

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS

#### CHOWILLA DAM

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Will the Premier table in the House the minutes of the last meeting of the River Murray Commission and ensure that any such document he tables includes the exact text of the resolution for which the South Australian Commissioner voted at that meeting concerning the Chowilla dam?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will do my best to facilitate the supply of the material sought by the Leader. However, I refer the question to the Minister of Works to ascertain what information he has in this regard.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As the Leader indicated last night that he desired further information on this subject, I had a report prepared this morning by Mr. Beaney who, besides being Director and Engineer-in-Chief, is also the South Australian Commissioner on the River Murray Commission. The report, which covers the aspect on which the Leader has sought information, states:

The South Australian Commissioner went to the April meeting of the River Murray Commission with the clear direction that he should not support any resolution to cancel or indefinitely defer the construction of the Chowilla dam. This was given in confident expectation that the issue would not be forced to finality at the meeting. It was realized that the upper-river alternative site had not been investigated to a stage where a reliable estimate could be made of the cost of the alternative and it was understood that further work would have to be done to justify the most enthusiastic supporter of such a project in any attempt to substitute it for Chowilla on a short or a long-term basis. Prior to the April meeting an interim report had been received from the consultants to the commission suggesting that Chowilla did not provide adequate salinity control. At the meeting the South Australian Commissioner challenged the data on which this report had been produced and received authority from the commission to make further inquiries from the consultants. This was subsequently done and the consultants agreed to re-examine the whole basis of their interim report. To date, this has not been completed.

It was realized prior to the April meeting that any attempt to put the matter to arbitration at that stage would invite any arbitrator appointed to put the whole matter back to further inquiry into the whole range of benefits sought from Chowilla and to require documentation of proposals made for an alternative.

The present situation is that the commission has requested the Snowy Mountains Authority to investigate the physical practicability and the cost of an alternative at Dartmouth on the Mitta Mitta River. On verbal advice it appears unlikely that this investigation will be completed before the end of 1968.

From this the Leader can see that the Commissioner was instructed to go to the meeting with a clear direction that he should not support any resolution to cancel or defer indefinitely the construction of the dam. I believe this was the information the Leader was seeking.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: From reports, we understand that the Premier had talks about the Chowilla dam with the Minister for National Development (Mr. Fairbairn). Can he say what Mr. Fairbairn said in those conversations?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I had talks together with Mr. Fairbairn and the Prime Minister covering the whole range of benefits, needs and other aspects relating to the dispute and dissension that have arisen concerning Chowilla. I am afraid that I am unable to tell the House of any result from those talks, as they were held privately in an endeavour to strengthen South Australia's approach to the Commonwealth Government in this matter. I make no secret of the fact (I do not believe this is a secret anywhere in Australia) that the Eastern States want the dam built up-river.

Mr. Hudson: So did the Commonwealth.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think it is fair to say that the Commonwealth rests its position on the comparison now being made. However, I am not so sure that the other States rest on the comparison: this remains to be seen when the results of the comparison are available. I was encouraged by some of the aspects of these talks, especially by the recognition of South Australia's need for water. However, in some other respects I was discouraged. The South Australian Government is pressing on with its representations, but I am afraid that it will not be able, at every turn, to reveal details of what are, after all, "across the table" talks on a matter that is the subject of an agreement between four Governments. The position is certainly complicated in regard to revealing minutes or in regard to revealing the feelings of any particular party.

Mr. CORCORAN: Although the Premier has said that his discussions with Mr. Fairbairn were private, will he say whether Mr. Fairbairn has modified his previously stated attitude that he was against Chowilla?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not know the exact reference that the honourable member makes but I take it that what he has said is so. However, I have not found this in my talks with Mr. Fairbairn: I have found (and I believe this to be so) that the Commonwealth Government rests its case on the comparison that is being made. It is in the interests of South Australia to ensure that the comparison is made on the basis of equal benefits to South Australia. We do not want a comparison with something up river that will provide fewer benefits for South Australia than would Chowilla.

Mr. Corcoran: What if it provides equal or greater benefits?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Although that question is hypothetical it should not be side-stepped. In looking for an alternative, the authorities will obviously look not to something that will provide greater benefits for South Australia but to something that I fear may not provide as much benefit. Therefore, the comparison made would have to be fair. It is in our interests that the comparison be on the basis of equal benefits in every respect to South Australia and I consider that, if such a comparison is made, South Australia will come out on top.

Mr. HUDSON: In the House of Representatives, during a debate regarding the control of salt in the Murray River and also dealing with certain grants that were being made to Victoria, the Minister for National Development said:

The best site for a storage on the Upper Murray, which appears to give benefits at least as great as those from the Chowilla project, is at Dartmouth, on the Mitta Mitta River.

Are we to understand from the Premier's answer to the last question that, if the comparison confirms that statement by Mr. Fairbairn, the Commonwealth will then be completely confirmed in its opposition to the Chowilla dam?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member was present at a meeting at, I think, Berri when this matter was dealt with, but he is in order in asking for an answer in this House. However, I do not accept the Commonwealth Minister's statement and I object to his making a statement before a report on the comparison is available.

Mr. Hudson: As he said the Commonwealth would rest on the comparison, the project would be rejected if the comparison was unfavourable to the Commonwealth?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I believe that is the present view of the Commonwealth Government, which is an important party on the commission. I have stated publicly in South Australia that I believe that this is its attitude. I refer again to the fact that alternative comparisons were started in 1967. However, I believe there is no alternative except that outlined by the Minister of Works: that is, either accept the comparison or have the matter go to arbitration. In the latter case, the arbitrator, when considering a technical matter such as this, would have to refer again to the whole technical aspect of Chowilla. Therefore, at that meeting there was no alternative but to accept through the commission the continuation of this comparison.

Mr. CLARK: I read a report in a newspaper stating that an explanatory pamphlet concerning Chowilla had been printed. Will the Premier make it available to members if it has been printed and, if it has not been printed, will he make it available when it has been issued?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member is correct: a pamphlet has been printed, and I am sorry I did not say that when answering previous questions.

Mr. Hudson: When was it prepared?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Last Thursday or Friday.

Mr. Hudson: Why weren't members given a copy?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have some in my bag for members.

Mr. Hudson: Will it be distributed?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Certainly. They have just come off the printing press, I think on Friday or yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Under Standing Orders honourable members are allowed to ask only one question at a time and the same thing applies to Ministers when replying to questions: they may reply to only one question at a time. The honourable member for Gawler asked a question, and the Premier will reply to that question.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I accept your admonition, Sir, and I will reply to the honourable member in this respect. The pamphlet is now available and I shall be pleased to furnish copies to members. I have several for each member, because I am sure members would want, if they approve of the pamphlet, to distribute copies of it to their colleagues and constituents in places of influence. One of the reasons for having this pamphlet printed was to let other States see it and to give at

least some sign that the South Australian Government still supports the Chowilla proposal. The pamphlet will be forwarded to all members of the Commonwealth Parliament. I have found in the past many misconceptions regarding how we, in South Australia, support this project and how its technical aspects have developed. Of course, this is only a short pamphlet because of cost factors, but it is only one small way in which we can promote the Chowilla project.

Mr. RICHES: Referring to the pamphlet which is being distributed to honourable members, I point out that the answer to question No. 10 ("Has Chowilla been agreed to?") is as follows:

Yes. It was accepted by the River Murray Commission in September, 1961, and an agreement between the four Governments was ratified by their respective Parliaments in 1963.

Can the Premier say whether the Government has taken advice on the question of South Australia's legal rights under this agreement? If it has, does the Government intend to act on any advice it has received? Further, can the Premier explain South Australia's legal rights in connection with the building of the Chowilla dam?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government has taken legal advice on this matter from within its own resources. I remind the honourable member that the sum of \$28,000,000 is written into the agreement that was ratified by the four Parliaments concerned.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: As one of the components.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, of course; and it has a bearing on the enforcement of the agreement. I believe that no time factor is written into the agreement. However, I am sure that the honourable member will be able to examine the advice that has been given in this regard. Although I do not have a copy of that advice with me at the moment, I point out that advice has been taken and that Government action has been framed accordingly.

Mr. Riches: Will you table it in due course?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: We are in no way trying to withhold this advice, but we are concerned whether it will be to the advantage of the State to make it available. If the honourable member speaks to the Minister concerned, who has this advice in his possession, he may care to ask a further question on the matter. I would ask the honourable member to speak to the Minister and, if he wishes to

make a formal request, I should like to oblige him. However, the honourable member should perhaps first decide whether it would be to the State's advantage to make such a request.

Mr. CASEY: Can the Premier tell the House the results of the conversations regarding Chowilla dam that took place between the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales and him?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Owing to his departure overseas, I was unable to see the Premier of New South Wales. I talked to Sir Henry Bolte about a number of matters, one of which was Chowilla. When I approached him I told him I should like to talk to him without prejudice and without the nature of the talks being made public. Therefore, the discussion between us was informal, one of the subjects dealt with being Chowilla.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It is reported in the press that the Premier stated that he would prefer Chowilla. Can the Premier say whether this public statement implies that he will be prepared to consider an alternative?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government's attitude is set out in the pamphlet that members have. I think it is as has been stated here today. The River Murray Commission has commenced an exhaustive study of an alternative site, which is on the Mitta Mitta River, and I think that the reasons why our delegate to the commission accepted this alternative have been given today. I repeat that we did this to keep the project viable and the alternative to our action was to have a dispute that would have been adjudicated, I think, by the Chief Justice of Tasmania. We considered that, if this were done, the Chief Justice of Tasmania would have had recourse to a great deal more technical information. As to the prospects of whether the agreement would have been enforced by further legal action, I think I covered that matter when replying to the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches).

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. GILES: Can the Attorney-General say what is the attitude of the Minister of Local Government towards contributions in respect of Government grants and to work done on behalf of the Highways Department, and what is his policy on granting greater autonomy to local government?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will obtain a report from my colleague and let the honourable member have it.

### PENOLA ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Mr. RODDA: I have received letters from a representative of the District Council of Naracoorte and from landholders in the Penola district expressing their dissatisfaction with the lack of progress being made by the Electricity Trust of South Australia on the extensions in the Penola district. I understand that a survey is proceeding at Penola, but much concern is being expressed regarding the long time it is taking in getting electricity to these districts. Regarding the question of a depot, a fuse attendant, who is a private contractor, is stationed at Penola, but difficulties are being experienced in obtaining prompt service. Will the Minister of Works have inquiries made to ascertain what is the position regarding reticulation of electricity and a depot at Penola?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I shall have this matter examined for the honourable member and inform him as soon as I receive a report from the Electricity Trust.

### PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL

Mr. McKEE: Earlier today I referred to the unsatisfactory conditions prevailing at the Port Pirie Hospital in regard to children's accommodation. Will the Minister of Works consider the early construction of the proposed children's ward, so that this unsatisfactory position can be alleviated urgently?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I shall be pleased to take up the matter for the honourable member, and inform him of the result as soon as possible.

### STUDENT TRAVEL CONCESSIONS

Mr. WARDLE: As secondary school students from Tailem Bend are transported by train to Murray Bridge, can the Minister of Education say, first, what is the actual cost of the train that is provided for this purpose, and, secondly, whether the Railways Department contributes to the fares of the children of railway employees?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will obtain a report on the matters on which the honourable member has directed his question to me, and I will let him have a report as soon as possible.

### GRAPES

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Lands obtain from the Minister of Agriculture a statement of the Government's policy on fixing winegrape prices?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My colleague has provided me with the following information:

The Government is fully pledged to continue the method of fixing minimum prices for the purchase of wine grapes. Parliament unanimously agreed to amend the Prices Act in 1966 to enable the Prices Commissioner to fix the minimum price to be paid for grapes. This operated for the last two vintages and has proved very satisfactory.

This statement was made at the opening of the annual meeting of the South Australian Wine Grape Growers Council in Adelaide last week, when the Minister was replying to a series of questions directed to him by delegates.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: My question relates to the surplus grapes delivered to the 1965 and 1966 grape pools in respect of which an initial payment of \$10 a ton was made. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether any further payment has been made since that initial payment was made? If there has been, how much a ton has been paid since then for grapes delivered to the pools? If no further payment has been made, will the Minister ascertain when further payments are likely to be made in respect of surplus grapes delivered to those pools?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain a reply from the Minister of Agriculture.

### ABORIGINES

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: When I was Minister of Aboriginal Affairs I approved of a five-year programme for South Australia, which was presented by the Director of Aboriginal Affairs at the last meeting of State Directors of Aboriginal Affairs. I should like to know whether the honourable Minister will be presenting, at the meeting of all State Ministers of Aboriginal Affairs which is to take place soon, this programme which deals with pre-school education, hostels for secondary school students, transitional housing, conventional housing, hostels for children and working youths, transient hostels, and old-age homes. Will the Minister present this programme in its entirety, or does he intend to make alterations or additions to it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The direct answer to the honourable member's question is "No", but I should like to enlarge upon that a little. He referred to this matter last night, and I have inquired since to confirm my own recollections of the matter. The honourable member will recall that the last Directors' meeting was in February (about two months before he went out of office), and he was probably informed afterwards by the Director that the five-year plan which had been worked out had been submitted to the

Commonwealth. I am now informed by the Director that he has been told by the Commonwealth that this will form the basis of the Commonwealth's consideration of the States' needs. The meeting on July 12 (a meeting that has been postponed many times; I see in the docket that my predecessor was anxious that it should have been held in March, but that was not possible) will be attended by the Prime Minister, by Mr. Wentworth (Commonwealth Minister-in-Charge of Aboriginal Affairs), and by Mr. Peter Nixon (Commonwealth Minister for the Interior) as well.

I am hoping that at that meeting the Commonwealth Government will tell us how much money it can make available to the States for Aboriginal work and whether any conditions will attach to grants of money, particularly whether it is to be used for any specific purposes. The Commonwealth may well specify that some part of the money shall be used for a particular purpose, such as housing. This will not cause us any worries, as the honourable member will know (and I am sure his immediate predecessor the Leader of the Opposition will agree) that much work has to be done on housing for Aborigines in this State. But the main purpose of the meeting, as I see it, will be to ascertain how much money the Commonwealth is prepared to make available to us and, as I understand it from the Director (and he gave me a minute this morning), the Commonwealth is using as a basis for consideration the five-year plan which had been prepared.

#### RAIL STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: It is well known that standardization of the South Australian portion, at least, of the Port Pirie to Broken Hill railway line will be completed at the end of this year. I should like to know what progress has been made in connection with continuing work on the next portion of this project, in particular the Gladstone-Wilmington and Orroroo-Peterborough sections. Will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, obtain a progress report concerning what has happened in this regard?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think I should refer the matter to my colleague, so that I may give the honourable member a precise answer.

#### MOUNT GAMBIER CROSSINGS

Mr. BURDON: Many times during the past five years I have asked questions seeking information about the provision of automatic

devices to afford protection at several railway crossings in Mount Gambier. I have been told that certain railway crossings are on a list of priorities. In the interests of public safety, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Transport to see whether work can be urgently carried out at these crossings at the earliest possible time? Also, will he ascertain the priorities for work on these crossings?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will do that.

#### YORKE PENINSULA MINING

Mr. FERGUSON: An article in the *Advertiser* of Thursday, February 22, reported a probable find of large deposits of nickel and iron ore under water in Spencer Gulf and on land along the coasts of Yorke Peninsula and Eyre Peninsula. The probable location of these minerals was discovered during an aerial survey by American scientists with a geophysicist from the Commonwealth Bureau of Mineral Resources, who investigated a magnetic anomaly in Spencer Gulf reported over the years by mariners. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Mines whether a report has been received by the South Australian Mines Department on this survey? What is the potential of these fields?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to obtain the information. If it is available before the House meets again, I shall have it sent to the honourable member.

#### CONTAINERIZATION

Mr. RYAN: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, say what the freight charges are to be on cargo to be railed in container units from Adelaide to Melbourne and Sydney for shipping by oversea containers?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will take up the matter with the Minister and let the honourable member know the outcome.

Mr. HURST: In view of the announcement by the Minister of Marine that Associated Steamships Proprietary Limited does not intend to use Port Adelaide as a terminal port, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Transport what time will be occupied in the railing of containers from Adelaide to Melbourne and Sydney and in the transfer from rail to shipping terminals?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, I will try to do that.

#### NARACORTE BY-PASS

Mr. NANKIVELL: During a previous session I drew attention to the situation at

Moorlands, where Highway No. 12 joins Highway No. 8. Nothing was done at this junction until a fatality had occurred there. I draw the attention of the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads, to the situation that has now developed outside Keith where the by-pass joins the old road from Naracoorte to Keith. As this situation is similar to that which existed at Moorlands, with a doubt as to who has the right of way, will the Minister ask his colleague to have an investigation made so that action can be taken to avoid a fatality occurring at this junction?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, I will ask my colleague whether action cannot be taken quickly.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Premier say whether his Government intends to construct a Government hospital at Modbury in accordance with the unanimous recommendations of the Public Works Committee contained in its report dated February 8 this year? Much preliminary work has been done. Is this now likely to be wasted in favour of what the Premier described in his policy speech as an adequate hospital at Modbury?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government intends to build a Government hospital at Modbury and is pressing on with planning for this building. I understand that the Minister of Works, as Minister in charge of the Public Buildings Department, is having the plans reconsidered but, as we do not intend to recast priorities in this matter, the hospital will go ahead. If the honourable member wishes to know more details of the project, perhaps she would like to address a further question to the Minister of Works.

Mrs. BYRNE: I was pleased to receive the Premier's assurance that the Government had not altered priorities in respect to the erection of the Government hospital at Modbury. However, he also said that an alteration in the plans of the hospital was being made. Can the Minister of Works indicate the extent of these alterations and say why they are necessary and whether they will involve a delay in the progress of work on the hospital?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Some alterations have been suggested (in fact, I think they will improve the scheme) by departmental officers, the Minister of Health and myself. I do not think this will have any effect on the completion date of stage 1. At present, as the honourable member is aware, on-site ground formation work being carried out by the

Highways Department is almost complete, and some fencing is being done. I am hopeful that some professional officers (architects who are at present working on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and are scheduled to complete this component of work) can be transferred to the Modbury Hospital work to hurry it along. The design is practically as approved by the Public Works Committee and this House. These improvements have not been finalized and when they are I may be able to advise the honourable member further. However, I do not think it is expected that the completion date of stage 1 will be delayed.

#### GILES POINT

Mr. HUGHES: Can the Minister of Marine say when the construction of the bulk loading facilities at Giles Point will be completed?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Although I do not have the exact date with me at the moment, I know that this work is going ahead as rapidly as possible. In the preparation of the Estimates a considerable sum is being provided this year for the work. The work being undertaken by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited is well established and the work of the Marine and Harbors Department is under way. Although I am speaking without notes, and subject to correction, I believe the work will be completed during 1969. However, I will get the exact date for the honourable member and post it to him during the recess.

#### JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. LAWN: Does the Attorney-General intend to follow the practice introduced by the former Attorney-General of allotting a quota of justices of the peace to the districts of members?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: First, I should like to apologize to the honourable member for not replying to his letter of April 30 to which he referred last night during the grievance debate.

Mr. Ryan: Shocking!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, it is a bad thing. I should have been cross if I had been a private member and had not had a letter acknowledged in that time. I can say only that it is caused by the pressure of work in my office, and I shall try to see that it does not happen again. I have referred to this letter because it was on the topic of justices of the peace. Since coming into office, I have found that the system devised by my predecessor of quotas in the various districts

for the appointment of justices of the peace is administratively cumbersome and has not worked well. It is difficult to keep track of justices. Like any other members of the community, they change their place of residence from time to time and move from district to district. There are about 6,000 justices in South Australia. As my colleague the Minister of Works, who is a former president of the Justices Association, reminds me, they get old and die, just as other people do. To sum up the position, it is very difficult to keep track of where justices are and whether they are able to continue to carry out their duties. This means that, while a quota set for a district is full, overflowing or only half full at a certain time, the situation can be quite different within a few months. Because of that, when I am making recommendations for appointment I do not intend to stick rigidly to the quotas devised or laid down by my predecessor, although I do think that they are a guide. In some areas, they show that, obviously, there are more justices than are strictly necessary and, therefore, my inclination will be not to make recommendations in regard to any such area. On the other hand (and I think this applies to the District of Adelaide), in some areas there are substantially fewer justices than are required and in those cases I shall be anxious to make recommendations in proper instances. For the reasons I have given, I do not intend to stick rigidly to the system that has been laid down.

I should like to add one other thing. I regret that the Government is not yet able to make an announcement on this matter. My predecessor said that he intended to establish a separate class of justice, to be known as justice of the quorum. I personally think that the idea behind this announcement is good and I hope that, after I have made certain recommendations to Cabinet, I shall be able to make an announcement on this matter, probably within the next few weeks.

#### VEHICLE OVERLOADING

Mr. JENNINGS: A considerable time ago (and the time involved will become obvious as I proceed) I received an inquiry from the manager of a company in my district, one of the company's drivers having been picked up for overloading. The manager asked me to inquire whether further action would be taken against this driver. On that occasion I did what I had done on, I suppose, hundreds of previous occasions: I telephoned the appropriate officer of the Highways Department. I was

told, for the first time in many years, that he was not now enabled to give me any information at all, that the information would have to come from the Minister himself. I said, "Do you mean to say that I have to get in touch with the Minister about this?" He said, "Well, that's what the Minister says." I said, "All right. I hope I do not have to wait for weeks or months for an answer to my letter." He said, "No. The Minister has assured us he will answer expeditiously any letters from members of Parliament." So I wrote to the Minister of Roads on May 13, stating:

I should appreciate it if you would have this matter investigated and advise me so that I am enabled to inform the company.

I was not making any representations at all on behalf of the person. I have a reply dated May 17 (although I obviously did not get it on that day), which states:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 13th May concerning possible action against Mr. Rino Battistella for "overloading". I shall have this matter investigated and shall write again when I have received a report. Yours faithfully, C. Murray Hill.

Admittedly, that signature is in the Minister's own handwriting, but it is over the rather peculiar description, "Hon. C. Murray Hill, M.L.C." Although that letter was written on May 17, it is now June 26 and I have not heard another word about the matter. Will the Attorney-General take the matter up with the Minister of Roads to ascertain whether I could possibly get an answer to the letter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, I will do that as a matter of urgency.

#### METEOROLOGY

Mr. FERGUSON: I understand that the Bureau of Meteorology has commenced, or announced that it will commence, work on an installation on Troubridge Island, near Edithburgh, that will provide weather information of interest to fishermen. I am not sure to whom I should address the question, but will the Minister of Lands ascertain the type of installation intended to be provided and the way the information will be made available to fishermen?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall get that information. First, I shall approach the Minister of Agriculture, who may already have the information. However, I shall let the member for Yorke Peninsula know what is the position as soon as possible.

#### METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE

Mr. BROOMHILL: I have been approached by many residents of the area in Fulham Gardens, adjacent to Tapley Hill Road, who

have problems in regard to floodwater damage to their properties and have difficulty in reaching their houses after rain. I understand that the Woodville council has told these people that it has applied to the Government for assistance under the metropolitan floodwaters drainage scheme. I understand that the total cost of the work required is \$100,000 and that the council is seeking \$50,000 from the Government. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads whether the plans have been submitted and also what stage of consideration has been reached within the department?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, I will try to do that.

#### KIMBA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. EDWARDS: Kimba is an extremely good wheat-growing area, and there are also thousands of sheep and hundreds of cattle in the area. However, because of the lack of water throughout the area, progress is being retarded in both the town and in the surrounding country. As the Kimba water supply scheme is an extremely important project to my district, including the area around Darke Peak, I was pleased to see mention of it in the Speech of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor on the opening of Parliament yesterday. Can the Minister of Works say when work on the pipeline from Poldia to Kimba will be commenced?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member was correct when he said that in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech yesterday the Government had indicated that work would commence on this scheme during the coming financial year. I shall ascertain the exact date of commencement and inform the honourable member soon.

Mr. CASEY: Can the Minister say what amount of money will be made available in the next financial year for the commencement of the main? He may not be able to state the amounts specifically, but he may be able to say approximately how much money will be made available for this extremely important scheme.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I cannot state the amount, because I cannot recall it. The whole allocation for this department will be reviewed after the Premier and the Treasurer have returned from the Loan Council meeting, but the Government's statement is that this work will be commenced in the next financial year. When we have had the regular

review of progress and as soon as I can ascertain the amount involved, I shall advise the House. The honourable member will realize that the precise amount involved in such projects is always stated in the annual Loan and Revenue Estimates that are presented to the House by the Treasurer as part of the Financial Papers. However, I shall try to find out before that is done and advise the honourable member.

#### STATE TAXATION

Mr. LAWN: In the *News* of February 20 in a report that appeared under the heading in large print, "4 point plan for South Australia", the Premier, who was then the Leader of the Opposition, said that if his Party won the next election it would have a four-point plan for South Australia, the fourth point of the plan stating "Finally, we will resort to taxation if necessary." The press reporter asked whether this included the turnover taxes imposed by the Western Australian Brand Government and the Victorian Bolte Government, and Mr. Hall said, "Yes, all forms will be studied." Can the Premier say whether the people of South Australia can look forward to a wages and a turnover tax, or whether, in view of last Saturday's by-election result in Millicent, the Government has decided to drop the fourth point of its plan?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Treasurer and I will go to Canberra this afternoon to attend the Loan Council and the Premiers' Conference, and the results of those talks will have a great influence on what the Government must do concerning financial management. I am sure the honourable member will study with interest the proposals that the Government will provide in its Loan and Budget accounts.

#### MOUNT LOFTY WATER SUPPLY

Mr. GILES: An area of many hundreds of acres of uncleared land situated on the western side of Summit Road, between Crafers and the Mount Lofty summit, is a potential fire hazard. Fires are fought by using plant that uses water, but at this stage no reticulated water is available to this area. Householders rely on rainwater that runs from roofs into tanks, and there is one bore at a channel on this road. Can the Minister of Works say whether reticulated water is to be made available to this area and, if it is, when?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member and inform him when it is available.



## GALLERY DEMONSTRATION

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My attention has been drawn to a most extraordinary statement by the Premier that has been headlined on the front page of today's *News*.

Mr. Corcoran: It's not unusual for him to make extraordinary statements.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is one in which he accuses the honourable member and me. The accusation relates to certain incidents in this House last evening.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition, having asked for permission to make a personal explanation, was granted leave and I ask honourable members to allow the Leader to make his statement without interruption.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A perfectly orderly meeting took place outside this House last evening at which I requested the people out there, if they wished to make known their views on electoral reform, to use their proper rights as citizens in a lawful and orderly manner to lobby members of Parliament, to take deputations to them, to see them personally, or to write to them in order to bring home their views on electoral reform. A certain number of people who attended the meeting, and others, came into the gallery and when you, Mr. Speaker, resumed the Chair there was some noise from the gallery. Because I, as would any other member, disapproved, I shook my head and raised my hand to signal my disapproval to the people in the gallery.

Mr. Lawn: I witnessed that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On this basis (because there is nothing else cited) the Premier goes into the press without raising the matter here and comes out with this lying statement that I incited the crowd to interrupt the business of Parliament.

The SPEAKER: I do not think the Leader should use the word "lying": he should substitute "untruthful".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is untruthful, and it is obvious to every member that it is untruthful. If the Premier objected to anything I did in this House last evening his proper course was to raise it here on the basis of privilege in this Parliament, but nothing of that kind was done because there was no basis for him to do so. I did not do anything to

incite the crowd in the gallery and you, Mr. Speaker, were in the Chair and saw what happened.

Mr. Clark: You did the opposite.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly, yet this kind of statement is made, an utterly untruthful allegation against the Leader of a political Party, the Leader of the Opposition in this State. There is not the slightest evidence that anyone can cite that I did incite them. What Mr. Corcoran and I said to the crowd last night was recorded, but I noticed no words of his or mine are cited in this statement. There is nothing they can point to in what we said that incited people, and nothing which was improper or disorderly or which prevented them from exercising their rights as citizens, yet this minor incident has been blown up in the Premier's statement and an accusation made against me that is utterly baseless. I ask for a withdrawal of this allegation and an apology for it, and as a member of this House I am entitled to that.

The SPEAKER: Does the Premier care to reply to that explanation?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If I could substitute the word "excite" for "incite" perhaps it would satisfy the Leader.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It certainly would not.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! If this disorder continues I will adjourn the House, using the power I have under Standing Orders. I ask honourable members to contain themselves.

Mr. HUDSON: The front page story in today's *News* contains the following passage:

The Premier, Mr. Hall, said today that Parliament had been brought into contempt by the actions of the Opposition Leader, Mr. Dunstan.

The report continues:

Mr. Hall said Mr. Dunstan had shown his contempt for the Parliamentary institution by two actions.

"One is his insistence that we should settle the matter of electoral reform outside of debate in the House," Mr. Hall said.

"The second is his action and that of his deputy leader, in so inciting the group in front of Parliament House last night that they disrupted debate from the galleries."

Mr. Hall said he had not been personally annoyed by the sight of 200 people in the galleries.

But he had seen Mr. Dunstan make gestures to the demonstrators from his seat in the House.

"I just believe it is not good for the future of the institution that Mr. Dunstan should

be in communication with them from his seat in Parliament, and be directing their actions by signalling to them," Mr. Hall said.

I am sure you are aware, Sir, as well as I am, that that accusation is completely untrue and unfounded, and, in my view, it is an attack on the privilege of a member. Whether it constitutes contempt of the House, I would not know. You, Sir, were here during the whole of the proceedings, and any action by the Leader of the Opposition would have been under your observation. Therefore, if in your view of the proceedings last night this attack by the Premier on the Leader of the Opposition was completely unjustified, will you see to it that a complete withdrawal and apology is made and that any further action necessary to protect the rights of members in this House is carried out?

The SPEAKER: Unfortunately, I have not yet seen the article in the *News* to which the honourable member has referred. However, I feel that last night's incident was unfortunate. I did warn persons in the public gallery that they had to maintain order, otherwise I would have to ask that the Strangers' Gallery be cleared. I did notice the Leader of the Opposition indicate something, but what it was for I do not know. Whether he was indicating to the crowd to keep quiet I could not say.

Mr. Ryan: Was he inciting them?

The SPEAKER: I do not think he was inciting them, not in the Chamber. I understand that later, when the gallery was cleared, the Leader tried to quieten them down. That is only hearsay: I do not know whether it is correct or not. About 20 minutes later I told the Sergeant-at-Arms to tell the sergeant of police that the people could return to the gallery provided they conducted themselves in an orderly fashion, which I think they did thereafter.

The honourable member raised an important question regarding the privileges of an honourable member in the Chamber. There are several textbooks on the privilege of members in a House of Parliament. However, I do not intend this afternoon to go into the rights and privileges of a member in this Chamber. Before I answer the honourable member's question, I should like to study it and obtain better advice on the ultimate privilege of a member and on whether one member is interfering with the rights of another. After I have done so, I will convey my reply to the honourable member.

Mr. RYAN: The Leader asked, through you, Mr. Speaker, for an apology from the Premier

and a withdrawal of the statement he had made. As you evaded the question, Mr. Speaker, I now ask you whether, in view of the fact that the Leader, the member for Glenelg, and now I, have asked for a withdrawal and apology, you will ask that this be given.

The SPEAKER: I do not think I was evading the question. I understood the member for Glenelg to question me on the rights and privileges of members and on whether those rights and privileges had in any way been breached. I cannot say at the moment whether or not a withdrawal is warranted. As I told the member for Glenelg, I should like to have a better authority to draw on than my own experience in order to understand fully the rights and privileges of members as they apply here. If members' rights and privileges have been offended in any way, it is my duty to uphold them. I should like to obtain an opinion—

Mr. Ryan: When? In a month's time!

The SPEAKER: No, I will write to the honourable member, if necessary. Naturally, I cannot undertake to give a ruling before the weekend, but in the meantime I ask the Premier whether he wishes to make any further statement, in view of the questions asked by the member for Glenelg and the member for Port Adelaide.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I said last night, too many charges and counter charges were made concerning electoral reform. I said that that situation should cease, and that we should get down to discussing the substance of the matter. The statement made does not help the position.

Mr. Corcoran: You made it!

Mr. HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the Premier at liberty to amplify the remarks that have already appeared in the press, or is his position one of indicating whether or not he is prepared to withdraw his remarks at this stage?

The SPEAKER: I asked the honourable the Premier, in view of the questions asked by the member for Glenelg and the member for Port Adelaide concerning a withdrawal, whether he cared to make any further statement. The Premier would be distinctly out of order in debating this question further in answer to my question. Does the Premier wish to make a statement that will clarify the position? If he does not, I shall then have to take the matter further.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.  
Leave granted.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The questions asked and the discussions that have taken place do not help electoral reform in South Australia. My statement to the *News* was made in answer to a request to detail what I said in the House last night.

Mr. Hudson: You said nothing about that last night.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have not finished my explanation. As I could not remember what I said in the House last night, I made a statement along the lines of what I had said. The statement that I made was based on my knowledge of certain facts. An organized gathering took place outside this House last night; it was publicized previously; and it was addressed by the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader. I do not know whether or not it was publicized that the members of the delegation would enter the House. However, I assumed (I think correctly) that the problem that arose in the gallery last night, in fact, arose as a result of the presence of those members of the public who attended the meeting addressed by the Leader and his Deputy. Further, the Leader of the Opposition was making signs to the gallery, and I referred to that in my statement. That is the basis on which the statement was made early this morning and, if members look at *Hansard*, they will see that I referred to it in my address in this House.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You didn't refer to it in those terms.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Premier.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I referred to it in this House, and I referred to the Leader's involvement along the lines that I have indicated.

Mr. Clark: In this particular instance?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes.

Mr. Clark: I thought it was a more general statement.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I stand to be corrected here: I am not saying that what appears in the press is the same as what I said in the House. I made a statement along the lines of what I said because I was unable to recall exactly everything I had said in the House. That will give the House an idea of what I based my statement on. If the word "incite" worries the Leader, I have said I shall be happy to substitute the word "excite". I

said that the Leader had communication with the gallery by means of signs from his seat.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: In my opinion, the Leader had communication with them and was trying to instruct them to do something.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And then you go on and say I was inciting them. Now you say you don't know what I was doing.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This is my opinion of what happened and it is based on what I saw. I have therefore explained it to the House.

*Later:*

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I ask leave to make a further personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I make a further explanation in regard to the concern shown by Opposition members at my statements in the *News* today. I have consulted with my colleagues regarding the gestures of the Leader in the House, and they believe that I may have imputed too much significance to the gesture that was made. I have no desire to do that. Therefore, if, as he states, he was endeavouring to quieten the gallery and doing nothing more, I accept that. I say that in a conciliatory tone, because I do not in any way say that I did not say what was in the newspaper. I have no recollection of all the details of what I said over the telephone this morning, but I accept that what appears in print is my statement.

Mr. Hudson: And you apologize for it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not believe that these words or this subject deserve the prominence they are receiving.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have dealt with the Leader's gesture in the House and, as I say, I have no desire to misinterpret it. If I did misinterpret it, I apologize for that. This does not mean that I personally approve a number of other subjects referred to in my statement; of course, that is my opinion, which I stated. I understand that the Leader was particularly worried about my reference to his gesture in this House. If I have misinterpreted this, as my colleagues tell me I probably have done, I apologize for that.

## BREAD

Mr. LANGLEY: During the last month there has been much speculation concerning the baking and marketing of bread in the metropolitan area during the weekend. Can the Minister of Labour and Industry tell the House what is happening in country and city negotiations with bakers and shopkeepers?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As this matter has received much public attention and as it affects so many people, I have taken the liberty of preparing an extensive reply. The existing dispute between sections of the baking industry has been simmering for more than a year but has intensified in the last few weeks. It has been claimed that over the past few years a number of the larger city bakers have extended their operations into many country towns (up to 70 miles from Adelaide). This has resulted in some country bakers either being forced out of business or having their turnover seriously curtailed. The country bakers then retaliated by baking fresh bread for supply to shops in the city area on weekends.

This dispute between the baking industry came to a head when the Secretary of the Bread Manufacturers of South Australia Incorporated wrote about May 30 last to shopkeepers in the metropolitan area who had been selling country-baked bread at weekends advising that, unless they stopped selling such bread, the metropolitan bakers would take action against them by—

- (a) strictly adhering to maximum wholesale prices;
- (b) ceasing to credit unsold bread;
- (c) not guaranteeing delivery times.

This action appears to have been taken without consulting the country section of the association. A considerable amount of resentment from shopkeepers resulted and I was successful in persuading the bakers to resume normal delivery times. It appears as though the move by the metropolitan members of the association has increased the demand for weekend bread by making the public aware that it is available.

Representatives of the country section of Bread Manufacturers of South Australia subsequently met with city members and then requested—

- (a) that the present restrictions on hours of baking in the metropolitan area should be applied throughout the whole State;

- (b) that all bakeries and shops selling bread should be licensed;
- (c) that bread not be sold over 30 miles from place of manufacture (with certain exceptions).

This would involve zoning and considerable difficulties in policing same. At the same time several bakeries in the inner country districts that were not members of the association claimed that this move would remove their livelihood and they in turn could be forced out of business by further intrusion of city bakeries.

Discussions have been held with all interested parties in the present dispute and from these talks it appears that the present laws relating to baking are not being observed in four respects—

- (1) Some bread is being baked in the metropolitan area at weekends.
- (2) Bread is being carted in vehicles not approved as required under the Food and Drugs Act.
- (3) Bread unsold in shops has been returned to the manufacturer contrary to the Food and Drugs Act.
- (4) It has been claimed that some country bread sold in the city at weekends is under-weight.

The Government proposes to take the following steps to see that these laws are observed:

- (1) Prosecutions have been laid in three cases of illegal baking on weekends and further inspections will be made.
- (2) Stricter inspections will be made to see that bread is carted in approved hygienic vehicles or containers.
- (3) Amendments will be considered covering the return of unsold bread from shops.
- (4) Checks will be made to protect consumers against underweight bread being sold.

This provision exists in the legislation at the moment; it has not been available for many years, but the bakers and the unions have now agreed to it. The Government does not favour the abolition of the present restrictions on the baking hours in the metropolitan area at present. Both the bakers and the unions concerned have now stated their willingness to bake and deliver bread on any Saturday immediately prior to a public holiday on a Monday.

The Government does not favour any further restriction being introduced as in any case these would involve legislation which could not be introduced for several months. At present there appears to be a growing demand by the public and small shopkeepers for fresh bread at weekends and the Government is hopeful that this supply can be achieved by continued negotiations.

### MOSQUITOES

Mr. HURST: Some time ago I referred to the Public Health Department the mosquito menace in the Taperoo area and surrounding districts. An investigation then having been made, it was ascertained that the breeding grounds of these mosquitoes were in areas that were not controlled by the Port Adelaide City Council. I then asked the Public Health Department to convene a conference with the Port Adelaide, Salisbury, and Woodville councils, the Electricity Trust, Imperial Chemical Industries, and the Commonwealth and State Health Departments in an effort to obtain agreement concerning the sharing by those bodies of the costs of effectively spraying the areas involved and to eliminate the mosquito menace, which is causing great inconvenience to my constituents as well as, in the summer months, to people employed in industry in the area. As I understand that a conference on the matter may have been held, will the Premier ascertain from the Minister of Health whether in fact that conference has been held and to what extent the parties involved may have reached agreement on the cost of spraying the area?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: From representations made in my own district over the years, I know the problems that can occur: I know how various councils are involved and how the distribution of expense to achieve the elimination of this nuisance has, of course, to be arranged among the various bodies. For this reason and for the reason stated by the honourable member, I should be happy to raise the matter with my colleague.

### GAS

Mr. RICHES: My question follows some remarks I made during the grievance debate last night concerning the possibility of having work in connection with construction of the natural gas pipeline carried out in one of the Spencer Gulf ports. It has been put to me that, according to press reports, some con-

tracts have been let to Japan for the supply of material. It is felt that this work could be off-loaded in country areas near the centre of the pipeline. In any case, the manufacture of pipes could be carried out just as easily, and possibly more economically, near the centre of the work rather than at one end of it. Will the Minister of Works (who I know showed considerable interest in this project last year) have a thorough investigation made into the possibilities of decentralizing some of the work in connection with the construction of the pipeline? I assure him that, although this work may not be of great magnitude from the point of view of the industrial complex of the city, it would mean considerable benefit to the areas concerned.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Natural Gas Pipelines Authority is now administered by the Treasurer, but I will pass on the details of the question. I will ask my colleague to obtain a reply as soon as possible and see whether these matters can be considered.

### FISHING

Mr. CORCORAN: The Minister of Marine will be well aware that some slight alteration has recently taken place in the operations of surveys for fishing vessels. He will know that, since the regulations were introduced in 1964, some difficulty has arisen. I personally introduced two deputations to the then Minister of Marine, and one to the then Premier of the State. The Minister will also be aware that the Select Committee which investigated the fishing industry had included in its terms of reference an investigation and report on the regulations. As a result of this, an advisory committee was appointed, and I believe that it has already met twice. However, I do not know whether it has made any recommendations. As the Government now intends to survey vessels under 25ft. as well as those over 25ft., will the Minister consider revoking these regulations completely, allowing the advisory committee to do the work it was set up to do and, when the work is concluded, consider reinstating the regulations? I believe that in this way much confusion and inconvenience can be saved to those people subject to the regulations.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member has raised an interesting subject. True, as a result of legislation last year, the Minister of Agriculture convened a meeting of fishermen and fishing interests under the chairmanship of the Director of Fisheries and

**Fauna Conservation (Mr. Olsen).** The regulations are being drawn and recommendations made, but this impinges on the survey regulations to which the honourable member referred, because no person can obtain a survey licence at a certain time unless he has a current fishing licence. I understand that the Minister of Agriculture has convened several meetings and that he is trying to expedite the completion of this work. In its report of last year the Select Committee suggested that these matters should come into force in July, 1969. One of the recommendations was that vessels under 25ft. should also come under survey. However, the position is that some vessels over 25ft. are due for their second and third surveys.

It has been decided, and I will recommend, that these regulations be revoked so that the survey will not be insisted on until July, 1969. There will be a considerable rush at that deadline for surveys. Where a person requires a survey for some particular purpose (for instance, on the first occasion he takes a boat out to sea, when he requires a survey to obtain a licence and insurance) this can be made voluntarily. Also, any person who volunteers to have his boat surveyed before the deadline can have this done. However, I will recommend that the regulations be revoked and that a fresh start be made in this regard from July, 1969. That is my recommendation, and it will be put into force.

#### CERAMICS

**Mr. McKEE:** The Premier is probably aware that for some time negotiations took place with a company known as Australian Ceramics Industries Limited in regard to establishing a ceramics industry at the old uranium treatment plant at Port Pirie. Has the Premier any information regarding the progress of these negotiations? Is this company still interested or is any other company interested in the old uranium treatment plant at Port Pirie?

**The Hon. R. S. HALL:** Negotiations are continuing and an announcement will be made shortly concerning the use of the Port Pirie treatment plant. More than that I cannot say at this time because of the type of negotiation that is taking place. If the honourable member wishes, I shall be happy to discuss the matter with him privately to reassure him.

#### WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY

**Mr. FREEBAIN:** Can the Minister of Works indicate what is the continuing pro-

gramme for a reticulated water supply to Watervale?

**The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE:** Some work has been done on this project. Although I do not have the report with me now, I shall ascertain the information requested by the honourable member and inform him directly during the recess.

#### OAKBANK AREA SCHOOL

**Mr. GILES:** Can the Minister of Education say when the agricultural building promised for the Oakbank Area School some time ago will be erected?

**The Hon. JOYCE STEELE:** I shall be happy to get that information and let the honourable member have it at the earliest opportunity.

#### WALLAROO HARBOUR

**Mr. HUGHES:** Prior to March 2 (namely, on February 8, February 22 and February 29) a half-page advertisement, authorized by Mr. R. Y. Wilson, of 175 North Terrace, Adelaide, was published and one of the statements in the advertisement was as follows: "We want to improve Wallaroo harbour and have it used more." At that time the present Premier was Leader of the Opposition and was setting up his Party as an alternative Government, so he must have had some idea of what improvements for the harbour were envisaged at that particular time; otherwise, the advertisement would not have appeared in the press so many times. Can the Premier say what improvements were envisaged for the Wallaroo harbour to enable it to be used more?

**The Hon. R. S. HALL:** It is the policy of the Government (and it was the policy of the then Opposition) to improve harbour facilities in South Australia wherever necessary when possible. The detail of these improvements is a matter for the Minister of Works and Minister of Marine and I do not know what proposals he has for developments at Wallaroo or what plans there may be. I can speak only of overall policy on the matter. If the honourable member would like to address a question to that Minister, the Minister will either give him the information now or obtain it for him.

#### WHYALLA OCCUPATION CENTRE

**The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY:** The occupation centre in Whyalla at present has children aged from five years to 19 years attending it

and, as there are no facilities for separating children of different ages, this presents great problems for the teachers. A new occupation centre building has been completed for at least eight weeks and a tender was to be let for fencing work and the provision of concrete paths. The Minister of Works was good enough to tell me, in a letter dated June 7, that Cabinet at that time had not given approval for the acceptance of a tender for this work. Can he say whether Cabinet has yet given approval and whether the work can be expedited in order to facilitate the transfer to the new occupation centre building?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I recall that correspondence passed between the honourable member and myself on this matter and I understand that further advice has been given. I have checked with my colleague the Minister of Education on what has happened in this regard and she has told me that a contract has been let now to a company to carry out this work, the time of the contract being about six weeks.

#### PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL

Mr. RICHES: A paragraph in His Excellency's Opening Speech yesterday referred to the Government's intentions regarding the building of country hospitals. Certain references have appeared in the press regarding the proposals for the new hospital at Port Augusta. This work has been investigated and recommended by the Public Works Committee, and it was a definite promise to the people from the previous Government. The people are anxious to get an assurance that the system of priorities will be maintained and that the work on the hospital will be commenced on the date set out by the department. I do not expect that the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, will be able to reply fully to my question today, but if he cannot do so will he take up the matter with his colleague and let either the hospital board or me have a reply at an early date?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to get a report from my colleague for the honourable member.

#### HAMBIDGE RESERVE

Mr. LAWN: A letter I have received seeks information regarding Hambidge Reserve on Eyre Peninsula. This letter suggests that it is possible this reserve will be opened for farming, and some people are concerned that

this may be so. Can the Minister of Lands give me any information on the possibility of this reserve being opened for farming or for any other purpose?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This matter has been the subject of public controversy for a long time, and the question is not yet fully resolved. I shall not attempt to deal with the entire history of the matter, but I can say that I have examined it very closely. There are two sides to the question. The Hambidge Reserve is a dedicated reserve under the National Parks Commission and, as such, it cannot be alienated unless a resolution is passed by both Houses of this Parliament in the one session. The controversy over this question and the subsequent discussions that have gone on over the years have been protracted. Most of the negotiations went on before I assumed office. When I assumed office I said to myself, "If there is anyone to recommend to the House an alienation of this reserve or any part of it, I am the one to do it." Therefore, it is clearly my responsibility and my decision, irrespective of what other negotiations have gone on in the past.

I have visited this reserve and other reserves on Eyre Peninsula in the last fortnight or so and have carried out a fairly comprehensive inspection of them. Many people of all shades of opinion have spoken to me about this matter, and I have undertaken that before reaching a decision I will discuss with all interested people their points of view. Also, before coming to a decision I will discuss the matter with my colleagues. If they decide that I should go ahead and alienate any portion of this reserve, the matter would come before Parliament during this session. If, after considering all the factors, my colleagues decide that I should not take this action, no more will be heard of the matter. All I am saying is that I have not reached a final decision. I am still discussing the question with both sides of opinion, and if I make a recommendation to Parliament it will be accompanied by a full statement of the history of the negotiations and the various points of view that have been expressed over the years.

#### WATER REQUIREMENTS

Mr. LANGLEY: On August 30 last year the member for Flinders, now the Treasurer, moved in this House the following motion:

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

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

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

As no doubt the new Cabinet has established this committee, will the Minister of Works tell me the names of its members?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: No consideration has been given to the appointment of such a committee because, if my recollection is correct, this motion was voted against and defeated by the then Labor Government.

#### TRANSPORT STUDY

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the election campaign the Premier in a public statement said that the Labor Government had delayed the publication of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study report for political purposes, and that the political purpose that was most affecting this matter was that the survey would probably affect my district and I did not want it to be published before the election. The Government has now been in office for just over two months. Yesterday, a statement was made by the Minister of Local Government that the report of the study would not be ready for publication until August 12 of this year at the earliest. Can the Premier confirm that statement, and if it is correct will he also withdraw the statement he made concerning our supposed delaying the publication of the report for political purposes?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: When we first came into office I asked the Minister to have this report printed as expeditiously as possible, because I believed that when it was printed many problems would arise for individuals throughout the metropolitan area. As yet, I have not checked with him on how much delay occurred before the printing was ordered.

Mr. Corcoran: Will you check?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: I, as Chairman, and other members of the Public Works Committee are concerned about references to the committee in relation to schools to be built on various sites that may have freeways adjacent to them. Will the Premier expedite the publication of this report, as the delay is causing inconvenience to this committee?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall add that question to the approach I make to the Minister.

#### NANGWARRY HOUSES

Mr. BURDON: Recently, I have been approached by social workers at Mount Gambier concerning houses at Nangwarry belonging to the Woods and Forests Department. It has been a recent practice for the department to make available some of its unoccupied houses to people who may need houses in Nangwarry, but I have been informed by the social workers that this policy seems to have been altered. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Forests whether the policy that previously operated has been altered?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am not aware of the circumstances but I shall ask the Minister of Forests to inform the honourable member of details of the present situation.

#### CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. HUDSON: I have now received the pamphlet on Chowilla. Can the Premier say whether he hopes that this pamphlet will convince the members of the Parliaments of Victoria, New South Wales, and the Commonwealth, because there is no explanation in it of the basic problems of salinity at Mildura, which was one of the reasons why these Governments reconsidered the Chowilla dam project? How can they be convinced when no explanation is given of the main feature?

*At 4 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency, the Lieutenant-Governor:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech



with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

#### NEXT DAY OF SITTING

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier) moved:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, July 23, at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

#### SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.3 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 23, at 2 p.m.