's Estimates. With the dry season, some investigation in the area is urgent. At present there is a heavy drain on the basin and the water table has dropped considerably. The water has an increasing salt content and, whereas it was previously reasonable water for stock to drink, it is now nearly useless for that purpose. This basin will have to be the next to be brought under some form of control. However, before that is done investigations must be carried out in the area to find out what is necessary.

Mr. RODDA: In the South-East there are thought to be unlimited quantities of underground water. In 1960, the O'Driscoll report comprised a comprehensive survey of water in the South-East and in the adjoining parts of Victoria. Mr. Ward has also made a useful contribution regarding the supplies of underground water. Because of the demand in latter years for water for irrigation, it is necessary to see whether there is any draw-down on the perimeters of the Murray basin. In areas north of Bordertown signs of depletion are evident. This applies also to the flats near Naracoorte and to Lochaber. Only last week I was told by graziers that they have had to deepen their bores for stock water. At Padthaway the bores do not show any signs of diminishing water flow. However, with the advent of electricity in the area, there will be an enormous demand on the underground water supply. Perhaps weirs will have to be installed to recharge the aquifer.

At Frances and at areas surrounding Lake Cadnite dry boring can be successful and the

lagoons and swamps and the other surface water can be drained successfully into the underground reaches. In other areas, the impervious clay layers may prevent this. I urge the Minister to impress on his colleague the necessity for full-scale investigation of underground water supplies in the South-East.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will refer the remarks of the member for Albert, Stirling and Victoria to the Minister of Mines.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF MARINE

Marine and Harbors Department, \$3,634,370.

Mr. FERGUSON: I noticed some time ago advertisements in the press calling for tenders for the demolition of the outer end of the Minlacowie and Port Rickaby jetties. Have tenders been accepted for this work?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Marine): No tenders have been accepted as yet.

Mr. McANANEY: I notice in the Auditor-General's Report that, after paying interest on capital, the Marine and Harbors Department shows a substantial profit on operations. I do not think that this should necessarily be so. The inconsistency of the Labor Party amazes me, because members of that Party walked out of the Commonwealth Parliament—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! To which line is the honourable member speaking?

Mr. McANANEY: I am speaking to the line dealing with the total charges of the department. It is not in the interests of South Australia that the costs of this department should be so high, because they affect the cost of production.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$7,400.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister has a committee which is at present inquiring into the possibility of an additional port on lower Eyre Peninsula. This committee is the second of two committees appointed by the Minister. The first committee was charged with the duty of investigating the desirability of additional ports. It brought in its report and subsequently a request was made of the Minister that an additional port on lower Eyre Peninsula should be given priority. He agreed to this in so far as he appointed a committee to inquire into the desirability of increasing the capacity of the wheat-loading plant at Port Lincoln and other incidental matters, and to ascertain whether it was desirable to establish a new port farther up the coastline on Spencer

Gulf. Can the Minister say whether this matter is still being inquired into, and when does he expect to receive the report?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The committee is still operating and it will be some time before a report is completed.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister say when the widening of Port Pirie channel will commence?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. McANANEY: Regarding the item "Subsidy towards research into beach erosion", I point out that this problem becomes more serious each year. Who is carrying out these investigations and what is their nature?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I recently visited the people at the Adelaide University who are doing this research work. They are doing really good work in respect of beach erosion, beach formation and the characteristics and habits of the water. By the time their inquiries are completed they will have prepared valuable data to assist the department in dealing with foreshore works in South Australia.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Several years ago something in the nature of an experiment was carried out at Glenelg, when it was decided to run a causeway from the north-west corner of what was the old amusement park. From my observations of this scheme from the air each week it appears that it has been singularly successful. A vast area of sand has built up on both the southern and northern sides of this causeway. This suggests to me as a layman that it has been a valuable experiment. This erosion of the foreshores from Glenelg southwards appears to have been caused largely by the oblique angle at which the sea comes in to the beach; it then swings away and carries sand out with it. If groynes were erected it seems almost certain that this success would be repeated further down the beachline. I do not know what the committee will report, but, from what I have observed along the Australian coastline and from reports I have read concerning parts of the European coastline, it appears that this is a good way of overcoming what has been a serious problem.

The sand at Glenelg appears to have built up to about its limit. A similar pattern has developed there to that which occurred north of Largs Bay after the breakwater was built many years ago at Outer Harbor. As the Minister knows, this area has developed from what was open water when I was a schoolboy to solid earth at the present time that can be

developed as recreation parks. I know that during my term as Minister the then Harbors Board had well developed ideas for utilization of this land. I hope that the success at Glenelg will be repeated further down the coastline, and I feel sure it will be repeated if similar action is taken.

I do not know how far the proposals for Thevenard have advanced but I understand that the Marine and Harbors Department has been considering an alternative route for the channel and that the Minister visited Thevenard to look at it. Whilst there may not now be the same pressure on this port that was experienced in previous years, I believe that this matter requires urgent attention. Can the Minister say what stage investigations into a new channel, or improvements to the old channel, have reached?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I agree with the honourable member that we may not have the same activity this year that we had in past years, but future activity at the port will undoubtedly be even greater than last year's activity. The project is about ready to be referred to the Public Works Committee for investigation.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF TRANSPORT

Minister of Transport Department, \$19,249.

Mr. HALL: I believe that the financial accounts concerning the standardization of the railway from Port Pirie to Broken Hill would not be included in the normal accounts shown here, and therefore I—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the point the honourable member is raising deals with the matter of railways.

Mr. HALL: It deals with the Minister of Transport.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will be dealing with the Railways Department later.

Mr. HALL: If you, Sir, are happy for me to ask a question on this matter later, I shall be happy to oblige.

The CHAIRMAN: There may be a line in respect of railways on which the honourable member may speak, but I am not ruling on that now.

Mr. HALL: Where else would the Minister be referred to in any other accounts? Obviously at some stage the same person is the Minister of Railways.

The CHAIRMAN: The Railways Department is dealt with later.

Mr. HALL: I submit that the Minister is responsible for his department; he is the Minister of Transport.

The CHAIRMAN: I consider the Leader of the Opposition would be in order in raising the matter when we are dealing with the Railways Department line.

Line passed.

Railways Department, \$32,489,341.

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister say what stage negotiations have reached concerning the standardization of the Cockburn to Broken Hill line, on which the completion of the Port Pirie to Broken Hill line must depend?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Minister of Social Welfare): Confidential negotiations are still taking place, particularly concerning the section between Cockburn and Broken Hill.

Mr. HEASLIP: What is the position regarding the standardization of the Port Pirie to Adelaide line? This is a vital matter to the State. Unless we get standardization from Port Pirie to Adelaide, all the traffic from Western Australia will go direct to the Eastern States: it will by-pass Adelaide because of the handling and delay that will take place unless the line is standardized.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This information would have been more appropriately sought when we were dealing with the Loan Estimates. However, in view of the importance of the standardization programmes I shall ask my colleague, the Minister of Transport, whether he can give any fresh information regarding this matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the line "Ticket printing staff, equipment room staff, railway laundry staff, portion of charges for Statistical Bureau, \$83,461". I have mentioned this matter before but, by coincidence again, my pocket has felt the sting of it today. As the Minister knows, the railways give school-children concession fare passes, which are issued quarterly and do not bear any relationship to the three school terms. In my case this means that I have to buy four quarterly passes for each of my three children, although the school holidays take up about 13 weeks of the year. This is one of those examples of a system that ought to be brought up to date in the interests of public relations and in the interests of encouraging more passenger traffic. When the Minister was Leader of the Opposition he said, when giving his policy speech:

It will be the responsibility of the Minister—that is, the Minister of Transport—to insist that the Commissioner re-organize the services without any increase in fares but under sound re-organized administration in a firm

belief that the railways belong to the people. A reduction in fares and more trains must be the slogan.

I cannot think of anything that would help public relations better than this one change. It cannot be beyond the railways and its ticket staff to arrange for terminal passes for school-children for use on the railways instead of insisting that the passes be bought in quarters that do not coincide with the school terms. Will the Minister discuss this matter with his colleague? Recently, I asked questions about the sign placed on top of the Adelaide railway station, as complaints had been made to me about it, many people considering it to be ugly. I was told that the sign would be there for five years with a right of renewal, but the payment to the department was not disclosed. I am sorry the sign has been placed on the station and that signs are also erected along railway lines. During the Loan Estimates debate I asked whether a buffet car could be provided on the Overland, and the Treasurer told me that a passenger car would have to be removed for a buffet car to be used. Soon after I had asked the question I received the following letter, addressed from Torrens Park:

Mr. Millhouse, As a retired railway man I should not comment on their business, so I will stay anonymous in case they take away my pension from the superannuation. A friend told me this morning that you have again raised the old perennial about a buffet car on the Overland and been given the old answer about the passenger car which would have to be left off because of its weight. The limiting factor on the weight of the Overland is the haul over the Adelaide Hills. In my day the steam locomotives really used to struggle, as perhaps you know. But, there is no need for a buffet car to come all the way back and forward to Adelaide like a passenger car. It could be joined on quite easily in the middle of the train at Murray Bridge and taken off there on the way back.

This suggestion is worth investigating, as it seems to be a sensible and practical compromise. Will the Minister consider it? The Overland was two hours late this morning. When it is late (which has occurred frequently) nothing is provided for the convenience or refreshment of passengers. A light breakfast is provided for sleeper car passengers but for those sitting up, and particularly women with young children, it is a great inconvenience and hardship not to have breakfast or some refreshments but to have to wait at a place along the line for two or three hours. Will the Minister ask his colleague to consult the Railways Commissioner to ascertain whether arrangements can be made for the sale, if necessary, of breakfast and drinks to

passengers on the train, rather than their being left stranded until the train reaches Adelaide?

Mr. RODDA: I have received complaints about the conduct of some passengers on the Overland. I know that porters have been loth to remonstrate with people under the influence of alcohol who have been causing discomfort to other passengers. We should not condone this conduct. It is not easy to arrange for a police officer to remove such passengers from the train, but it may be necessary, if the practice continues, for a constable to travel on the train. I heartily agree with the remarks of the member for Mitcham about the buffet car, and hope that the suggestion will be seriously considered because, with the member for Light, I had experience of the conditions when we arrived by train at the station on a Sunday morning to find that no cafeteria facilities were available.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: For some time I have made representations for a more up-to-date and modern railway service between Adelaide and Angaston. The present railcar service is unsatisfactory, as it takes about two hours for this journey of only 50 miles. I think the Minister of Tourism will realize the importance of the Barossa Valley to South Australia. I am certain that a modern and efficient service (perhaps with an air-conditioned Bluebird type of car) would attract considerable patronage.

Until a few years ago many people from the metropolitan area and visitors from other States used to travel to the Barossa Valley by means of a special railcar service provided for tourists. However, that patronage was lost, mainly, I consider, because people thought the service was not efficient enough. The tourist trade is now catered for by private road buses. The people in the Barossa Valley consider that they are entitled to a much speedier and better service than they are getting. Unless something is done soon, the patronage will be lost entirely. I was told a year or two ago that a different service would not be provided until 1970. However, I urge the Minister to give immediate consideration to providing at an early date a more modern service for the Barossa Valley.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: As the member for Victoria said, when he and I arrived in Adelaide on one rather cold and uninviting Sunday morning some months ago we found all the railway station facilities closed. I understand that the cafeteria at the station opens at 6 a.m. on other mornings of the week. Occasionally

I have breakfast at that cafeteria and it provides an excellent service.

The lack of facilities on Sunday mornings is most unsatisfactory. This is especially so because there is no cafeteria car on the Melbourne express. I support the suggestion of the member for Mitcham that it is quite feasible to attach a buffet car to the Melbourne express at Murray Bridge and to detach the buffet car at that station on the Adelaide-bound express. I believe that the Railways Department could improve its service to the travelling public by providing this facility and that at the same time it could attract greater patronage. Some excellent services are provided on the railways in other States. On the Melbourne-Sydney line the cafeteria car remains open all night. If the Minister of Transport applied himself a little more industriously he could improve the service for passengers travelling between Melbourne and Adelaide, for the benefit of the railways and our State's revenue.

Mr. QUIRKE: Although I intend to say a word or two in support of the Railways Department, I shall try to give it a little advice as well. I am concerned about the refreshment and other services provided by the railways. I acknowledge that the Railways Department is battling to make a go of things without incurring too big a deficit each year, but, if a member of Parliament or anybody makes a suggestion for the better running of the railways, over the years the department has adopted the attitude that "it cannot be done", which is completely wrong. Now and again the railways could accept some criticisms and suggestions from this Chamber and act on them, for a change. The Railways Department pleads that it is short of money but no great amount need be spent on improving its services to the public, which are nothing to boast about. For instance, the department made a great song and dance about the improved breakfast service on the Overland, but all it amounted to was some marmalade added to the bun habitually provided. Let the railways accept some criticism for a change. They hide behind the assertion that to provide a proper breakfast a heavy dining car would have to be hauled over the hills and back again. A railworker suggested they would have to do nothing of the sort; nobody would think of hauling a 100-ton vehicle over that range of hills. It could be left at Murray Bridge, where there are cafeteria services. If the railways are to provide a decent passenger service, their thinking must be reoriented.

Mrs. STEELE: In his policy speech at the last election, the former Treasurer (Hon. Frank Walsh) mentioned railways and how their services could be improved. I, too, have some ideas for improving our railway passenger services, in particular for people in South Australia wanting to visit places of some tourist attraction outside Adelaide. For instance, an excursion trip to Victor Harbour could be promoted, provided it was done properly. I have in mind a trip that takes about the same time in Western Australia from Perth to Bunbury, a daily service, obviously to attract tourists. The coaches are comfortable, and each one has a most attractive hostess. Also, an appetizing packed lunch consisting of sandwiches, cakes and fruit is provided for use either on the train or when it reaches Bunbury. The hostess will also make arrangements for people to be met by taxi at the Bunbury station and to be taken around the town and shown its environs, for it is an attractive town. Something of that kind could be organized in South Australia.

I recall, too, a trip I took from Adelaide to Victor Harbour about two years ago on what was advertised as an excursion train. As a South Australian, I felt sorry for any visitors who happened to be my fellow passengers on that occasion. The train on which we travelled was the most dilapidated set of rolling stock I had ever seen in my life. We literally bumped our way from Mount Barker Junction to Victor Harbour. All through the Adelaide Hills and from Mount Barker through the rolling countryside to Victor Harbour is most attractive country. However, the train on which I travelled was no advertisement for the South Australian Railways and would not have encouraged anybody to make a trip. I hope the Minister will have the Railways Commissioner examine the possibility of excursion trips to Victor Harbour.

Another excursion trip could be organized to the Barossa Valley. There should be greater co-ordination between road and rail transport to ensure that people can see the countryside from both trains and buses. During my recent trip to Europe, the trains on which I travelled, particularly in Germany, were fast, quiet and smooth. I travelled along the Rhine River on a most modern and beautifully appointed river steamer. Having travelled for about four hours, I got off at Koblenz, returning to Frankfurt in a German train along the banks of the Rhine.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member can only do what the Standing Orders

provide. She can speak to the administration of the Railways Department, but her travels overseas cannot be connected with that.

Mrs. STEELE: I am trying to link up my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN: Earlier the honourable member was relating her remarks to the administration of the department, but now she is dealing extensively with her travels overseas, and I do not consider that to be in order.

Mrs. STEELE: Overseas I travelled on modern electric trains. It will not be long before the growth of Adelaide will bring about the need for some electrification of our railway system. In time we will have to consider providing some underground railway services. I hope that the railway system in this State will provide much more attractive services to the travelling public in the way of excursion trips. We have every opportunity for these trips, if only someone can get the idea through to the Railways Commissioner.

Mr. McANANEY: The administration of the Railways Department is one of the most important items in the Estimates, because 7½ per cent of revenue from taxation is spent in maintaining the railway system. If this money could be used for other purposes we might be able to have a higher standard of education and so on. The possibility of alternative services in some cases must be considered. The member for Burnside suggested an improved service to Victor Harbour and, for two months of the year, that could be of some advantage. However, the distance by rail to Victor Harbour is 80 miles as against 50 miles by road. The people who use the railway service are mainly pensioners some of whom have complained to me that they would prefer their subsidy to apply to bus services because the railway service operated at an inconvenient time.

I am sympathetic to officers of the department for the conditions under which they work. If the department were operated as a trust (similarly to the Electricity Trust), unprofitable services could be eliminated and improved services provided on the more profitable lines. The department should do more cost accountancy to ascertain which services are making a loss. However, the idea seems to be to provide a service. I understood that the interstate services were providing an increasing return but, in 1966-67, the tonnages hauled to Victoria dropped by 150,000 tons; the total was even less than it was five years ago. If the traffic is dropping on the best lines, something must be done about it. Recently one of the leading

railway authorities in the world said that the South Australian Railways Department was greatly overstuffed.

If one goes to some of the country railway stations one will agree with this point. However, I noticed that last year 120 more people were employed by the department; I cannot see the need for this extra staff. In a drought year, one would expect the railways to make substantial losses because less grain would be carried. However, I do not think this makes such a great difference. With careful management, expenses can be cut. If the harvest for this year is only half that of the previous year and the department does not adjust expenditure accordingly, another \$1,500,000 will be lost by the department in the coming year. Of course, that money must come from somewhere else. Already the National Debt Redemption Fund gets an increased proportion of our money every year, and this will place an additional burden on the railways. In Queensland and New South Wales there is not much hindrance to road transport in respect of the carrying of goods, yet those States' railways are doing better than our railways. We must take positive action to stop the railways being a drain on this State's finances.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Committee has discussed the problem of maintaining railway passenger patronage. It seems to me that passenger traffic on railways is declining everywhere. Even the famous Canadian-Pacific Railway, which has one of the finest trains in the world, is anxious to get out of its responsibility under its charter to carry passenger traffic.

The member for Burnside has from time to time suggested that the Adelaide railway station should be brightened up. However, I believe that it is probably as well maintained as any station I have seen anywhere in the world. Some stations may be better, but many are worse. I am convinced that by world standards the Adelaide railway station stands reasonably high, but that does not mean that it cannot be improved.

I ask the Minister why the Railways Department has not seriously considered and encouraged the utilization of the vast area over the platforms in Adelaide as a car park. With the growth of car parking facilities in the metropolitan area and the success that always seems to attend such projects, it is time the Railways Commissioner again considered this matter. It presents no insurmountable difficulties, and it would be a revenue earner.

I am not suggesting that the Commissioner himself should necessarily be involved in the expenditure connected with the building of this facility. If the proposition was offered to private enterprise I am sure there would be much interest in it. I point out that there are many modern means of overcoming the ventilation problem at reasonable cost. I believe that private enterprise would be happy to enter into negotiations to build a structure to the Commissioner's specifications and standards, and that private enterprise would be prepared to spend the necessary money on the basis of a long-term lease.

I am sure that such a project would be a continuing source of revenue for the Railways Department over many years. The Commissioner should cause an inquiry to be commenced; it need not be a departmental inquiry. The member for Burra stated that he believed the Commissioner and his staff tend to be very departmental. Although necessarily the Commissioner would be concerned, I believe an inquiry into a car park could involve members of the outside commercial world and of the building industry.

I compliment the Commissioner on the greatly improved standards of the camping quarters provided for his employees who are obliged to work away from their homes. This is in line with what industry generally is tending to provide. The standards hitherto provided were quite inadequate, but they have been progressively improved over the last four years, and such improvement is deserved by the employees.

I turn now to the re-laying programme of the ways and works branch of the Eyre Peninsula system. The 500 miles of narrow gauge railway on Eyre Peninsula were constructed with material that had been rejected by the department for use on "the mainland", as it is called. The fact that the Eyre Peninsula railways have handled rapidly growing tonnages of grain and superphosphate in recent years is a tribute to the railway employees on the peninsula. Only those of us who live there and who travel over the line know what condition the track is in for a good deal of its length. I have travelled in the railcar from Port Lincoln to my home at Cockaleechie on hundreds of occasions.

In wet winter weather the ballast under the line in some places is so seriously eroded that the holes that have formed in the track fill with water, and when the train passes along the sleepers go down into the muddy water,

and the trees along the road are spattered with mud at every join in the track. I know most of the railcar drivers on the line and I have stood in the cabin and have seen this happen. If one goes through Wanilla forest one can see this. How, under these conditions, the employees are able to drive their heavy goods trains over this sort of line amazes me, but they do it with few upsets and derailments and they succeed in moving harvest after harvest of considerable tonnages.

The employees in this area receive a good deal of praise from the public in the area for the way they work under these conditions. The re-laying programme is going on and the standard of the new track is quite good. Some people have advocated that the line should be standardized to 4ft. 8½in. gauge, but I do not think that is necessary. I think that well-laid 3ft. 6in. track would carry a great tonnage successfully, as it has on the line from Port Pirie to Broken Hill over a period of years and as it still does on the Queensland railways. It is not necessary to go to the expense of standardizing the Eyre Peninsula system, but it is necessary that the track should be improved at a rate faster than the Commissioner is presently undertaking. His programme provides for about 10 miles of line to be re-laid each year, which will mean that it will take a long time to bring the line up to standard. I ask that this re-laying programme be speeded up, because it is necessary and is justified in the light of the tonnages of grain and superphosphate that the line is now carrying.

Thirdly, regarding superphosphate, I wish to mention the rolling stock that is provided on the Port Lincoln and Thevenard Divisions for the transport of bulk superphosphate. The trucks used are the old YY and YX, with a few more modern bogie-type trucks. These trucks have been on the line for more years than I care to remember. In my wheat-lumping days I loaded practically every truck on the division with wheat and I know them all affectionately almost by name and number. These trucks are still being used for the carriage of bulk superphosphate, but they are not suitable for this purpose.

The trucks have been reasonably maintained for the carriage of bagged grain, but even with modern equipment and up-to-date elevators for taking the superphosphate from the trucks, this cannot be done without considerable wastage, as no flaps are provided on the hinge side of the doors, so that the superphosphate falls out of the trucks and must

be shovelled by hand. Bulk superphosphate has recaptured a good deal of the traffic the railways had lost up to the introduction of the carriage of superphosphate in bulk. The Commissioner might assist in the recovery of this traffic and assist the people who take delivery of superphosphate in bulk if he were to use a better type of truck for conveying the superphosphate from the works to the sidings. I hope he will pay some heed to my request.

I consider that the role of the railways is changing from passenger traffic to goods traffic and this traffic could be retained on a competitive basis. This could be developed, and it is the pattern throughout the world. In the United States of America one frequently sees long freight trains with no fewer than five diesel locomotives coupled together in charge of one man. Due to this arrangement the railways in other parts of the world are more than able to hold their own with other forms of transport. I believe this could be done here, but it will only be done if the Commissioner heeds the requests of the people who use the railways. He should make conditions a little better so that people will continue to use the railways.

Mr. RODDA: I wish to mention the South-Eastern passenger service. I know that the Commissioner is marshalling his forces to get the most for his money. Livestock trucks have been put on the trains from the South-East and these have been shunted into the passenger terminal at the Adelaide station. This means a long walk for the passengers on the train and their clothes have been soiled as a result of the trains being used for the carriage of bullocks. The freight trucks could be shunted off at Mile End and not brought into the passenger terminal.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member for Mitcham asked a question on the line dealing with the ticket-printing staff, etc., for which an increase of \$2,864 is provided. The increase in this line was brought about as a result of an increase in the basic wage. Several members asked questions about the refreshment services. An increase of \$19,524 has been allocated, because of increased business expected. I shall ask the Minister to see whether something cannot be done about refreshments for passengers on the Overland and other long-distance trains after late arrivals in Adelaide. At the opening of the new Government Garage, which I had the honour on behalf of the Government to perform, the catering was organized by this department

at a reasonable cost, and I doubt whether it could have been improved.

The function at the opening of the Keswick bridge will also be catered for by the refreshment services. I shall refer the question of providing a buffet car on the Overland to the Minister. The sign on the Adelaide railway station is let by contract, but the Government does not intend to divulge details of business associated with various competitors. I shall refer the request of the member for Angas to my colleague; also the question of the Victor Harbour service. In answer to the member for Stirling, a revenue accountant and an expenditure accountant are employed by the department, and I have no doubt that they would be competent to handle cost accounting. I am surprised that after so many years as a Minister the member for Flinders has permitted such a state of affairs as he described to exist, and that he would have ensured that repairs were made.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I was not complaining about you.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall ask my colleague to ascertain whether additional funds can be provided. The Railways Commissioner is trying to influence an industry in my district to use railway facilities, and I think he will be successful, especially with the advent of the container method of transporting cargo. For short hauls in the inner suburban areas road transport can provide a better service to passengers than can be provided by the railways, but this aspect may be considered in the report on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study which, I hope, will be available soon. I am satisfied that the railways are able to compete more than favourably with road transport for long distance haulage. The question of parking over the railway station is still being considered. I assure members that all matters raised by them will be conveyed to the Minister of Transport so that he may consult the Railways Commissioner about them.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Minister ascertain whether the railways will forgo the charge of 83c a ton on grain moved from a silo on railway property to be fed to starving stock? This charge is made by the railways but is not a freight charge. This is not a justifiable charge. There are many destinations to which the Railways Department could not deliver grain in bulk. For instance, there is no railway at Mannum. The department could not provide unloading facilities for bulk grain at places along the Pinnaroo

line or the Loxton line. Many people are suffering from one of the worst droughts ever known in this State and struggling to keep their stock alive by carting grain from the silos. Surely the Railways Commissioner could forgo some of this charge of 83c a ton and thereby render some small assistance.

I believe that the refreshment rooms at the Adelaide Railway Station are a credit to the Railways Department. I have taken visitors from other States and from overseas to the station for meals, and many of them have commented favourably on the way that establishment is conducted. However, the Adelaide Railway Station is certainly a very gloomy place compared with stations overseas such as Washington, New York Grand Central, and Stockholm.

The Minister of Social Welfare, representing the Minister of Transport in this Chamber, has stated that the railways can cater efficiently for haulage over long distances. I agree that in the haulage over long distances of super-phosphate and other heavy materials such as grain the railways can compete favourably with road transport. I have been awaiting the report of the Royal Commission on State Transport Services. Can the Minister say when the Government expects to receive that report? Many people and organizations, not only in primary industries but in other—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is not in order in developing that argument too far.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It is in connection with the railways, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member cannot develop the question of road transport unless he can link up his remarks with the railways.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I shall content myself with saying that I hope the Government receives the report soon. The greatest handicap the Railways Department is suffering is its public debt charges. The Auditor-General's report shows the great difficulty the department faces in meeting its outgoings from its receipts, so when the burden of the public debt charges is added one can see the difficulty it faces.

I hope the Minister will take up with the Minister of Transport and the Railways Commissioner the question of acquiring hopper-bottom grain trucks as quickly as possible. This type of truck would allow a much quicker turn-round at terminal ports such as Wallaroo, Port Pirie, Thevenard and Port Lincoln, thus ensuring a more rapid movement of grain

from country silos to the ports. More and more of these trucks have been put into service in New South Wales, where I understand they are regarded as one of the best paying propositions ever introduced. Honourable members will realize the advantages of these hopper-bottom trucks. I strongly recommend that the Government examine this matter quickly, for I am certain that the Railways Department could in a short time greatly increase its revenue from grain haulage.

These trucks can be loaded very quickly at railway sidings. All one does is pull the truck along and then pull a lever. A truck of this type is then loaded very quickly by means of the funnel emptying the grain into it. This system has been favourably commented on not only in New South Wales but also in other parts of the world. These trucks are a great innovation, and I consider that they are urgently needed.

Mr. COURCE: I refer specifically to the line under the Rolling Stock Branch setting out the salaries and wages of members of the staff and the mechanics and labourers engaged mainly at the Islington railway workshops. I have often raised with the Minister the question of continuity of work and employment at these workshops which, as they are situated adjacent to it, have an impact on my district. On August 1 I asked the Minister a question regarding work being carried out at these workshops for other organizations such as the Railways Departments of other States and the Commonwealth Government in respect of rail standardization. The Minister replied:

My colleague reports that the current work being undertaken at the Islington workshops for the manufacture of standard gauge rolling stock for the Peterborough division is expected to be completed at the end of this calendar year. However, tenders have yet to be called for a number of additional projects, and it is hoped that the South Australian Railways will be successful in obtaining the orders.

Will this work continue? Specifically, I draw the Minister's attention to the totals shown at the bottom of page 94 of the Estimates. The figure proposed for this year is \$2,705,569. In 1964-65 (a significant year) the allocation under this head was \$2,882,000; for 1965-66 it dropped to \$2,714,000; for 1966-67 it dropped still further to \$2,597,000; and for this year it is \$2,705,569. This means that, compared with 1964-65, less money is to be spent on salaries and wages at the Islington railway workshops than was spent in the last year of the Playford Government. This needs explaining because not only is the estimate this year less than in

1964-65 but also since that time there have been at least three award wage increases, both basic wage and marginal, and a service pay award has been made to railway employees. These awards in themselves would mean a significant increase in this line. As the vote for this year is so much less than it was four years ago, the only conclusion to which we can come is that either fewer men are employed at the Islington railway workshops now or less work is being done or planned. There is no other explanation.

Other members and I have stressed the importance (and I believe the Minister has, too) of keeping our own railway workshops working to maximum efficiency and providing the greatest amount of employment possible. This should concern every honourable member in this Chamber. I have been to the Islington workshops many times and I pay a tribute to the designers, engineers and workmen who do the work, which is first-rate. We compete successfully with other railway organizations in Australia, and we win on a comparative cost basis. I would appreciate a serious reply by the Minister.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: According to my information about rolling stock, the work in progress on the 5ft. 3in. gauge is: 21 diesel electric locomotives and spares, costing \$805,000; 20 suburban rail cars, \$1,456,000; 10 hopper wagons, \$77,000; two joint stock passenger cars, \$77,000; two joint stock sleeping cars, \$13,000; five workmen's sleeping vans, \$98,000; 60 flat wagons, \$54,000; improvements to freight vehicles, \$363,000; sundry rolling-stock items, \$45,000; for the 3ft. 6in. gauge it is: seven hopper wagons, \$32,000; six steel brake vans, \$80,000; sundry rollingstock items, \$14,000; for the 4ft. 8½in. gauge it is: conversion of diesel electric locomotives, \$200,000; conversion of wagons, \$88,000; plant and machinery, including motor vehicles, \$288,000. This makes a total for the Rollingstock Branch of \$3,690,000. As regards the line referred to by the honourable member, the information I have is that there is an increase of \$107,795 for award marginal and basic wage increases. If the honourable member had paid attention during the debate on the Loan Estimates, I would not have had to read out this information to him tonight.

Mr. COURCE: The Minister was confusing materials used with labour costs. I was talking only of salaries and wages at the Islington workshops. There is an increase of \$107,795 this year but even with that increase the total is less than the allocation made last

year of \$2,766,910, all of which was not used. Even with this increase it is less than the amount provided for salaries and wages in 1964-65, the last year of the Playford Administration. On the figures before us, less money is being provided for salaries and wages at the Islington workshops than was spent in 1964-65. The Minister's reply in no way satisfied me or explained the reason. If the Minister cannot give me the information now, let him say so and indicate that he will get it for me later. I believe I am entitled to this information.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am able to give information only about margins, awards and the basic wage increase. On the point raised by the honourable member, I can assume only that there has been some reduction in staff. In view of the importance the honourable member attaches to the matter, I shall obtain information on it.

Line passed.

Transport Control Board, \$45,965.

Mr. McANANEY: What is the explanation for the sum of \$12,200 (a new appropriation) allocated for the purchase of log books?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Subject to legislation relating to hours of driving being passed by Parliament, this line provides for the cost of initial stocks of log books, associated forms and sundry items. Apparently legislation must be introduced before the expenditure of this sum will be made.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister give details about "Costs awarded in court proceedings"?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A successful appeal in the Supreme Court and the High Court resulted in costs awarded against the Government totalling \$1,775 in 1966-67. As no appeals are pending provision has not been made for expenditure under this line for 1967-68.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister give a further explanation of the pending legislation that will require the printing of log books?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the honourable member is in order in referring to that.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister referred to this in his explanation.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is in order in canvassing the administration of the department. However, in reply to his question he was informed that this provision is dependent on legislation being passed.

Therefore, discussion is out of order in the Committee of Supply.

Line passed.

Motor Vehicles Department, \$782,995—passed.

MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND
MINISTER OF ROADS

Minister of Local Government and Roads Department, \$172,662; Highways and Local Government Department, \$3,525,965—passed. Miscellaneous, \$292,100.

Mr. HALL: Under the line "Purchase of land for public parks and recreation areas, etc.", \$250,000 was voted last year and \$250,000 exactly was spent. I imagine that some surplus has been transferred to the deposit fund. I see that \$250,000 is proposed for this year also. Can the Minister say what sum was actually spent last year and how much was transferred to the deposit account?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): The Leader will appreciate that I cannot give the exact figures. However, a considerable sum was spent in the purchase of land; in the Modbury area, one purchase to the extent of \$150,000 was made. I shall be happy to obtain the figures requested by the Leader.

Mr. HALL: I appreciate the offer, but I thought the Minister might have the figures because this sum has possibly not been fully expended.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It was spent last year, but I do not know what proportion went to the deposit fund.

Mr. HALL: I accept the Minister's offer to get the figures. Also, I want to know whether there is any specific target for the deposit fund. Will this provision ensure that the full sum is available for the purpose and, if it is not used in one year, is it available for the purposes the Government approves in this direction?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know exactly what the Leader means when he refers to a target. No doubt he appreciates that the purchase of public parks involves councils as well as the Government. This matter depends to some extent on whether councils have funds available to enable them to take over areas to be converted to public parks, and on whether requests from councils along these lines are forthcoming. A substantial sum was spent on one area last year. I do not know what applications have been made to the Minister of Local Government this year in connection with this line. I do not know whether councils have requested that areas be

purchased, saying that they will participate on an equal basis financially. I understand that the Auditor-General has drawn attention to the way in which this line was previously administered. Apparently, the allocation was not being used in accordance with the Public Parks Act. However, as this matter has been tightened up, the procedure is now directly in accordance with the Act. This means that councils to which land is handed over have to contribute 50 per cent of the cost. I do not know of any specific target, but if there is such a target I shall obtain the information for the honourable member.

Mr. RODDA: I refer to "Electricity Supplies (Country Areas) Act—grants to councils". A problem for South-East councils has cropped up in that an 8 per cent supervision charge is levied against councils. I point out that this charge becomes considerable. What is it being used for?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall obtain the information from my colleague.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Regarding the item "Electricity Supplies (Country Areas) Act—Grants to Councils", last year \$10,000 was provided but only \$124 was spent. This year the line shows a saving of \$124. In other words, there appears to be a very big alteration of policy on this matter. When the Government discussed with the Electricity Trust the question of reducing country tariffs to the level of city tariffs, the Government was confronted with the problem that some councils had established small electricity plants that were completely removed from the electricity grid and could never be connected to it. It was realized that consumers of this electricity would inevitably be in a difficult position because its cost would always be exorbitant. Consequently, it was arranged that grants would be made to councils that arranged electricity supplies in order to provide some relief to this type of consumer. Has there been an important change of policy, and has the Government now decided that this assistance will not be given in the future?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I take it that the honourable member is referring to subsidies given to council areas where there is no Electricity Trust supply. There has been no change in this matter. The trust has advised that no additional grants are proposed for 1967-68. I am not certain of the form of grant that is paid. However, I am certain it has nothing to do with the subsidizing of tariffs. Tariffs were reduced while the mem-

ber for Gumeracha was Treasurer, and they have been further reduced since then in order to bring country tariffs within 10 per cent of city tariffs. I shall ask for a report on the matter.

Mr. COUMBE: The Local Government Act Revision Committee is doing much work on a subject of great importance not only to members of this House but to every municipality, corporation and city in South Australia. I wonder how far it has proceeded with its formidable task. The sum of \$6,500 was provided last year and \$19,200 is provided this year, which indicates that the committee will be very busy. This sum would cover not only members' fees and travelling expenses but also those of the learned counsel who assists the committee. I understand he is Mr. Gifford, Q.C.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Is he a practitioner practising in South Australia?

Mr. COUMBE: I understand that he is a member of the Victorian bar and, as such, he is not admitted to the South Australian bar. However, I believe that arrangements have been made for him to assist here. Can the Minister say when we can expect this committee to complete its investigations and when a report will be brought down? Also, can he indicate where in the Estimates provision is made for the work of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study? I asked a question regarding this matter (it was not the first time that I had done so) and I was less than satisfied with the answer. I think the Minister's colleague said that a report was being completed and that it might be presented at some time in the future and that I should realize that its printing would take a considerable time. This is quite unsatisfactory because this study is of great importance to metropolitan members and will have a great bearing on the future development of the metropolitan area.

Many projects, including freeways, highways and drainage schemes, are being purposely held up until the study is completed: can the Minister give some positive indication as to when this will occur? I can only assume that the Government is stalling. I can put no other construction on this because of the devious way in which the Minister's colleague gave the answer. I should like the Minister to give me some definite information on this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member can place whatever construction he wishes on the reply of the Minister of Roads. The honourable member knows the

magnitude of the study, which was commenced in 1964 or 1965. The study is proceeding and the report will be a voluminous one. The report has been completed, but it is a matter of printing it and the maps associated with it. It is hoped that in about two or three months the report will be available. The Government is as anxious as the honourable member is to have the report brought down and has no reason to delay it. The survey is a very costly one. It is unfair of the honourable member to say that the Minister is avoiding the question. With the pressure the Government Printer is under, the Minister cannot say exactly when the report will be available.

Regarding the Local Government Act Revision Committee, it is intended that the committee's activities will considerably increase this year. To date the committee has made a number of trips to country areas and to other States. These are the reasons for the increase in the allocation this year. It is apparent that it will be another year before the report can be expected, although I should not like to be quoted on this. I do not think the committee could give an indication of when its report will be available, as it is evident that a number of matters must still be considered by it. In view of the effect the committee's report could have on local government in this State, it is only fitting that the investigation should be very thorough and that the report should be a good one. The services of Mr. Gifford, Q.C., who is a recognized expert on local government matters in Australia, were sought by the Government on behalf of the committee. I shall examine the honourable member's comments and if I have missed any point he has raised I shall obtain the necessary information for him.

Mr. COUMBE: I mention the line, "Levi Park Trust—Government contribution". This park was set up under a special Act administered by the Walkerville and Enfield councils. For a number of years a \$200 grant was provided for this park, but this year the grant has been deleted. What is the reason for this?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The grant is no longer required but why, I do not know. I shall inquire into the reason for this.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I mention the line, "Grant to Woomera Board for expenses in connection with dog registration and control, \$200". Throughout the State this work is done by local government. What is so special about Woomera that it must get a grant from the Government to control its dogs in a Commonwealth military establish-

ment? How did this line originate and what is the reason for it? I should think there would be people in Woomera capable of taking registration fees without getting a subvention for the purpose.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I believe this grant is to cover the cost of printing registration discs. I do not know why the Government makes this grant but I shall be happy to obtain this information for the honourable member.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF SOCIAL WELFARE

Social Welfare Department, \$3,048,637.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There are two items I wish to mention under this line. The first is "Provisions, special monetary relief, medicines, drapery, clothing, reimbursement of travelling expenses, interments and sundries, \$420,000". An increase of \$27,096 has been provided over the amount expended in 1966-67. At first glance one would think that this was a fairly normal increase in a particular line, but there is more to it than that, because if one looks at the Treasurer's explanation of the Estimates one finds that in the last paragraph he stated:

Included in the provision of \$3,049,000 for the Department of Social Welfare is \$420,000 for public relief.

On the other hand the Treasurer went on to have a crack at the Commonwealth Government, even though it is giving us some money. The Treasurer further stated:

The extent of Commonwealth assistance to South Australia in 1967-68 is expected to be of the order of \$60,000, and this amount has been included in the Estimates of Revenue as a probable receipt.

We are getting \$60,000 for relief payments, yet the increase in the line is less than half of the amount that we are getting from the Commonwealth Government. This means we are putting aside less from State resources this year than we have in the past, and this is the pattern followed by this Government. The latest report of the department (dated June 30, 1966) shows that the number of relief applications approved during the year was 2,864, representing 9,330 persons, an increase of 943 cases and 3,280 persons from the previous year. The gross cost of the relief, including administrative expenses, was \$307,866 in 1964-65 and \$411,252 in 1965-66, an increase of \$103,386. Although the total number of persons assisted increased by 54 per cent from 1964-65, the gross cost increased by only 34 per cent. Apparently, those who were on relief received

less than had previously been the case. The report states:

Numerically by far the greatest increase was in the number of persons assisted because of unemployment. However, in many of these cases the unemployment was of a very temporary nature and relief was issued for only a short period.

The department did not make it clear that those on relief after the first period could return for supplementary assistance, but many did not do so. These trends occurred at a time when the Government had set up a Social Welfare Department with a Minister whose sole job was social welfare, yet we find this trend. It is ironical that before the Labor Party was in Government we had, for many years, heard complaints from members then in Opposition about the inadequacy of public relief and about all the big things that they would do when they got into office. They have not been able to do them.

A few months ago a social worker living in my district sent me a copy of a letter that she had forwarded to the then Minister of Social Welfare, the present Treasurer. That letter, dated May 29, 1967, reproached the Government about public relief and its failure to improve the situation since it had been in office. The last paragraph stated:

I should like, therefore, to inquire whether my above impressions are correct and whether it is the Government's intention during the term of the present Parliament to at least rectify some of the disadvantages which seem to have arisen for the pensioner families of this State by virtue of the fact that the relief scales have not been changed since this Government came into office.

Mr. Langley: Did you say "pensioner"?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes: does the honourable member wish to argue with Miss Lean?

Mr. Langley: Not really, but I thought pensioners came under social services.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thanked Miss Lean by letter on June 1, and on the same date I wrote to the then Minister, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, asking him to send me a copy of the reply that he would send to Miss Lean. To date no reply has been received either from the Hon. D. A. Dunstan or the Hon. F. H. Walsh.

Mr. Coumbe: Why?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Because the letter is unanswerable. We have heard so much from the Treasurer lately about people who do not answer letters: he refers to the Prime Minister in this way. A month later, after Miss Lean had not had a reply from the Minister, an article appeared in the *Sunday Mail* on June 24 about this matter. An example was given of

a case of great hardship and social workers were referred to. The article stated:

Workers said these were only two cases of hundreds where families were in dire need because unemployment benefits were inadequate.

In the article Miss Lean was reported to have said:

As the Opposition Party some of the Government members implied criticism of the previous State Government for the inadequacy of supplementary allowances as well as the fact that the rates were not made public, but this Government, however, has not changed this state of affairs during the 27 months it has been in office.

That brought a response from the new Treasurer and from his Minister of Social Welfare, which was published in the *Advertiser* on Monday, June 26. One paragraph of that report states:

Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Walsh both said that the Social Welfare Advisory Council was preparing a report on State public relief and until the Government received the report and recommendations it would not alter the existing relief assistance.

Subsequently, I asked questions of the Treasurer and of the Minister of Social Welfare, bearing in mind that Miss Lean had written to me and sent me a copy of the letter; also, that she is one of my constituents and, beyond that, the importance to this State of adequate public relief. What do we get the next day (June 27) from the Treasurer? He said that the whole matter of public relief allowances in South Australia had been referred to the Social Welfare Advisory Council, and he went on to say:

In the meantime, we have asked that the whole of the public relief system be revised urgently and the Social Welfare Advisory Council has had this matter before it since it was appointed.

Incidentally, it was appointed in March, 1966, so it has taken a jolly long time. The Treasurer continued:

The Government intends to revise the whole public relief scale during the life of this Parliament and we have asked that the Social Welfare Advisory Council urgently complete its investigations.

Well, that may be its intention, but we can see from this line that it is not going to mean much more relief to the people in this State who need it, because there is not a very great increase in the amount. In fact, it is less than half of the amount that now is to come from the Commonwealth Government. In subsequent questions we get the same story. We were told on July 11 that the report was now to hand and was being given current

consideration by Cabinet. The Hon. Frank Walsh went on in this way:

No alterations in the allowable income standard have been made, but alterations were made to the means test allowing people to receive public relief without their being required to be completely destitute before qualifying.

Then he went on to make a most revealing statement. He said:

I am not satisfied with the way in which these matters have been handled over the years.

Of course, they had been handled by his predecessor, the present Treasurer, for over two years, but apparently the Minister was not satisfied. He ended his answer to me on that occasion by saying:

People are entitled to much information about this matter and, as soon as I have it ready and it has been seen by Cabinet, it will be made available.

It is still not available. As I understand the intention of the Minister of Social Welfare, it is to publish a booklet like the booklet published by the Minister for Child Welfare and Social Welfare in New South Wales, headed *Social Welfare Services of New South Wales*. The one I have is for 1966. We still do not have anything here, and the Government has made it clear that it is not prepared to alter the relief scales until this jolly booklet is ready. I do not know how long we must wait for this, and I do not know how long those who need more relief will have to wait. However, if this line is any reliable guide they will not be any better off in this present financial year than they have been in the past.

This is a most unsatisfactory situation, when we bear in mind what the member for Norwood, the present Treasurer (who was the strongest critic of the last Liberal Government on social relief) said in the past and what he has said since he came into office, and when we bear in mind also what the Hon. Frank Walsh has said since he became Minister of Social Welfare. When will we get some action, and when will Miss Lean get an answer to her letter, if not in writing then at least an answer to the points she makes by some improvements in them? This is the Minister's sole portfolio now, and I know he is giving all his time to it. I hope that it brings some results, but I am afraid, looking at this line, that it is not bringing any results, because the State is putting less into public relief this year than it did last year. It had grabbed \$60,000 from the Commonwealth Government and has made that an opportunity to reduce its own allocation. I think that is a very poor show.

Can the Minister give me some reply to the points I have made?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: First, I want to put the member for Mitcham back on the rails. It was stated in the press and, I believe, in other places that the Commonwealth Government would assist by paying the States half of what they were spending on deserted wives. We were told by the Commonwealth Government that a conference of Directors would be held in Canberra and that it was expected a conference of Ministers would be convened shortly afterwards. Attempts were made both in writing and by telephone to ascertain when this conference was likely to be held, but we have not yet been able to get any answer from the Commonwealth Government. A minute that I have approved and forwarded to the Treasurer authorizes the Director of Social Welfare to proceed to Canberra as soon as the conference is convened. I have been informed by telephone that the only item for consideration will be the question of deserted wives.

I have a great objection to spelling out the categories that come within the six-months waiting period. However, these categories can be stated as divorced women, deserted wives, women with husbands in gaol, and women with husbands in mental hospitals. I believe each category could and should be referred to as a "manless family". Regarding the \$60,000 mentioned by the honourable member, the conference has not taken place, and that it is not the fault of this Government.

Mr. Millhouse. The money has been allocated.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It has not been received. The honourable member referred to a case mentioned by a social worker in the *Sunday Mail*. However, I was told by the department that it did not know of the case.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you mean by that?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The information I have had from the Director is that the family referred to in that article is not known to the department. Therefore, I do not see how we can be held responsible.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think it is a false case?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member makes these innuendoes, but I am not going to be dragged into some stupidity of his over the matter. I have stated the case truthfully from information given me by the Department of Social Welfare.

Mr. Millhouse: I am only trying to understand what you are saying.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is not my fault if the honourable member cannot understand. He should know that the Commonwealth Government is responsible for providing public relief for people who fall sick or become unemployed. They also are eligible for child endowment payments. After a certain age they become entitled to an age pension if they satisfy a means test. Commonwealth assistance is not available to the people in the categories I have mentioned for six months: it is the State's responsibility to try to give assistance, which it does. Had it not been for the propaganda about the Commonwealth Government paying half the cost, I am sure information would have been available to the public about the Government's intentions on relief.

Cabinet has considered an estimate of costs submitted by the Director and an officer of the Treasury. My first proposal would have cost this Government up to another \$700,000 beyond what was expected to be paid. However, there is now to be a revised proposal, which must be advertised and made known to the people when it is ready, because I do not believe in the under-the-table practices of the Playford Government. When agreement is reached, we shall publish the new relief proposals.

Mr. Millhouse: But it will not be in this financial year?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member is very wide of the mark.

Mr. Millhouse: You have not provided any more money for it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is not a question of the money being available; it is a case of Cabinet agreeing on certain measures that will benefit the people of this State. The honourable member also challenged what the present Treasurer did when he was the Minister in charge of this department. Long before I became the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber I attacked the miserable way in which the Liberal Government dealt with these matters. Under that Government, families who possessed a radio were denied public relief. A radio was regarded as a luxury. If a family possessed a washing machine, it had no chance of relief. This Government allows a family to own a television set without being barred from relief.

Mr. Jennings: Can the member for Mitcham deny that?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: He can deny anything, but he cannot deny this truthfully.

This Government does not want people to suffer indignities because of hardship. Child endowment used to be taken into account when assessing relief, but my department has abandoned that policy, so we are making some little progress. It may seem little but it means much to the people when these things are all taken together—and, in the near future, they will not be the only items to be considered. What thought has the member for Mitcham ever given to the unborn or to those girls of tender years in institutions, unmarried and pregnant?

Has he ever considered whether or not they should get relief? The Liberal Government did not give it to those unfortunate girls, but I am trying my hardest to do so. So far, nothing has been done for the girl of 16, or even under 16, meeting with this type of misfortune. Of course, Commonwealth assistance is available in the form of pre-natal and post-natal payments, but the girls still have to pay for confinement at the Queen Victoria Hospital.

Mr. McKee: Are there many of these people?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I could take the honourable member to see a hundred tomorrow.

Mr. McKee: What was the position under the previous Government?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not know if they were catered for, but they are today. I do not advocate a nation of illegitimate children, but I do say that young girls who are pregnant and unmarried should have more consideration given to them than is the case today. I am confident that Cabinet will approve certain matters I have presented to it regarding relief. To some extent these matters will result in an improvement in the present position. There must be agreement with the Commonwealth on relief if we are to get anywhere. I am informed that the position regarding unemployment relief in Queensland is almost pathetic. In South Australia, if a person is unemployed, he must first make an application at the Commonwealth Social Services Department; then he goes to the State Social Welfare Department. Of course, some type of means test has to be associated with all of these matters. However, if people do not have any money they will receive the relief payments. Unemployment benefits are not paid in advance and it may be three weeks before a person receives anything.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thank the Minister for attempting to answer me. He had a difficult job because the figures on the lines did not support additional relief being provided. I wish to read the following comment made by a social worker about this matter:

In response to Mr. Dunstan's statement in reply this week to Mr. Millhouse as published in the *Advertiser* of June 28, 1967, namely, that the Social Welfare Advisory Council's investigation had revealed that public relief in other States was shockingly poor and at times almost non-existent, I would agree that this is so. For many years the South Australian relief payments relative to those in other States were good. The conditions pertaining to qualifications for South Australian relief left much to be desired but the rates were good relative to other States.

That is something members of the Government Party could take to heart. I wish to refer to a matter that I have raised often, and that is the emergency housekeeper service run by the Social Welfare Department. Many people in the service itself, in the department, and outside are afraid that this service is about to fold up. In the report for 1965-66 under the heading "Emergency Housekeeper Service" the following appears:

As part of its facilities for necessitous persons, the department provides a housekeeper service for family emergencies.

It goes on to say that a housekeeper can be provided for up to six weeks. It continues:

During the year, housekeepers were supplied to 100 homes in all parts of the State. This compares with 124 homes in 1964-65. Recruitment of staff suitable for this work is extremely difficult and some requests for assistance had to be refused because of staff shortages. A charge is made to cover the cost of the housekeeper service but the amount charged may be reduced in cases of hardship.

It goes on to give figures that amount to under \$10,000 altogether. The report uses the words "As part of its facilities for necessitous persons". The whole problem is that the charges made for this service are now far too high. The then Minister of Social Welfare wrote to me on April 19 last setting out the charges that are made. The charge made for a housekeeper is \$38.50 a week. It is impossible for anybody, except a person with a comfortable income, to pay such an amount as that. The letter goes on to say that reductions may be made on application in individual cases if a need is established. In fact, the means test is severe and one has to have a low income indeed before one can get any reduction from the figure of \$38.50 a week. The letter continues:

The standard rate of charge is approximately 38 per cent more than the weekly wages cost. That is the administrative cost loaded on top of the wages paid to the women in this service. My family and I have availed ourselves of this service from time to time, and we have found it excellent and a very great help. However, we are not the sort of people for whom this service was originally intended. I have never been called necessitous: I do not think I could be so called in my financial circumstances. I am informed that nearly all the people who use these housekeepers are professional people, because they are the only people who can afford this service. This is why year after year the use made of it has been declining. If we go on like this the service will soon have to fold up.

It is sheer nonsense to say that the decrease has been due to recruiting difficulties, and so on. It has never been easy to get women for a job like this, but the stark fact is that the need still exists: it must exist when illnesses occur in certain types of family. The only reason for the decline in the use of this service is that the cost of it is too high. These facilities are supposed to be used by people in necessitous circumstances, but they are not so used at present. I raised this matter again with the successor as Minister of Social Welfare to the Hon. D. A. Dunstan and I received the same sort of reply, and I have also received it in answer to my questions. I ask the Minister to look at the problem himself, and not to rely on information given by members of his department.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In 1966-67 housekeepers were supplied by the department to 76 homes throughout the State; this figure compares with 100 homes in the previous year. The main reason for the reduction was the difficulty in obtaining suitable women prepared to accept work of this type. The gross cost, including \$1,000 for administration and other expenses, was \$8,450 and receipts were \$6,488, resulting in a net cost for the year of \$1,962.

Whilst I am prepared to discuss this matter with the Director, I point out that I am not prepared to reduce the standards that have been set. If a housekeeper service is to be provided, the housekeeper is entitled to a room to herself and to a proper rate of pay. Provision should be made for fares, holiday pay and annual leave. I am prepared to have investigated the honourable member's statement that this service is used only by professional people, but in no circumstances am I prepared

to reduce the standards. If it is possible to recruit suitable housekeepers who can be accommodated and engaged in accordance with proper standards, I am prepared to investigate the matter further.

Mrs. BYRNE: Regarding the item "Children placed out", I notice that last year \$184,865 was paid for the maintenance of children placed in foster homes. Can the Minister say how many children were so placed, and what clothing was provided for them?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: For many years the policy has been not to detain children in institutions, as it is believed that children are better cared for in a family group. I cannot provide the figure that the honourable member has requested but I shall obtain it. A bulk clothing store is maintained, which also supplies the requirements of the smaller institutions and homes. The costs are re-charged.

Mr. COUMBE: Regarding the item "Promotion of social welfare within the community", I presume that the pilot project referred to is that at which the Minister will officiate in the Norwood district in a week or two. Whilst I understand what is intended, can the Minister inform the Committee what form the after-school activities take, how they will be promoted, and in what areas of the community the money will be spent? Also, can he say how an organization can qualify?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: On Friday week I shall preside at the opening of this place in Norwood. It was associated with the Education Department and it comprises about an acre of land. It has certain provisions for shed accommodation and I have requested an officer of the Department of Social Welfare to obtain the necessary tutors to take charge of activities. It is proposed that activities will be provided between 3.30 and 5.30 p.m. on week days and an attempt will be made for it to be open between 9.30 and 11.30 a.m. on Saturdays. This is a trial run to see what the children of the area desire. The place will be supervised at all times and whatever staff is engaged will be responsible for keeping the children occupied in some activity. It will be an opportunity to keep the children off the streets and to give them a chance to take part in some type of organized activity. The maintenance of the place, such as the cutting of the grass and looking after the shrubs on the property, will be done by the residents who will be transported from Magill to keep the area in good condition.

Mr. Coumbe: Have you any definite plans to set up any others?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is proposed to establish these centres wherever it is possible to do so, particularly in the congested residential areas that have no open spaces, in order to encourage after-school activity. I prefer to call these places youth centres. Already some organized effort has been made in Norwood and Kensington that was well received. The children there were interested in what was provided for them, and I believe the activities there will be transferred to this youth centre as soon as it is functioning.

Mr. McANANEY: About 18 months or two years ago the then Minister of Social Welfare introduced a new system for serving maintenance orders on defaulting fathers. In the Auditor-General's Report I notice that little increase has been made in the maintenance payments during last year compared with the previous year. Why has this system not worked out as well as the previous Minister told us it would?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The collection of maintenance this year has improved over that for last year.

Mr. McAnaney: By about 6 per cent.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: And the Interstate Maintenance Section has improved its collections for other States. Applications are being called for a maintenance officer who will prosecute cases in country centres. This will not necessarily mean that whoever is appointed will concentrate solely on travelling throughout the country but it will mean that three maintenance officers will take turns in presenting cases instead of depending on the Legal Aid Section of the department. This should increase collections for maintenance. An application has to be made when a person is in arrears, but by the time it is processed at least a month or six weeks could elapse. The party concerned is represented at the first hearing, but if he cannot offer payment the case is adjourned, which means that no maintenance is received. It is a question of trying to catch up with the defaulter. I think there will be further improvement in the maintenance section as a result of its added staff.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: What are the activities of the Social Welfare Advisory Council that replaced the previous board? I know that its duties are different from those that the board had. Does the council visit institutions under departmental control the same as the old board did or does it simply meet and deliberate? How often does the council meet, and is it concerned only with

questions referred to it by the Minister or can it initiate inquiries, and has it done so?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: On May 12, 1966, the then Minister, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, referred to the council the question of what amounts should be fixed for public relief payments in South Australia and on what means test, and the council reported on that submission on July 5, 1967. It considered that the Commonwealth Government was responsible for relief matters, but did not positively recommend what payments should be made. It suggested that long-term benefits should be used for public relief.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Did the council suggest that long-term Commonwealth payments should be made?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, to State relief. Long-term payments apply to those on age and invalid pensions, and short-term payments are for those suffering from sickness and the unemployed. The person on an age pension finds it difficult to recover economically but those on sickness and unemployment relief can do so after a period. Long-term relief payments cannot be paid to all applicants. The council visits different institutions and, at present, is inquiring into assistance for pregnant unmarried girls. I do not criticize the Director of Social Welfare, but after my discussions with him I find that he is not the easiest person in the world to get on with. He has a job to do and is a qualified auditor. I do not know where to find a person more out of step with public relief than an auditor. I would rather have the member for Mitcham as the Director of Social Welfare, as I am sure he would have a more humane approach to these matters.

Mr. McANANEY: Is there any reason for the reduction from 547 to 490 children admitted to institutions, although expenditure has increased?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Again, I do not reflect on anyone, but the Juvenile Court magistrate has vastly different ideas from his predecessor. The number of committals to institutions is less, but many children who are committed today would have been more receptive to discipline had they been committed earlier to institutions. The administrators are concerned that in many cases these children do not accept discipline. It is the responsibility of the Juvenile Court magistrate, and I know the Treasurer's attention has been drawn to these matters. The Director is also perturbed about it, but I do not know the solution.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you intend to take action?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: How can I take it?

Mr. Millhouse: I don't know.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member should know. Members of the legal profession should accept positions as magistrates, but they prefer to continue in practice.

Mr. Millhouse: You are not reflecting on Mr. Elliott, I hope?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: That is the last thing I would do. If I was permitted to give Mr. Elliott some advice, perhaps I could do that, too.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$137,770—passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

The Estimates were adopted by the House and an Appropriation Bill for \$206,928,853 was founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is for the appropriation of \$206,928,853, details of which are set out in the Estimates that have just been dealt with by honourable members. Clause 2 provides for the further issue of \$140,928,853, being the difference between the amount authorized by the two Supply Acts (\$66,000,000) and the total of appropriation required in this Bill.

Clause 3 sets out the amount to be appropriated and the allocation of the appropriation to the various departments and functions. The clause also provides that if increases of salaries or wages become payable pursuant to any determination made by a properly constituted authority the Governor may appropriate the necessary funds by warrant, and the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased accordingly. The clause further provides that, if the cost of electricity for pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide main, from bores in the Adelaide water district, and through the Morgan-Whyalla main should be greater than the amounts set down in the Estimates, the Governor may appropriate the funds for the additional expenditure, and the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased by the amount of such additional expenditure.

Clause 4 authorizes the Treasurer to pay moneys from time to time up to the amounts set down in monthly orders issued by the Governor, and provides that the receipts obtained from the payees shall be the discharge to the Treasurer for the moneys paid. Clause 5 authorizes the use of Loan funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Commonwealth and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by clause 3. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1967.

Clause 7 authorizes the expenditure of \$4,150,000 from the Hospitals Fund. Members may recall that last year a similar clause gave authority for the expenditure of \$350,000 from the fund in 1966-67 and during the early months of 1967-68. That authority was given as one figure. This year the clause is in the same general form but it has been deemed desirable to show separately the figures for the two years concerned. The authority of \$3,150,000 sought for 1967-68 is the amount expected to be available for distribution during the year, and the detailed proposals totalling that amount have been set out in the Budget papers which have been considered by honourable members. Should the amount available for distribution prove to be in excess of \$3,150,000 in 1967-68, it would be necessary for the Government to seek Parliament's authority before actually making further expenditure beyond that figure. The logical time to seek that approval, if necessary, would be when Supplementary Estimates are before the House.

For the early part of 1968-69 until the passing of the new Appropriation Bill an authority is sought to expend from the fund amounts not exceeding \$1,000,000. This should suffice to cover the sums becoming available until about mid-October, 1968. It would be reasonable to expect assent to the new Appropriation Bill in the middle or latter part of October, and in accordance with present practice that Bill would give authority for the whole of the expected expenditures from the fund in 1968-69. Clause 8 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated. I commend the Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): As the Treasurer wishes to take this Bill through all its stages I think his concluding remark about commending the Bill for the consideration of members is not quite appropriate. We

certainly have not had sufficient time to consider the Bill, which incorporates some changes this year as outlined by the Treasurer. I should like an assurance that apart from the matter he has referred to concerning the Hospitals Fund the Bill is in its usual form. I take it that the Treasurer will give that assurance.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

Mr. HALL: Having had that assurance, I trust that it will be repeated in the Committee stage if necessary. We have discussed the formal part of these matters at some length. I am willing to support the Bill but we could easily let it stand over until tomorrow. However, if the Treasurer desires to proceed with it tonight, I shall support the second reading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill but it should not be necessary for the Leader of the Opposition to make a speech and at the same time inquire about the contents of the Bill. It would make the running of this House smoother if these things were arranged beforehand and the Treasurer told the Leader of the Opposition what was going on. This lack of courtesy has occurred so much in the last session that I resent the way in which the Opposition is being treated. Last week the Treasurer criticized the Opposition for repetitive speeches and almost every week, if not several times a week, he has criticized the behaviour of the Opposition in Parliament. Perhaps he should look at his own conduct in this Chamber and see whether perhaps the fault does not lie with him, because most members in this Chamber have had experience of previous Treasurers, and particularly the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) who for many years led this House and, with very few protests over all those years, managed to conduct its business smoothly. This he did by taking into account the point of view of the Opposition. Nobody on the Government benches will deny that. He always studied the point of view of the Opposition and, if he wished to introduce a Bill and have it put right through, he would arrange for it by consultation with the Leader of the Opposition or he would agree to a deferment or in some other way he would study the desires of the Opposition.

It is time the present Government learned to study the Opposition's point of view instead of incessantly criticizing us. Now, the Treasurer introduces an Appropriation Bill without doing the Leader of the Opposition the courtesy

of telling him anything. Obviously, we cannot consider it in the way that the Treasurer has just suggested. We can only accept his assurance that this Bill is what everybody expects it to be. We do not deny that he is right—we are not used to doubting that he is correct—but we have a right to be consulted. If the Treasurer says that this Bill contains what we think it does, I will accept it but it should not be necessary for the Opposition to have to make these concessions to custom without some form of prior consultation.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I cannot understand why the member for Alexandra has spoken like he has. Ever since I have been in this Chamber this has been the procedure. There is nothing new about it. Members opposite are disgruntled and bitter that they are no longer accepted as the governing class in this State, which is a bitter pill to swallow, particularly for the member for Mitcham and also for the honourable member who has just resumed his seat after getting up and making an exhibition of himself, as he did just now. This will not do them any good. The trouble is that they have lost the prestige of being the class given the divine right to govern.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Treasurer to pay the orders of Governor, and discharge by receipt of party."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Last year a similar clause 4 appeared in that Appropriation Bill: in fact, it has been in these Bills for probably 15 to 20 years, so it is not new. However, last year it appeared in an entirely different form, a form not envisaged when first drawn up and a form with very little legality behind it. Can the Treasurer give an assurance that we shall not have a repetition of what happened last year when, in accordance with the provisions of clause 4, warrants were made out by the Governor and countersigned by the Chief Secretary, and payments were made? That went on for 11 months of the year. Payments were made, receipts were obtained, and then the Government altered its mind about how it would adjust its finances.

The moneys that had been paid out under this clause suddenly became, in some mysterious way, a part of Loan moneys. I do not know what view the Auditor-General took of this, but I understand that he has placed an additional amount in the Revenue Account and balanced the books by paying

Loan money into General Revenue and leaving these amounts still standing under the Governor's Warrant. I am not sure of that, nor have I any way of ascertaining that I am right, because it is not possible for me to cross-examine officers, not is that desirable; I do not desire to do so. I ask the Treasurer whether it is proposed this year, having made payments under a Governor's Warrant and having received the money, to adjust the books by substituting payments from the Loan Account for that purpose. Will the Treasurer give an assurance that any Governor's Warrant issued under clause 4 will not be cancelled nor any action taken to alter the books after the payment has been made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I give the honourable member an assurance that the books of this State will be dealt with in a proper and legal manner and that the powers of the Treasurer as authorized by this Parliament in accordance with long standing procedures of law will be upheld. This matter has been canvassed in this place previously. I have pointed out that the honourable member's statement that I had done something new in this matter was incorrect; it was not new but something done before on a number of occasions, in fact done by the honourable member himself. As far as his doubting the legality of this matter is concerned, the Auditor-General was consulted before this was done and entirely approved of the matter. The honourable member cannot point to anything in the Auditor-General's Report to suggest anything improper about what was done. Nothing improper was done in relation to the accounts of the State, and I assure the honourable member that nothing improper will be done. The point the honourable member has taken is erroneous and ill-based and the information he has given the Committee about its being new is completely wrong.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Treasurer say specifically where there is power in any Act to cancel the warrant which the Governor has given where payment has been made by that warrant? There is certainly no power in this clause to cancel the warrant given by the Governor: such a warrant is given only when there is a certificate that the amount is necessary and in accordance with the Act. This has to be countersigned by the Chief Secretary to that effect. In this case, after the warrant has been submitted to the Governor and signed by the Chief Secretary, payment is made under it. Then, by some

mysterious means the effect is that it is transferred to an entirely different fund. Last year moneys paid under a warrant in the Revenue Account ultimately were met by subventions from the Loan Account. If the Treasurer can say where there is power to cancel such a warrant, I will be satisfied.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well that there was no necessity to cancel the Governor's Warrant before. This whole matter has been debated *ad nauseam* in this place. On a previous occasion, the honourable member spoke and then egged on the member for Mitcham to speak on this matter. I was able to point out that the honourable member changed the tenor of his argument in about five minutes when he discovered the informa-

tion that I had completely exploded the case he put before the Committee.

Mr. Millhouse: When was that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the debate on the Public Purposes Loan Bill. In fact, the member for Gumeracha has been trying to work up something in relation to accounting procedures which has no basis whatever. There is no necessity to cancel the Governor's Warrant and that was made perfectly clear in a previous debate.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 8) and title passed.
Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 28, at 2 p.m.