

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 30, 1968

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

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FLUORIDATION

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Since the Government came into office it has given detailed consideration to the fluoridation of South Australia's water supplies. The Chief Secretary, in his capacity as Minister of Health, and the Minister of Works have brought full information to Cabinet. Cabinet has decided to approve the addition of fluoride to public water supplies and will proceed forthwith with the necessary planning so as to ensure protection of the dental health of South Australian children. As the necessary preparations for the addition of fluoride will take some time, it will be probably all of 12 months before the plan becomes effective. Members will realize that they will therefore have the opportunity to ask questions of the Government about this matter or debate it in the House if they so desire.

### PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: In accordance with the undertaking I gave in reply to a question directed to me last Wednesday by the honourable Leader of the Opposition, I have conferred with the Government Printer concerning his release of Bills before their introduction into Parliament. The Government Printer furnished me with the following minute:

This department preserves a very strict code concerning copies of Bills before introduction in Parliament. Under no circumstances are copies of Government Bills supplied to anyone other than the Parliamentary Draftsman or his Assistant. The Parliamentary Draftsman is recognized as the originating author. It is common practice to supply to him, on request, additional copies of these Bills. A verbal request was made by the Senior Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman for two additional copies of the "Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1965", and following normal procedure these were supplied by me to him, and to nobody else.

In like manner, copies of a private member's Bill are supplied by the Government Printer only to the author—that is, to the private member responsible—or, at the request of the member, to the Parliamentary Draftsman should he be responsible for the drafting of

the Bill. This department and all officers concerned with Parliamentary work recognize that all Bills are strictly confidential until introduced in Parliament.

From the discussion I had with the Government Printer I am satisfied that he supplied copies of the Constitution Act Amendment Bill referred to by the honourable Leader to nobody but the Senior Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman and that neither the Government Printer nor any member of his staff supplied a copy of this Bill to the present honourable Attorney-General. I have satisfied myself also, and give the assurance to the House, that the Government Printer and his staff have acted in accordance with their long-standing practice, in the utmost good faith and with impeccable propriety.

Having served for so many years as a private member, I now, as Speaker, am deeply concerned to protect members' rights and privileges. I consider that the Government Printer's practice on the release of Bills is designed properly to preserve the confidential character of a Bill before its introduction into Parliament in so far as such a matter lies within his power.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I ask leave to make a statement.  
Leave granted.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: A few weeks ago I was accused by the honourable Leader of the Opposition of improperly obtaining from the Government Printer a copy of a Bill dealing with electoral reform which the previous Government had directed the Parliamentary Draftsman to prepare for introduction as a Government measure. The fact that such a Bill was in existence became known to me when public statements had been made by the honourable Leader and other Opposition members, who had referred to some of the contents of the Bill. Accordingly I made inquiries of my officers as to the whereabouts of the Bill and the official docket in which it was enclosed. I was informed that no copies of the Bill were in the office of the Parliamentary Draftsman and that the docket containing the printed Bill had been forwarded to the Premier's Department before the defeat of the previous Government on the floor of this House.

As the Bill was not drafted as a private member's Bill and was in fact a Government measure, it should form part of the records of the Parliamentary Draftsman's Department and would ordinarily be included by the Government Printer in the annual volume of "Bills

Over" to which I, as Minister in charge of the Parliamentary Draftman's Department, always have access. The official docket containing the Bill was not to be found in the records of the Premier's Department, to which it had been forwarded by the Parliamentary Draftsman. The Bill formed part of the official records of a department within my Ministerial control. I therefore directed one of my officers to obtain a copy from the Government Printer. This he did in the usual way. I then received from him the print of the Bill, bearing at its head the words, "Prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman", and the date April 10, 1968.

## QUESTIONS

### FOREMEN

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to the question I asked the Premier on July 25 about an interim industrial agreement for foremen in the employ of the Government?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The position regarding the marginal rates of pay of foremen is as set out below. Foremen's margins did not remain static between May, 1957, and June, 1964. During that period they were increased from the following dates:

Date	Reason for increase
1/6/58	New agreement.
1/4/59	Increases granted to Public Service officers.
7/3/60	28 per cent margins decision.
12/8/63	10 per cent margins decision.
6/1/64	Increases granted to Public Service officers.

Following the metal trades decision, agreement was reached between the Public Service Board and the Public Service Association for the payment of an allowance from January 22, 1968, to overcome anomalies that arose because of that decision. Since this agreement was reached the Public Service Association has not submitted any case where tradesmen were being paid more than the foreman in charge of them. Negotiations for increased margins for foremen have been continuing since June 3, 1968, when the association first sought such increases. On July 8, 1968, the association indicated acceptance of an offer by the board to increase the marginal rates of pay of foremen by amounts varying from \$3 to \$3.45 a week, provided the increase operated from January 22, 1968. On July 23, 1968, the Public Service Board informed the association that, although it was unable to agree that the increase should operate prior to June 3, 1968, as the claim had not been lodged until that date,

it was prepared to make a recommendation to the Minister that the Government, as an act of grace, pay the increase from April 15, 1968, provided that the association accepted the complete offer on this basis. The association has now indicated its acceptance of this offer, and I have approved the recommendation of the Public Service Board for the increase to be paid from April 15, 1968.

### GAS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: As the Minister of Works knows, it is intended that natural gas be provided to the cement works at Angaston by means of a spur pipeline from the Gidgealpa-Adelaide main. I understand from information given in the House last year that gas is likely to be available at Angaston at the same time as it is available in the metropolitan area, namely, in September, 1969. Can the Minister say (or will he obtain the information if he does not know this) whether it is intended to make available, from the spur pipeline, natural gas to serve householders in the thickly populated areas of the Barossa Valley, for household and domestic purposes? I asked a similar question of the then Premier last year but I understood that the information was not available at the time.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: As I realize the importance of the undertaking to the honourable member's district, I shall obtain a report as quickly as possible.

### GAWLER SEWERAGE

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about the commencement of the Gawler sewerage project?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Provision has been made in the 1968-69 Loan Estimates for the Gawler sewerage scheme to be commenced in the 1968-69 financial year and it is intended that work be commenced on the approach trunk sewer in January, 1969.

### MITCHAM GIRLS TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the Mitcham Girls Technical High School, at which children from the Mitcham and Unley Districts attend?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The Director, Public Buildings Department, states that it is intended to demolish the residence and to prepare the area left vacant as an additional playing area. Public tenders closed on July 23, 1968, for the demolition of the residence and for the preparation of the area for grassing.

The erection of fencing and the construction of an area of new pavement have also been included in the call for tenders. The tenders received are now being considered, and a recommendation for the acceptance of a tender will be made soon.

#### LEASES

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the expiry of a miscellaneous lease?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The routine procedure on the expiry of a miscellaneous lease is that some months before expiry an inspection of the land and valuation of improvements are carried out. In many cases the lessee is contacted during these inspections. If the Land Board recommends re-allotment to the same lessee, he is informed of the conditions and rental applicable to a new lease, and an application form is forwarded for completion and return. If the land is required for other purposes, or is to be thrown open for general application the lessee would be informed in good time before expiry. In such cases the former lessee is informed when the land is offered for application, unless he has indicated that he is not further interested in the land. Although this procedure is carried out as a routine practice, there is no obligation to inform lessees, who should possess a copy of their lease. However, if the honourable member has details of a case in which this practice seems not to have been carried out I would be interested to have the details.

#### MODBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on July 23 about an area at Modbury requiring sewerage?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: A sewerage scheme has been approved for the area adjacent to the Tea Tree Gully Council chambers, including Jenkins Street and Raymond Road. Provision has been made in the Loan Estimates for this scheme to be constructed in the 1968-69 financial year, and it is expected that work will commence in February, 1969.

#### TRAIN ACCIDENTS

Mr. EDWARDS: On Eyre Peninsula during the last 12 months there have been at least two deaths, and several people have been injured, as a result of vehicles colliding with the sides of trains because the trains cannot be seen at night. It has been suggested that a red fluorescent strip be placed on trains,

but this request has been refused. Another suggestion was that a white fluorescent strip be used, as is used on the right-hand side posts on highways. This strip is most effective at night and, if used on rolling stock, should not interfere with the guard's signals. Will the Attorney-General confer with the Minister of Transport about the suggestion that all engines and rolling stock be clearly marked on both sides with a white fluorescent strip, or some comparable method that the South Australian Railways thinks suitable, in order to eliminate serious and disastrous accidents at rail crossings?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: A number of suggestions has been made over the years to overcome this grave situation. I shall be happy to put the suggestion to my colleague.

#### PARTY MEMBERSHIP

Mr. McKEE: My question deals with the statement the Premier made on his arrival in London. According to a report in the *Advertiser* of July 1, the Premier said that he would like to have spent a longer time in the United Kingdom but that, as the State Parliament was to meet on July 23 and as the Government had a majority of only one, he would have to be back in Adelaide for the sittings of Parliament. As the Premier is well aware that there are 19 Government members and 19 Opposition members, his statement has confused the general public. In order to prevent further confusion among the general public will the Premier clarify his statement regarding whether you, Mr. Speaker, have joined the Liberal and Country League?

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is not allowed to be debated. It is political comment, and the honourable member knows that. Does the Premier desire to reply?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not wish to debate the issue, but I sympathize with the honourable member in his not knowing where he is or where he should be. When he peers through the political fog in which he appears to be at the moment, he will find that he is sitting on the left side of the Speaker.

#### PICCADILLY WATER SUPPLY

Mr. GILES: Although I believe that about 12 months ago the district of Piccadilly, one section of which is fast becoming an urban area, was promised water, it has not been given a supply as yet. Can the Minister of Works say whether a water supply was promised at that stage and, if it was, when the work will be carried out? If a water supply

was not promised, will the Minister see whether water can be laid on to this part of Piccadilly and when the work can be carried out?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member has posed an "if not, why not" question. I will obtain the information he seeks.

#### PENSIONERS' TELEPHONES

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to the question I asked on July 25 regarding telephones for pensioners' cottage flats?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have an interim reply. When the honourable member asked the question I replied that I would take up the matter with the Postmaster-General's Department to ascertain what costs were involved and then refer the matter to the General Manager of the Housing Trust for his views. I have taken up the matter with the P.M.G. Department. The department will grant a reduction of one-third in the annual rental if the pensioner is living alone or with any other person whose income does not exceed \$19 a week. The annual rental would therefore be \$26.66 (a reduction on the full rate, which is \$40), and this includes the installation of one telephone. If extra equipment is desired, the full cost must be met. No concession is granted towards the cost of installation (\$30) of the service or calls made (4c a call). The reduced rental concession is also available to war widows and blind persons. Having taken the matter that far, I intend to refer it to the General Manager of the trust for his comment.

#### WATER ACCOUNTS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Meter readers employed by the Electricity Trust and the South Australian Gas Company, when they have taken a reading, show on the statements the previous meter reading, so that a person receiving an account from either of these bodies knows precisely the quantity of electricity or gas used within a certain time. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether similar information cannot be included on accounts issued by the Engineering and Water Supply Department?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I shall be happy to inquire for the honourable member.

#### QUORN HOUSING

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to the question I asked last week about housing in Quorn?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Housing Trust will arrange for one of his officers to discuss the provision of further houses at Quorn with the district council and any other organization concerned. The trust officer is expected to visit Quorn within the next few weeks.

#### WALLAROO ROAD

Mr. HUGHES: Some time ago I received the following letter from the former Minister of Roads:

In reply to your personal representations to me of the 13th instant, *re* the availability of a grant of \$10,000 to the Corporation of Wallaroo for construction work along Cornish Terrace, I desire to advise that this grant will be made available to the council for this work at the beginning of the next financial year (July) and that the council will be advised to this effect by the Highways Department early in July, 1968. I can assure you that this work should be completed in time for the next grain season.

The council having been notified by the Highways Department concerning this matter (involving a grant of \$8,000 and not \$10,000), I have since received the following letter from the Town Clerk of the Wallaroo corporation:

As directed by the council, I write to ask you to once again intervene in the matter of Cornish Terrace. As you can see, no progress is being made on the road. This is due to the slowness in getting the results of analysis in respect of the soil tests which were carried out about six weeks ago. These results are important, as it is on them that an estimate of the quantity of materials required for the work depends. Will you please endeavour to have the whole matter expedited, for it is only too obvious that the grain season will be on us before the road is ready, unless drastic steps are taken.

Will the Attorney-General take up this matter with the Minister of Roads and ascertain whether I might be assured that the Minister will arrange for his officers to co-operate in every way with the Wallaroo corporation to enable the proposed road to be built so as to accommodate the expected grain traffic in the coming season, which we sincerely hope will be a heavy one?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will pass on the request to the Minister of Roads immediately.

#### CHARITABLE COLLECTIONS

Mr. HUDSON: Under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, any organization raising funds for charity must obtain a licence from the Chief Secretary and, on the issue of that licence, the organization concerned then

has the right to issue permits to other bodies also to participate in the raising of funds. The accounts of any organization raising funds for charitable purposes must, I understand, be submitted to the Chief Secretary's Department, although a considerable delay often occurs before any accounts are received by the department. There has recently been concern, particularly in my district, over a quest which experienced difficulty, and it is apparent to a number of people that the Act is not adequate for its purposes. I am led to believe that not only this particular quest has experienced difficulty in showing a significant percentage of profit on the money that has been raised. As fund raising for charity has been professionalized in recent years, will the Premier obtain from the Chief Secretary general information about the financial success of various beauty contests on which professional fund raisers are employed? Further, will he ask his colleague to carry out a general investigation on the need for amendment of the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, so that it may be brought up to date and may effectively control fund raising in modern times? I bring this matter to the Premier's attention particularly, because I believe it is absolutely essential that the people who give to charity must be completely assured that a very high percentage of the money they give actually finds its way to the charity they believe they are supporting.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I believe that all thinking citizens agree with the honourable member's contention that there should be the highest possible return to a charity from any fund raising that takes place. Indeed, I know that one of the people most concerned with this is the Chief Secretary himself, and he has been considering this matter. I shall have pleasure in referring the question to him, and I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

#### MOUNT GAMBIER HOUSING

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to the question I asked last week about rental housing in Mount Gambier?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Housing Trust is aware of the need for more rental houses at Mount Gambier, and I am therefore pleased to be able to inform the honourable member that approval was only recently given for the erection of a further 50 such houses. Work will commence as soon as the necessary site works and subdivision are completed.

#### COST OF LIVING

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of last week about the rise in the cost of living in South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Commonwealth Statistician's consumer price index is not, as commonly so regarded, a cost-of-living index. Although as a price index it measures changes in the price of a number of selected items, representing in the aggregate a high proportion of the expenditure of wage-earner households combined into an index by using weights themselves representative of the average household consumption of the respective goods and services at the time the weights are fixed, it does not purport to measure the cost of living either in the same city at different times or in different cities at any time. The main component in the rise in the consumer price index in Adelaide in the June quarter, 1968, of 2.1 points (from 140.5 to 142.6) was meat which rose by 1.5 points.

#### BONDING

Mr. VENNING: As I understand that in this State there is a bonding system for medical students, will the Premier ask the Minister of Health how many students are affected by bonding and how successful the scheme has been up to the present?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to obtain a report from my colleague.

#### GAWLER HOUSING

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my recent question about building more Housing Trust rental houses in Gawler?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the trust has reported that the trust is not aware of an urgent demand for rental housing in Gawler but will, in the next few weeks, carry out an investigation of housing requirements there. At present, the trust is generally able to assist applicants for housing at Gawler within three months of application.

#### BIRDS

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my question of July 24 about a report of the trapping of wild birds near the Morialta reserve?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My colleague has supplied me with a report of the fauna officer who investigated the complaint, which was made by a person living near the area. At the earliest convenience to this informant, his complaint was fully investigated.

However, as the informant was unable to supply sufficient details to enable anyone to be apprehended, the investigating officer has asked that any further occurrence should be reported, whereupon the report will be acted on immediately. Meanwhile, the officer is visiting the area frequently to see whether he can detect any evidence of trapping. The reason for the report to which the honourable member referred is probably that the person who informed the department also contacted a newspaper.

### LIQUOR MEASURES

Mr. LANGLEY: Today's *Advertiser* states that liquor measures supplied by hotels are inconsistent. The measures currently used in hotels have operated for some time and certain controversy has always been associated with them. As the new Weights and Measures Act was designed to see that the measures were consistent and to protect the public, will the Minister of Lands ensure that correct measures are given to hotel patrons?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The officer concerned, who investigated this matter extensively, found that there was a degree of variation in measures and that the measures always seemed to be inadequate, the average error being about 15 per cent. This error was considered to be unreasonable. However, the new regulations will enable these procedures to be tightened up. Although this cannot be achieved overnight, the process will begin immediately and, as soon as it is possible, everyone who orders a half-ounce of whisky (and even those who order more) will get a true measure.

### SLAUGHTERING FEE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my recent question about the reason for the introduction of a service fee on country-killed meat sold in the metropolitan area, and other matters?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My colleague has supplied the following report:

The "service" charge of 1/3 a pound was levied by a previous Minister of Agriculture as one of the conditions of permits granted pursuant to powers given to the Minister of Agriculture under the provisions of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act to enable the entry into the metropolitan abattoirs area of meat slaughtered outside that area, for sale in wholesale and retail establishments. These permits may be issued by the Minister subject to such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate.

The purpose of the charge is to defray the cost of services rendered by the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, principally by way of shop inspections, to permit holders. It is difficult to assess what effect, if any, this charge has had on metropolitan meat prices and the operation of country abattoirs; but as country abattoirs are primarily export slaughtering establishments, it is unlikely that the charge would have a significant effect on their future development.

### PROFESSOR RICHARDSON

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning attacks made on Professor Richardson?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I do not intend to comment on the statements made by other members in Parliament, because those members have simply exercised their privilege. Unlike the situation in the Australian Labor Party, there are no Party-imposed restrictions on the statements of Liberal and Country League members. As far as the Government is concerned, it gave permission and approval for Professor Richardson—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is not allowed to debate answers to questions.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Very well, Mr. Speaker. The Government gave its approval for the trip that Professor Richardson will make to Russia soon.

### HOUSE FOUNDATIONS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my question about house foundations and footings used by the Housing Trust?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In view of the importance of this matter and the general concern of the public about it, I shall read in full this lengthy report by the General Manager of the trust:

For some years now the areas of trust housing development, both metropolitan and country, have been on soils of widely varying quality for building purposes, with the majority of sites being on soils of an expansive nature. In consequence, careful consideration has had to be given to the type of footing and wall construction best suited to these areas in order to minimize cracking caused by differential soil movement over the house site. Initially a Soils Committee comprising the Senior Architect, the Town Planning Architect and the Site Architect, was set up to study the problem on each site and, in conjunction with Mines Department soils surveys, it determined, without the support of laboratory facilities, the type and size of footings that were to be used, bearing in mind the cost per house that would be involved.

At about this time the trust also began working closely with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization soils division and contributed substantially towards the technical research activities of that organization into this State's soil types, notably at Elizabeth and in various country and metropolitan areas, in an effort to establish suitable footing specifications to meet the variable soil conditions encountered. Arising from this co-operation with the C.S.I.R.O., the trust established a well-equipped soils laboratory of its own as part of its engineers section, operating with a technical staff of 13. In addition to taking soil samples on every group housing site and testing to determine their engineering characteristics so that footings appropriate to the conditions may be provided, the laboratory is directly associated with experimental work carried out by the trust on a range of footing systems.

One such experiment is presently being conducted at Elizabeth Park, where 30 houses in brick or masonry-veneer construction have been built with various types of footings on soil considered to have a high potential movement. Twelve houses in the group have been constructed on reinforced concrete strip footings of various dimensions, the soil under the footings having been lime-stabilized to a depth of 5ft. The lime has been introduced either dry or as a slurry into patterns of closely-drilled small diameter holes or narrow trenches under the external footings. Other houses in the group have been built on different systems of deep beam and pier and beam footings, while three houses have received no special treatment at all and are being used to establish the performance of normal strip footings supporting masonry-veneer construction on this type of soil. All 30 houses, which are being retained by the trust for rented accommodation only, have been instrumented in order that changes in moisture content beneath each house and the relative vertical movement of the footings can be measured from time to time.

The trust has also experimented with raft-slab construction and in specific instances use has been made of a number of proprietary footing systems with varying degrees of success. However, other considerations associated with many novel but nevertheless technically sound systems frequently make the proposition uneconomical. From its research the trust has found that, apart from any seasonal causes, one of the major contributing factors to soil movement which takes place during the first five to six years after house construction is the result of continual "wetting-up" of the soil beneath the external footings to a depth of 10ft. through the development of gardens surrounding the houses. An obvious solution in these cases would be to provide pier and beam footings with piers not less than 10ft. deep. However, this involves considerable expense before even the main structure of the house is commenced.

The trust believes that a more realistic approach to this problem is to restrict, as far as possible, this "wetting-up" of the soil beneath the footings and to this end is now providing around the perimeter of its houses in particular areas 4ft. wide concrete paving

at the edge of which is a 5ft. deep continuous sheet of waterproof polythene membrane. This system of protecting the soil around the footings from excessive moisture also provides the home owner with the practical asset of sealed paving around the house. Nevertheless, there is yet no one answer to all the problems associated with soil movement and no one footing system that will provide an economical solution in all situations. The trust believes that each area must be considered individually and the most practical solution determined in each case.

I would only add that, contrary to the belief of many people, the trust has been very active, as this report shows, in the field of research into foundations for houses in various soils. I think the House will agree that the work of the trust has been commendable, and it will therefore be continued. It could well be that, when a little more experience is gained, a method of providing foundations economically for these types of house will be evolved and that this will solve many of the present problems.

#### FORESTRY RESERVE

Mr. ALLEN: Last Wednesday, when speaking in support of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I suggested that the reserve that had been set aside in the Clare area, so as to preserve the only stand of red cord stringy bark in South Australia, be named the Quirke Reserve in recognition of the services that Mr. Quirke had rendered to the State. Will the Minister of Lands consider this suggestion?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes. I have not given the matter proper consideration yet, although I noted the suggestion and would endorse the honourable member's remark that Mr. Quirke had done much for the State in regard to the preservation of various natural areas. I, with many other people, appreciate what he did. However, I cannot at present reply specifically to the question.

#### IRRIGATION PERMITS

Mr. WARDLE: For the year ended June 30, 1968, temporary permits, covering small acreages, were issued to certain irrigators along the Murray River, for two main reasons: first, to enable the production of additional stock food for the holders' own stock; and secondly, to enable the holders to produce stock food in general. Can the Minister of Irrigation say how many applications he has at present for the reintroduction of this temporary permit system, how much water

would be involved in the granting of those applications, and whether he has considered reintroducing the system for the year 1968-69?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will examine this matter carefully and get a report for the honourable member. The matter is closely allied with the work of the department administered by the Minister of Works.

#### CRAYFISHING

Mr. EDWARDS: I understand that the Minister of Marine is aware of much dissatisfaction amongst crayfishermen at present. The trouble seems to have arisen between the northern and southern zones, the southern zone having four members on the advisory committee and the northern zone having only two members. These zones are far apart, and it would be difficult for a member from Port MacDonnell to know what a member from Streaky Bay or the Ceduna area was doing. It has been suggested that a separate advisory committee be formed for each zone. As the Government recognizes a northern and southern zone in the crayfishing industry does not the Minister consider that it would be fair, just, and equitable to appoint an advisory committee for each zone instead of one committee for the whole State?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As this important matter comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister in charge of fishing, I will refer the question to him.

#### OAKBANK AREA SCHOOL

Mr. GILES: Although more than 400 senior students attend the Oakbank Area School at present, the school does not have a matriculation course. Students wishing to continue their education to the fifth or matriculation year must either travel to Mount Barker by going to the Oakbank Area School and boarding a second bus, or travel to Adelaide, both procedures necessitating much travelling time. Can the Minister of Education say whether a matriculation course could be included in the syllabus at the Oakbank Area School in 1969?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will get a report for the honourable member.

#### NARRIDY SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: As the school at Narridy was closed at the end of last year and as people in the area are willing to purchase the property, can the Minister of Education say what the Government intends to do with this school property?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will get a report from the Property Officer about what the department intends to do with this closed school, but I suggest to the honourable member that, if the people interested in buying it have not already done so, they should address the question to the Education Department.

#### MENINGIE HOSPITAL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Premier, representing the Minister for Health, say whether Cabinet has approved of the contract to be let for building a new hospital at Meningie?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am sure the honourable member will be pleased to know that I can give an affirmative answer: Cabinet has approved of the building of the hospital at Meningie.

#### FRANCES SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Education say whether an allocation has been made on the Loan Estimates for this year to build a new house for the headmaster of the Frances school?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am unable to answer that question now, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

#### EQUAL PAY

Mr. Hudson, for Mr. RICHES (on notice): When is it intended to make the next adjustment to salaries of women teachers under the equal pay proposals?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The next adjustment of salaries of women teachers under the equal pay proposals will take effect from July 8, 1968. The new salaries were gazetted on July 11, and the Accounts Branch of the Education Department is now working on salary adjustments.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: COUNCIL FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I ask leave to make a statement.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member can make a personal explanation on matters affecting him personally, which statement is limited to five minutes.

Leave granted.

Mr. McANANEY: Last week the matter of my membership of a certain organization was raised and my statement in this House about



how one can leave that association was disputed. Therefore, with your permission, I shall read the aims and methods of that organization and particulars of how membership can be terminated. They are as follows:

The aims of the council shall be to assist in the establishment, maintenance and protection of the rights and liberties of persons in Australia and its Territories against any infringement, or against the use or abuse of powers by Governments, their agencies, or others in authority or power to the detriment of the liberties which inhabitants of this country should enjoy.

Regarding methods, the council shall aid in advancing measures for the recovery and enlargement of those rights and liberties, and shall pursue its aims by vigilance, publicity, legal action and advice, protest, and other appropriate means, including assistance to individuals, and by formulation and presentation to Governments and other authorities of specific proposals and policies. The council shall be non-Party and non-sectarian.

Membership shall be open to any person of or above the age of 16 years who subscribes to the aims of the council. Persons may be admitted to membership on payment of the requisite subscriptions. The committee shall refer the question of any rejection of an application for membership or termination of membership to the next general meeting. Unless a two-thirds majority of those present and voting at the meeting are in favour of the rejection of the application or the termination of the membership, the application shall stand accepted or the membership shall not be terminated, as the case may be.

Possibly, it is not intended that one has to have a two-thirds majority to resign, but the wording definitely states that one has to have that majority.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 25. Page 281.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion, although this is the second Vice-Regal Speech we have had this year. First, a Speech was given by Sir Edric Bastyan, and I record the appreciation of the electors of my district for the personal attention that he gave to them and the way in which he entered into the activities of the district and took part, apparently willingly, in prominent functions and was pleased at all times to meet the people and to discuss their problems. He is a unique person and it will be difficult to find a similar person. Meanwhile, in the office of Lieutenant-Governor, we have an eminent South Australian who over the years has, I suppose, actually served a term as Governor

of this State. He has carried out the duties of the office efficiently and with great dignity, emphasizing that it is possible for an Australian to fulfil the functions of a State Governor adequately.

I congratulate the present Government on assuming office and, although it is in a precarious position, it has the numbers in this House and occupies the Government benches. I, too, congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on assuming once again the office of Speaker. We know that, from your long association with Parliament and with your previous experience as Speaker, you will carry out the duties of your office with dignity and will keep order within the Chamber at all times.

In adding my condolences to those of other members to the families of those who were members of this House and who died during the past session I refer, first, to the Hon. Frank Walsh. He was a man I respected in this House. He had worked his way through the trade union movement ultimately to become Labor Premier. I admired his tenacity of purpose, and I always admired and respected his basic honesty in all matters. The late Fred Walsh was a member of this House whilst I have been a member. He was a true trade unionist of the old school. He knew the problems of his people and had a biting tongue in debate when defending them. When he left this Chamber he was not without a successor but he did not have a successor of the same calibre in this capacity.

I also pay a tribute to the late Mr. R. W. R. Hunt, who for five years served this House as member for Victoria and who lost his seat in the 1938 redistribution. A great district man, he arranged for many important undertakings in the district of Tatiara, for the installation of one of the biggest electrical undertakings run by local government and for the provision of a drainage scheme in the area. During his Parliamentary career, and later, he took an active part in local government affairs in the South-East. He was one of those unique country persons who have the respect of everyone, and he was looked on as a seer by the people in the South-East. Together with other honourable members, I wish to place on record my sympathy for the families of former members who have died.

There are only one or two matters in His Excellency's Speech on which I wish to speak at some length. The first of these needs to be treated with some urgency, namely, the availability and use of water within the State. This

House has been in unanimous agreement on the question of the Chowilla dam. Indeed, it is one of the few things on which the House has been in unanimous agreement this session. All members are aware of the tremendous advantage of having such a storage system on the Murray River. The security the dam would give the State by providing a storage at the head of the river instead of at the mouth, as we have it now, and of being able to rationalize the use of water along the full course of the river's route through South Australia is of the utmost importance. It is all very well to restrict contemplation of this matter purely and simply to the River Murray Waters Agreement, which appears to be the present situation when considering other storages on the river; but what is important and what should not be overlooked is that there is another river adjoining the Murray River, namely, the Darling River, which is pouring millions of gallons of water through South Australia into the sea at Goolwa. This is water we cannot possibly store until we have a dam such as Chowilla, which is very important to South Australia. This aspect should not be overlooked when we are considering this matter.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: This is some of the best quality water that comes into South Australia.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes. It is not contaminated water: it is fresh water, much of it snow water. It moves freely through South Australia, and it is a tragedy we cannot trap it and put it to better use. Many schemes depend on the storage of water on the Murray River and on the river itself. For instance, we are now contemplating additional water mains to Adelaide. The provision of additional water supplies for industrial expansion in this State is important, because industry requires water as its lifeblood. As the member for the District of Albert I am interested in the Taillem Bend to Keith water scheme, which will draw water from the Murray River and supply it as far south as Keith, and beyond. The basic reason for this scheme, which will cost \$14,000,000, is that it will bring into production an area in South Australia which has a safe rainfall, which has reasonably good soils, and which has a tremendous potential for increased production. It is conservatively estimated that, on present costs and on present returns from produce, this area could return to the State an additional \$12,000,000 a year once the land is brought into full production.

It is important to the State that this area and any other such areas that have the potential for development in agriculture should be brought into production, because it is now apparent that we are unable to develop any other resources as quickly and as profitably as we still can develop certain types of agricultural and rural production.

The State needs to have additional earnings perhaps now more than ever before because of its particular position with regard to secondary industry and because of the problems associated with the type of industry we have here and the instability that could result in our manufacturing industries as a consequence of any setback in the Eastern States. We have already been through one of those situations where the market declined in the sale of motor cars, refrigerators and other pressed-steel equipment which forms the basic part of our manufacturing industry. All members know what repercussions this could have on the community and on the finances of the State. Therefore, from a State point of view it is important that we now do everything possible to bring into production as quickly as possible any land that is capable of increased production.

The Taillem Bend to Keith water scheme has been accepted by the Commonwealth Government as a scheme for consideration for subsidy under the water resources conservation legislation. The Commonwealth Government has allocated \$50,000,000 to encourage the storage and use of water in Australia. This scheme has been accepted for consideration for subsidy or support for a major contribution from the Commonwealth Government towards its cost, because in a State where there is a capital works budget of from \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000 and where there is a need for schools, hospitals and other major capital structures, it is difficult to find the kind of money that is needed to develop these projects, which do not serve many people now but which will ultimately contribute substantially to the wealth of the State. It is a great strain when placed on State finances to provide such developmental works. It is hoped that the Commonwealth Government will, after reviewing the scheme as it is now reviewing it on a cost-benefit basis, be satisfied with the benefits to be obtained from this area for the cost of the investment not only by the Commonwealth Government but by the landholders in question, and that the cost benefit to the State will prove that the scheme is worthy of the Commonwealth assistance.

I now wish to speak about water from a slightly different point of view, namely, its importance to the South-East. When the South-East was developed one of the biggest problems was surplus ground water. There is no question that landholders at that time wanted drainage. When the 1924 commission inquired into drainage in the South-East it received a huge volume of evidence supporting drainage. At that time the commission was invited to consider two proposals for drainage put forward by the chief engineers of the State. One proposal was to take the water northward to the sea and the other was to take the water directly westward to the sea. The commission came down in favour of the latter proposal because it was the shorter route to the sea, because it required less drainage construction, and because it might well have been cheaper. Since 1924 we have assumed that we have unlimited water in the South-East—that the water in our underground basins comes from somewhere else and that we do not need to worry about tipping millions of gallons of water into the sea, because there is plenty more water where that came from. But that is not so: this water is not unlimited, and it does not have some distant origin. In fact, we are wilfully depleting those supplies of water far too rapidly.

Recent work undertaken by the Soils Division of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization under Mr. Homes has conclusively established several points: the first is that Ewon Pond (Eight Mile Creek) and another similar outlet known as the "Piccaninnies" are actually underground rivers draining the lower portion of the South-East—at least, as far north as Tarpeena. This water has fallen on to the ground, soaked in, and followed the natural drainage to the sea. When we developed Eight Mile Creek for soldier settlement purposes, we deliberately accelerated the flow of this drain in order to reclaim the surrounding land, and nothing has been done to ensure that we were not doing incalculable harm to our water resources.

This development all took place in order to obtain a few fertile acres of land for dairy farms. However, the harm caused to tens of thousands of acres to the north remains to be seen. The water that goes into the Gambier limestone, which is the shallow lime basin, has soaked in from the surface run-off; in other words, it is water that falls on to the soil and runs away in the drains we have constructed. Through weaknesses in the basic soil structure, the water in the Gambier lime-

stone (in run-away holes and faults) is finding its way into the so-called artesian waters, which are contained in what is geologically known as the "Knight sands". This water is the life-blood of the area for irrigation, and it also feeds the lower aquifers which, as well as being the source of water for township supplies, are the source of pressure water in certain areas.

This water does not originate, as was once thought, in Victoria; it originates in South Australia. Some of it is run-off water from the highlands in Victoria, which comes into South Australia through a series of creeks and floods out on to our plains. This is one of the few things we get from Victoria for nothing; we do not get much else. Indeed, Victoria used to be pleased to get rid of this water. I believe that we should be grateful to have that water at present and that we should be doing far more to conserve it and to put it to some use. I do not think the Chairman of the Land Settlement Committee would mind my saying that about seven-eighths of the last evidence heard by the committee on this matter was against drainage. The witnesses appearing before the committee in this regard are vitally concerned with the area in question.

When I had the honour to be the Chairman of the committee, I was also in the position of arranging the hearing of evidence on drainage, and time and time again landholders put to the committee that drains which were too deep were tapping ground water and that the effect of these drains was being felt some distance away. In other words, we were taking away water that originated some distance on either side of the drains being constructed. Although this evidence was refuted by the experts, I think the writing is on the wall as far as they are concerned, for it is time that they looked at the facts more closely. Indeed, I believe it is time they had the responsibility, and were directed, to examine these matters critically and factually.

In other areas in my district companies such as Seppelt's at Keppoch and Lindeman's at Padthaway are setting up new vineyards, in an area containing the right soils and climate, in the belief that no limit exists to the underground water contained in the basin there. There has been a tremendous expansion of irrigation activity in that area over the last three or four years. The Electricity Trust has supplied power now, I suppose, to hundreds of pumps, which are all pumping no less than perhaps 100,000 gallons of water an hour.

The one saving grace in that area seems to be that the water table is shallow, and the water soon gravitates back into it, the only loss sustained being that of evaporation from the ground surface and through leaf transpiration. In other words, the wastage is not as high as it might be if there were a greater depth and the water were unable to gravitate back into the basin.

However, we do not know precisely what the source of water is, although we believe it originates through Morambro Creek coming in from Victoria. We believe it is local soakage water, but it is only a small pocket about five miles wide along the range. West of this it is as salty as the sea. We are continuing to expand industry associated with irrigation: a dehydrating plant is shortly to be established in the area to process lucerne meal (presumably to go into competition with the other dehydrating company) for export to Japan. This will provide a welcome and profitable outlet for lucerne growers in the area as an alternative to seed production. Land is being bought at between \$200 and \$300 an acre, because it has a particular basic worth at present and because people believe that this basic worth will not be depleted. However, we do not know that it will not be depleted; we cannot be certain that this water is unlimited. The people concerned have confidence in the Government's ability to prove these resources, because these resources are basic to industry.

Another area a little farther north around Bordertown and Mundalla receives water from creeks originating in Victoria. In flood, these creeks bring in a big volume of water, and there is also local catchment water, which goes through what are called sink holes in swamps into the underground basin. One of the interesting things that one sees, when looking at maps of the area, is that in the county of Chandos, which is now being considered by the Lands Department for settlement, the water is extraordinarily good just north of Bordertown, but it deteriorates as one proceeds farther north. It is 60-grain water in Chandos, which is a Crown lands area, and it would be interesting to know whether this water originated around Bordertown and Mundalla or whether, according to the mythical belief, it originated in the Grampians.

A critical assessment of the origin of this water, its possible source of replacement and what effective use we can make of it over the whole of this area, including the Mallee, is a matter of extreme importance. Today there

is an economic tendency for people to move into a more intensive form of agriculture such as dairying or small seeds production to try to bolster their incomes. This good farming land sells at a premium because it has a water potential. What is this potential? Whether we might be affecting water available to the Mallee country because of pumping in the Bordertown and Mundalla area we do not know: nobody seems to know. If the old theory is correct, that water comes from around the Grampians in Victoria.

Mr. Burdon: You are advocating a complete investigation of South-East waters?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, I advocate a complete and comprehensive investigation of all South-East underground waters and an assessment of the capacity of the area to provide water for more intensive development.

Mr. Burdon: I agree with that.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Until such an assessment is made, we cannot allow people to invest capital in intensive production. This Parliament has a responsibility to see that information is provided to these people on the resources available and whether those resources are sufficient to enable them to enter this type of enterprise.

Mr. Giles: We must ensure that the water is not pumped out of the district.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do not think this water could be pumped to Adelaide: the theory that the water is plentiful and that South Australia could be supplied from the South-East is wrong.

Mr. Burdon: I shouldn't say it was unlimited.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is not. I am frightened that we might be depleting it too rapidly and wilfully without considering the consequences. Some avenues of production can be profitably undertaken in this area. I believe we must rethink what we have done so far. Some need for urgency exists. The South-Eastern Drainage Board requires work so that it can remain functional. The equipment and staffing of the board must be maintained, because to establish the board again would involve great cost. We should provide for the board some form of work which would keep it intact, which would be to the benefit of landholders in the South-East and which would meet with their approval.

Serious consideration must be given to re-directing much of our drainage. I have previously referred to this matter in the House.

As the natural fall is 4ft. to the mile from east to west and 1ft. to the mile from south to north, the water can be progressively drained from the South-East right up to Salt Creek in the Coorong. Before all the drains were put in, Reedy Creek found its way to the sea into the lower end of the Coorong at Salt Creek. The Baker Range drain drained into the sea at Alf's Flat, a few miles inland, where a lake of thousands of acres of fresh water occurs when the water drains into this area. Now Reedy Creek is chopped off by the Blackford drain, which enters the sea just north of Kingston. No water flows along it except in extraordinarily wet winters, which are not common. The water that used to flow up Baker Range into Alf's Flat is now intercepted by the Bool Lagoon outlet drains and flows down Drain M into Lake George and then into the sea at Beachport. A tremendous volume of water from the creeks that rise in Victoria and from the local drains is caught on the eastern side. I am told that the drainage resources of the South-East in water runoff amount to about 400,000 acre feet. Although I find that hard to believe, I have been told on good authority that it is so. That is a fantastic quantity of water, and it could be put to some purpose. It could be drained northwards.

Rather than be tipped into the sea, it could be more profitably used if it were drained back into the Coorong, which is an interesting and unique area that could be improved and developed as a tourist attraction. However, to restore the Coorong to what it used to be and to take away all the bad smells, fresh water is needed. This can be accomplished by using the drainage water. Not only would this restore much of this area to its natural state (where the water was brackish) and allow the reeds and plants to grow so that the bird life would build up but it would also improve the fishing, which is of such great concern to fishermen in the area. Both of these natural drainage channels still exist and could be redeveloped. If the water were emptied into the Coorong, it could be more effectively and profitably used from the point of view of the State than it is at present, as it is tipped holus bolus into the sea. As the water went north, overland, in this country, it would soak into the ground and replenish the underground basins, which are so desirable in this area not only for irrigation but also in most areas (more particularly) for stock water.

The Coorong and the Messent reserve (adjacent to it behind Salt Creek) are both interesting areas, and could be developed as national parks. However, in order for this to be done we must restore the fresh water balance in the Coorong: we must restore its natural ecology to return it to the state in which it was before the drainage was undertaken and the water was chopped off. It is most important that these matters be examined critically to see whether what I have suggested is feasible and practical and whether it will be to the ultimate benefit of the State, not only to the benefit of the area in question. This area can be made attractive for those who live in it as well as for people who travel to and from other States.

I now wish to deal with country education, which interests me particularly. All country members are concerned with the upper level of education available at country schools. The member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) referred this afternoon to the journey students from his district must take from the Oakbank school to the Mount Barker school to attend matriculation classes. He asked whether matriculation classes for Oakbank school could be considered this year. Most people living in the country today do not live on farms. (Most people who live on farms are able to send their children away to school.) Instead, the country population consists largely of people who live in towns and service rural industry. These people, comprising electricians, engineers, Electricity Trust and Highways Department employees, and employees of stores, stock firms and banks, have a real problem. In the country their children cannot get the same level of education as is available in the city, notwithstanding that their children will be forced on to a labour market on which they have to compete with children who have had the advantage of a city educational system. Job competition is extremely keen and presents a real problem for people who are anxious that their children succeed but who, at the same time, wish to live in the country by choice. When the children of doctors and bank managers reach a certain stage, these professional men want to leave the country in order to ensure that their children will have opportunities.

In this State we have done a good job with area schools. There is no question but that consolidation of primary and secondary schools into units known as area schools (I do not know what they will be called in future) has enabled a higher level of secondary education

to be obtained because of the greater number of students, and the magnificent bus services being operated enables this aggregation of children. For a long time Victoria lagged a long way behind this State and Victorians looked longingly across the border at what was being done here. However, today in Victoria any school with more than 230 secondary pupils has a sixth grade, or matriculation class, and at present six former students of the Bordertown High School are attending the Kaniva High School in Victoria. Next year, if a matriculation class is not provided at the Bordertown High School, 20 children from Bordertown will be attending the Kaniva High School. The State is involved in costs, because the children are legitimately in receipt of boarding allowances, but that is not the point: what is important is that a school the size of the Bordertown High School should have a matriculation class so that South Australian children can receive the same level of education as can be obtained in Victoria.

The same proposition applies to the fourth-year general course, for which I understand a request has been made. That course should be provided if at all possible so that children who are not academically inclined but who require an additional year of secondary education may receive it at the school they have attended in their earlier school life. It is a little easier to solve the problem at the Bordertown High School than it is at places farther away that have fewer pupils. I think something should be done about this, and I ask the Minister to consider three suggestions. The first is that fifth-year classes be consolidated at a central school. This has not always been possible because of the long distances that some children would have to travel to their original school before being transported again. In fact, bus services have to be organized to enable the few who want to study the fifth-year course to catch another bus that will get them to the central school on time. A transfer operation necessitates the re-organization of the bus services, sometimes to an embarrassing extent.

However, the other night I discussed alternatives with some teachers. The first was the provision of hostels, which should be operated wherever possible to enable a centrally-consolidated school, such as a central area school, to function. I have in mind a school such as that at Lameroo, which is about 24 or 25 miles from Pinnaroo and about 21 miles from the Geranium Area School. At Lameroo in this fashion there would be sufficient students

to enable a matriculation class to be established, but boarding is a problem: it is not easy to get people to accept the responsibility of boarding children. The answer is the provision of hostels at places where there would be sufficient students to enable classes to be provided. Where this cannot be done, we should take action to assist the children who are at a disadvantage.

I accept that these classes cannot be set up for, say, six students, because of the cost of manpower, salaries and equipment. However, the matter of providing adequate boarding allowances is worthy of consideration. I have in mind an amount that will keep a child at school, provided he passes his examinations. Country children should not be deprived of opportunity merely because of their place of residence. I know many instances of children leaving school at third-year level because their parents, who are employed on properties, in garages, and so on, in country towns cannot afford to send them to other than the local school, which does not teach beyond third-year secondary level. It is unfair that these children, comprising bright students, should be so handicapped that, because of the financial position of their parents, they cannot get an education that would otherwise be available. After all, the State would benefit from the higher education that these children received.

I should also like to mention cost in relation to schools. I do not know whether the member for Enfield, who has been trying to help me, will help me on this matter. I think he agrees that, although we are building some extraordinarily good schools, the simple matter that we should be concerned about is the need for a school. The Chairman of the Public Works Committee may also agree that, although we are building magnificent schools, we are not building schools to a price. Some schools that have been constructed in the last few years are magnificent, but I think they are beyond the resources of the State financially because we have only a certain amount of money available and, if we can build only schools to meet new school requirements, the older schools suffer, not only because timber frame structures are added but also because people are being asked to put up with sub-standard conditions in comparison with the conditions in new schools.

Mr. Jennings: You want schools rebuilt.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes. I have a vested interest in this matter, and I do not mind agreeing. One way of achieving this is by

tailoring schools to a price, as is done in England, where the public building authority is told that it has to build a school of a certain standard and to a certain price. The authority is not told merely to build a magnificent school.

Mr. Casey: I suggest that you advocate that we go and look at that system.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I think that has been done. The Director-General (Mr. Walker) may be cross with me, because he wanted to speak to me before I made the statement. However, I want to make the statement now because it is my view. The Director-General is looking into that matter. In fact, there is not much that he does not catch up with. I also found, when I wanted to discuss agricultural education with him, that some thought had been given to this. This aspect of education is another matter about which I am concerned. A committee has been set up to inquire into agricultural education. I do not know whether it has met or, if it has, what deliberations it has made. Perhaps the Minister could help, but something should be done. Today, there is a tremendous gap in the higher secondary level of agricultural education. Once, Roseworthy Agricultural College filled this gap but today, in order to meet demands for technically trained people and also to capture Commonwealth assistance for tertiary education, Roseworthy has moved into the technical sphere and is no longer a training school for farmers and no longer of great value to the average person wanting to enter the farming industry. Perhaps Roseworthy has reached the point where many of the things it is doing could be done better at the Institute of Technology. This is a matter that should be critically considered, because we have spent much money for a few students.

We do not have an agricultural training college, as I understand it, as they exist in Western Australia. Victoria has three—Dookie and Longerenong, which are well up to the technical level to which Roseworthy now aspires, and, at Geelong, the Marcus Oldham Farm Agricultural College, a private college that has also been in difficulties about finance. I am alarmed that it is stepping up its level of teaching to a higher technical degree. This may be beyond many of its present students, and may defeat its purpose of training farmers principally because it is looking for funds from outside its resources to enable the college to expand. This is a vicious circle.

We have no school in this State that teaches general farm management or at which a good general agricultural education at a higher or secondary level can be obtained.

I have criticized Roseworthy knowing that the number of pupils is to be increased, but I know that most of the 113 students would be fully qualified to enter the university. Most of them are at Roseworthy because they could not enter the agricultural science faculty at the university as it was full and they applied to enter Roseworthy. The standard of entrance at Roseworthy has risen to university level, although this was not intended. Technical training should be provided and, if this can be obtained at Roseworthy, well and good. But what happens at the next step down? Agricultural science is taught in schools, but I am sceptical about the way it is being taught at present. I am interested in the course being developed at Urrbrae Agricultural High School, a course that will ultimately be equal to or better than the course in Western Australia.

In that State residential junior high schools are set up in regional centres throughout the State and students who have passed a second year course attend for two or three years for a higher secondary education in agriculture. Unfortunately, farming is no longer a way of life but a highly competitive business. This type of education is lacking in South Australia at present, and I hope the Government will consider this aspect in its review of education, something that has been lacking in the past. If this is not done people will suffer as a consequence.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Have you anything particular in mind?

Mr. NANKIVELL: A good level of agricultural teaching in all phases and teaching science with an agricultural bias would provide a course that had been envisaged at Roseworthy, except that Roseworthy considered that it was teaching people who had no knowledge of agriculture, and tried to teach them to be farmers. People with a farming background should be accepted, and given a well based scientific knowledge of agriculture at secondary level. This is an important aspect. I now refer to another matter, and am indebted to the Speaker for information he has given to me.

Mr. Hudson: Are you trying to prolong the debate?

Mr. NANKIVELL: No, I am making a normal speech and see no reason why I should do otherwise.

Mr. Hudson: When did you last speak in this debate for an hour?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have spoken before for an hour, but I will go for two hours now if it will make the honourable member happy.

Mr. Hudson: Is that a threat?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Of course not, but if the honourable member will let me continue I will finish in good time. The figures given me by the Speaker supplement those that I already had, and refer to the situation existing in the farming area today. These figures show that in the 20 years from 1948 to 1968 farm costs have increased by 120 per cent but export prices have fallen by 17 per cent, which means that in purchasing power farmers' returns for their produce are almost half what they were 20 years ago. From a primary industry newsletter I have received I note that during the last selling season wool reached its lowest price for nine years, the overall price for greasy wool sold during that period being 41.75c, which meant a fall in revenue of \$69,800,000 or 10 per cent on the previous season. The most serious aspect of this situation was that there was a 12 per cent fall in the average price of wool. If prices fall and costs rise it is important to consider the whole economics of agriculture in this State. The Agriculture Department was set up not only to inquire into matters of quarantine and to investigate problems but also to provide a service in agriculture to farmers. One section needs a substantial increase in staff. Perhaps the member for Glenelg may be interested in this aspect, because I believe it to be in the agricultural economics section of the department. Work has been done by the present economist on certain information provided by—

Mr. Hudson: If you had a competent Minister it would not be necessary.

Mr. NANKIVELL: He can speak to his experts if he wants to. It is evident that certain problems facing agriculture today need looking at very critically. Profitability, as I have already indicated, has fallen substantially; capital structure has increased; and one of the difficulties is to keep people profitably employed in agriculture. When we reached the situation in the dairying industry where we were getting unprofitable units, fortunately because it suited the Commonwealth Government it said that it would assist aggregation of unprofitable farming units in the dairying industry through the dairying improvement legislation. The Commonwealth Government would provide loans at low rates of interest

and on reasonable terms to facilitate the aggregation of unprofitable units. This is something that should be looked at today with respect to farming and grazing properties.

It is no longer possible to continue to build up the price structure to keep inefficient units profitable. We must look at what is a profitable unit, the size of the area, and how we can help people aggregate their units to a point at which they are profitable and people do not depend on subsidy and other forms of assistance to provide a reasonable living. This is one of the avenues of research that could well be undertaken by the Agriculture Department. I also understand it is intended to build a new headquarters for the department at Northfield. I hope that this intention has not changed with the change of Government, because there is no question that the department is badly catered for in the facilities provided at Gawler Place.

The department is inadequately provided for in the cut-down laboratories which were erected at Northfield but which were pruned to a price and not made big enough for the department's requirements. I hope the department will get its new headquarters and that, when they are constructed, provision will be made for expansion. I hope that they will be reasonably commodious to enable the department to continue to function effectively. I understand it is also intended to construct regional centres. These are centres which are completely staffed, which are independent in operation and which are centred throughout the State in given areas to give more effective service to people resident in those areas.

I consider there is a need for such a centre in the Upper South-East. I have previously suggested that there was a tailor-made facility at Brecon when the A.M.P. moved out, but that is no longer available because the property has been sold. Somewhere in that area there is a need for a regional centre to cater for the development that is taking place and is likely to take place to meet the requirements not only of the Upper South-East but of the South Mallee, which is the wetter part of the Mallee and which is different from the Upper Mallee areas that are catered for by the Loxton Regional Centre. I hope that the Minister and his colleagues will consider providing the centres because of the need for an improvement in extensions and of the need not only for improved knowledge to the farmer but for improved knowledge of the farming conditions the Government would be able to obtain if it operated such centres efficiently.



I was amazed to hear what the Minister of Lands said today when he implied that the 1c service fee was not having any effect on country abattoirs. I differ strongly from his views on this matter. I understand from my colleague the member for Murray (Mr. Wardle) that it is costing the Murray Bridge abattoir about \$40,000 a year, and this is an imposition. I also know that it is stopping one big company in this State from rebuilding its abattoir and expanding it in close proximity to Adelaide and the hills. A \$500,000 project is being held up because of this matter and because it is not known what the ultimate cost might be. This is something that needs looking into. It is a matter for the Minister of Agriculture. I think what the Minister said today is not factual, and I would like this matter straightened out and put into its proper context.

I offer a word of caution on land policy. I agree with what the Government has done in enabling country to be freeholded. I realize that the Minister is confronted with some problem in removing the 4,000-acre restriction. This might seem to be a fair and reasonable restriction to place on land in some areas, but in others it is causing some difficulty in management and is responsible for all sorts of tricks being employed to get around it. This should not be. I see no reason why a person who has perhaps 1,000 acres too many should have his application rejected purely and simply on the ground of acreage. The former Minister of Lands (now Deputy Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister the other day what was proposed with the opening up of land in the out of hundreds in county Chandos. It was indicated then that it was proposed at this stage to open up only eight blocks. I hope this is all that is done for the time being and that we enter upon this developmental project with great caution. I say this advisedly, in the light of what I have said previously about the fall in the price of wool, because this is an area that can be developed only as a stock grazing area, preferably for sheep, because it is suited to sheep rather than cattle. With a 4,000-acre block of land, and with an estimated cost of developing it of about \$25 to \$30 an acre, it is a great deal of money by anybody's standards.

Mr. Hudson: Even yours.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, even mine. Of course, this would be required for those blocks that we develop. Restrictions will be placed on them from the point of view of what they can carry and how they can be managed. I think

the whole thing needs to be studied critically to see whether or not it is feasible to go ahead and open this land up. Of course, it can be done in one way: I believe that it can still be opened up provided the land is made available to be worked in conjunction with an adjoining property. I think the danger will arise if the land is allocated to people as a separate unit on which they have to try to pay their way and make a living. I have always maintained that there is a serious danger in that country of placing it under stress. I think caution should be exercised in opening it up, but that if it is to be opened up there should be some restriction tying it to adjacent land so that it can be developed without putting it under any undue stress and so that it can be worked in as an adjunct to another property which might require additional acreage to make it a more efficient unit. Such holdings as these exist on the northern, western and southern fringes, particularly on the western and northern ends, where there are people who could handle this type of proposition fairly readily because they have the equipment. It would mean that it would probably provide the additional income that would enable a son (or another son) to stay on the home property, but it would be worked in conjunction with other land and not as a separate unit. If it is done this way, I think the problem in this matter can be safely overcome.

In conclusion, I should like to say a few words about the question of a hospital at the Flinders University. There has been some suggestion that this Government is not doing anything about this matter. I should like some confirmation at some time from the responsible Minister regarding whether or not this was not made part of the last triennium request when the Australian Universities Commission was here. I believe the previous Government hoped that this hospital would be built as a university hospital and thereby attract Commonwealth funds. I do not know whether that is so. Also, I do not know whether the commission considered the matter, favourably or otherwise. However, if it did not, I think it is most important that the State seriously consider it because of the need to train the additional doctors so sadly lacking in this State. Our problems have been discussed here before in relation to the Medical Practitioners Act and I have spoken at length on this matter setting out the figures that were prepared by the committee of inquiry. These figures showed that we were far from meeting our needs in

training doctors, that we were dependent on imports from other States and overseas, and that, unless we got this next medical college (I presume that at Flinders it would be called a "school") moving pretty smoothly before long, we would not be any better off than we are now. At present the university is taking in first-year medical students, but at this point of time there is no guarantee that when these students reach their third year they will be able to continue their studies at this university. I think this is a most important matter. If the Commonwealth Government or the Universities Commission is not going to assist us with this, the State will have to look at it very critically.

Notwithstanding what the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) has suggested, I could speak for much longer. I am not deliberately stonewalling in this debate: the things I have said are things I wished to say. In fact, I have a whole heap more I should like to say but, out of respect for the Opposition and its desire to get on quickly to other matters, I will conclude by saying that I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. EDWARDS (Eyre): I rise to speak for the first time in this House deeply conscious of the honour the electors of Eyre have done me in electing me as their new representative. The needs and wishes of my people will always have first priority in the deliberations I will make in this House. I congratulate the mover, the member for Chaffey (Mr. Arnold), and the seconder, the member for Murray (Mr. Wardle), for the able way in which they initiated the debate in reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech. I am privileged to be a new member with them, on the Government side, in this Parliament.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on assuming your high office. I realize the big responsibility you have in the discharge of your duties. The decisions that will be yours may not be easy ones, but we know that you will uphold, with impartiality, the privileges and traditions of this honourable House. You are well known and highly regarded in my district. I wish you well in this Thirty-Ninth Parliament of South Australia. I pay tribute to my predecessor, Mr. George Bockelberg, who was the member for Eyre for 12 years. Mr. Bockelberg, a kindly gentleman, served the District of Eyre with distinction. He was associated with many enterprising projects in that district. The completion of the sealing of the Eyre Highway to Ceduna is one of the many high-

lights he achieved as our member. He is respected and honoured by people in the district.

I express my sincere sympathy to the family of the late Frank Walsh, a former Premier of South Australia. Although I was not a member of this House during his term of office, I have learned, during the short time I have been here, of the esteem in which he was held. I also express my sympathy to the families of the late members referred to in His Excellency's Speech. I refer especially to the late Hon. C. D. Octoman, who was a personal friend of mine. Mr. Octoman did much for Eyre Peninsula, prominent amongst his activities being his contribution as a member of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. During his all too short term as a member of this Parliament, his qualities were distinctive and outstanding. His untimely passing cut short a brilliant career, and South Australia (Eyre Peninsula in particular) lost one of her finest sons.

I congratulate the Premier and his Ministry on assuming the Government benches. The honourable Premier is the youngest man ever to hold this high office in South Australia, and with his excellent Ministry he will do much for this State. The Ministry has commendable balance, clearly recognizing city and country interests. The policy of the Liberal and Country League has thought and activity for every section of the community. Our first and most important task is to restore South Australia's financial stability. We must restore the confidence of the people. I believe, with the honourable Premier, that private initiative and a proper regard for the economic and social welfare of every individual, together with efficient management of the State's resources and a constructive exploitation of the State's potential, will put South Australia back once more in the front rank of national progress.

I stress to the Minister the importance of travel and on-the-spot inspection of areas throughout the whole State, and I am happy to observe that this practice is being carried out. I have been impressed with the historic events thus far evidenced in this Parliament. The opening in April, with its subsequent happenings, has been an education and an eye-opener for me and my new colleagues. Whilst I regret the result of the Millicent by-election, I appreciated the opportunity to be able to take an active part in that by-election. As we approach the active legislative programme of

this session, I am fully conscious of the responsibilities placed on us as members of the Government Party.

His Excellency's Speech was one of realistic appraisal of policies necessary to get this State moving. I compliment His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor on his clear presentation of the Speech, and I trust that he is restored to health once more. I wish now to make some comments about the district which I have the honour to represent: the District of Eyre is a far-flung and expansive area; it is that part of South Australia that has the biggest untapped potential of any area in this State. I will henceforth be constant in my pleas for the facilities that we must have if my district is to progress and make the contributions to South Australia's economy which I know it has the resources to make. It is high time that we the people of Eyre receive consideration regarding water reticulation, roads, electricity, and radio and television reception, based on a production basis and not only on a population basis.

Compared with the rest of the State, our primary production per capita far exceeds that of all other areas. In the past, when we have asked for these amenities we have been told that we cannot have them because we have not sufficient people. Why should not this be taken on a production basis? Why should the people on Eyre Peninsula be the last people in this State to receive the amenities which most people consider their right, and which they regard as an accepted way of life? Our people are penalized in having to contend with arduous living conditions, when they are willing to go out and open up new country which will benefit everyone in the State. The situation regarding the projected Polda to Kimba main has been and is simply appalling, particularly in an area such as this, with the production which we have. We still do not have a permanent water supply for these districts.

Kimba, Darke Peak, Kielpa, and surrounding districts, are some of the best wheatgrowing areas in the State. Many thousands of sheep and large numbers of cattle graze throughout these parts. However, because of the lack of water, progress is retarded in all the towns and the surrounding country. I am pleased to know that the Government intends to correct this situation. The Kimba to Polda pipeline route is not the only area in my district placed in this unfortunate position: large areas north and south of Streaky Bay, and west of Ceduna, right out past Penong, all urgently need pipelines to carry water, which is the lifeblood of

the country. Although I do not know how many honourable members have had to cart water, I know of some farmers who have had to perform this unenviable task for over 12 months in one stretch. Some farmers are 25 to 30 miles from a standpipe. Water carting is time wasting and most unproductive in every way, and this applies especially during harvest time, when one should be out reaping. In addition, sheep and cattle must drink.

How can a farmer carry on with his reaping and get his wheat into the silos while he is losing valuable time carting water (and this happens frequently)? Then one can be in double trouble: the very day one delivers wheat to the silo in the morning one may miss out, because of the necessity to cart water. Some may say, "This is easy to overcome; buy another truck," but what about the young farmer who is just starting out—who is buying a property, and perhaps has land still to be cleared? He is not in a position to buy another truck especially for water carting.

From my own observations, there is far more water in the Polda and Kappawanta Basins than we are led to believe exists. There appears to be millions of gallons of beautiful fresh water flowing into the sea at Sheringa, and at other places on the West Coast. There are other streams flowing into the small lake which flows into the salt lake (Lake Hamilton). If this fresh water can be harnessed before it reaches the salt lake, it can be used to great advantage. As far as I can gauge, these streams are an overflow from the Kappawanta Basin. The Mines Department could well be asked to investigate these areas thoroughly. Mr. Alf Johnson of Sheringa, who drew my attention to this in the first instance, said that, whilst the Engineering and Water Supply Department was conducting the test regarding Polda Basin, it did not make any difference at all to the flow of water into the sea at Sheringa, opposite his property; nor was there any difference to the flow of the streams into the small lake north of Lake Hamilton (between Sheringa and Mount Hope on the Flinders Highway). I certainly think something could be done with this vast basin of fresh water, which is running to waste when it is so badly needed throughout the whole of Eyre Peninsula. There are a number of places from Sheringa along the coast to Baird Bay where fresh water is running into the sea. I know that the first three places mentioned, if controlled, have a

great potential. I sincerely hope to see a great improvement in the water situation in the electoral district of Eyre as soon as possible.

Early in July I returned to my district, having been away for a month, two weeks of that time being spent in helping with the Millicent by-election, and one week for the opening of Parliament. What a month it has been! Most areas have had 3in. to 5in. of rain for June, and another 2in. for the first week of July. When I left, most roads were in a reasonable condition; many are now quite impassable. It will take thousands of dollars to repair the damage done to these roads during the last few weeks. If more of our main roads were sealed, and more and better floodways and bridges built, as in most other parts of South Australia, not so much damage would be done by flooding. I do not think there would be many, if any, country areas on the Adelaide side of Spencer Gulf where the main roads and highways would be under water for two to three days at a time. Several roads in my electoral district have been built through water courses, and they will be under water for two or three months. There are several places where a council tractor and driver have had to be available to tow motor vehicles through mud and water on main roads. This wastes much time, and is extremely expensive to the taxpayer. School buses have been delayed, and teachers as well as students have been unable to get to school. In the case of serious illness, when one needs medical attention urgently, it makes the going tough, if not very dangerous, to be delayed by roads that are under water or are so boggy and slippery that one cannot get through.

As regards road sealing, the section of the highway from Cowell to Lock has been sealed only as far as Cleve, a mere 27 miles in a stretch of 75 miles of highway. It is high time this section was completed. This highway was formed up ready for sealing as far as Rudall, a distance of 14 miles, five years ago. I have often heard it said, "Look at the money being spent on roads!" Yes; large amounts of money are spent on forming roads, and then letting them go to pieces time and again before they are finally sealed. This is 'taxpayers' money being wasted, with very little final result to show for it.

I am pleased that the Eyre Highway is sealed as far as Ceduna; also, that a start has been made on the Flinders Highway. I was pleased to learn that \$960,000 is to be

allocated for the Flinders Highway. I hope it will seal the road at least to Elliston. Included also is an amount of \$96,000 for the Streaky Bay to Murat Bay section of the Flinders Highway. I presume this is for forming this part of the highway. If the railcar running from Cummins to Kimba and then to Buckleboo is replaced by a road bus service, we shall need much improvement on the route by the railway line where the bus will travel. The road from Kinnaird Tanks, on the Lincoln Highway, through Veran, Rudall, Kielpa, Darke Peak and Caralue to the Eyre Highway will need to be sealed as soon as possible; otherwise, there will be many times when the bus will not get through. This road should be sealed, as it is the nearest link from Kimba to Port Lincoln and serves a wide farming area as a vital link between those two towns. Also, another stretch of highway urgently needing attention is the Eyre Highway from Ceduna to the Western Australian border. This road should be sealed as soon as possible.

I cannot see why the Eyre Highway from Ceduna to the border should not be completed by the Commonwealth Government. This highway carries an enormous amount of interstate traffic, especially large transports, and I believe nothing ruins dirt roads more quickly than big heavy transports travelling over them during wet weather. I suggest that a toll be placed on the stretch of road from Ceduna to the border. Having travelled over this section of terrible road recently, I am sure no-one would mind paying a toll, which would be far less costly than repair bills for all motor vehicles travelling across to Western Australia. These are just a few of the roads in the electoral district of Eyre that need immediate attention to help this vast area of a great producing country. Credit is due to, and I should like to pay a tribute to, the many wonderful people who have pioneered this country and prepared it for a greater future. Their way has been hard, and I am sure that many older residents would have great pleasure in witnessing a big improvement in both water reticulation and roads. I am sure that with good roads we could quickly double our tourist trade.

Coming to electricity, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why the Electricity Trust of South Australia does not go ahead and build the substation four miles west of Cleve. This would give the people of Eyre a chance to have some of the privileges and amenities of the people in the cities and larger towns of South Australia. Why should country residents

always be the last to get these privileges and amenities, which are an accepted way of life for the city dwellers? Farmers and people in the smaller country towns would appreciate, and be very happy to have, a continuous supply of power and light. Recently, the Government Whip and member for Victoria (Mr. Allan Rodda) and I toured part of the electoral district of Eyre. Everywhere we went we were asked the same question—"When will E.T.S.A. power be available?" Questions relating to E.T.S.A. power were asked continually, from Lock to Elliston, up along the West Coast, through Streaky Bay to Ceduna, and then at all the towns we called at down through the centre to Kimba.

The continual problem seems to be to keep nearly worn-out lighting plants going. If there is any hope at all of E.T.S.A. power in the near future, farmers do not want to renew their lighting plants at this stage. Many schools are poorly lit and require adequate lighting and power. Some schools have been asked by the Education Department to use portable gas lights. These are totally inadequate.

We certainly need E.T.S.A. power for the Poldo-Kimba main, and all pipelines that the Poldo scheme will serve.

I am sure that every town on Eyre Peninsula would be only too glad to connect to an E.T.S.A. powerline, so let us have some action soon from the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

Whilst approaching Elliston from Lock, Mr. Rodda remarked on the magnificent view and what a wonderful place Elliston would be for tourists. The same thing happened when we were approaching Venus Bay and Streaky Bay. We have a magnificent coastline, one of the best in the whole of Australia. Many beautiful places could be developed for the tourist trade. Our fishing is excellent. The surfing beaches are perfect, and there are many of them. Mr. Don Jessop said, recently, that nothing at Surfers Paradise could compare with the surf on our West Coast beaches. Elliston, Venus Bay, Streaky Bay and many more places along our West Coast could be developed into wonderful holiday resorts, but the development of these small towns for tourism is retarded by lack of water, roads and power, poor radio reception and practically no television reception. If these amenities were available, the problem of accommodation would solve itself. These places could quickly become wonderful holiday resorts, equal to Victor Harbour or any other summer resort in

Australia. We have the potential for good tourist trade: let us do all we can to foster and develop it. We look forward to a much brighter future for the highways, roads, water reticulation and power for the vast electoral district of Eyre.

At the recent local government conference at Elliston, the promotion officer of the Tourist Bureau (Mr. Edward Correll) said:

A tourist explosion on Eyre Peninsula, geared to improve tourist trade between this State and Western Australia, has been predicted. However, tourism on Eyre Peninsula requires an influx of new services if expansion is to move ahead.

Eyre Peninsula is skirted by 500 miles of rugged coastline which has many natural attractions. I feel sure that local government bodies will develop suitable accommodation for tourists if the amenities of roads, water and power are available. Private enterprise will provide motels, holiday flats, beach houses, etc., if power, running water and access roads are available. The number of tourists for 1965 was 6,800; for 1966, 10,700; and for 1967, 13,100; that is evidence that tourism is rapidly increasing. Mr. Correll foresaw tourists motoring along the Eyre Highway and returning by the Flinders Highway. Therefore, the encouragement of tourism is a must for Eyre Peninsula.

Mr. Speaker, why can we not go ahead and build the proposed bridge at Port Augusta under the same principle as that used in the Eastern States? We should build the bridge, charge a toll for the use of it until it is paid for, and then remove the toll. I am told by members of the Carriers' Association of Eyre Peninsula that they would gladly pay a \$1 toll rather than have the long haul around Yorkey Crossing on every trip. I am sure the transport companies and the insurance companies would approve of this, if only from the points of view of driver fatigue and maintenance costs. The better and safer the highways and bridges, the less driver fatigue and therefore the fewer accidents and claims therefrom.

If any member does not think that this extra 18 miles is worth making a fuss about, I invite him to try driving over this particular stretch of road after an inch of rain. Members would not take their cars over it. I know that some work has been done on this project. I trust that those responsible will have a look at the possibility of doing something along the lines I have suggested, and will come up with a workable answer on this urgently needed new bridge at Port Augusta.

The bridge is needed just as urgently as the improvement of the highways of Eyre Peninsula to help in the great expansion programme of the district. The east side of the old bridge at Port Augusta has been strengthened to take the weight of the Morgan-Whyalla main. Could the west side of the bridge be strengthened immediately to enable heavy vehicles to cross? At present, all trucks of 20 tons gross weight and over have to detour around Yorkey Crossing, a distance of 18 miles. It is an arduous detour, which adds considerably to the freight on goods carried. This applies to all goods including food, farm machinery and all consumer goods. Thus another freight burden is imposed on the people of my district. Road tax must also be paid on these extra miles. Yorkey Crossing is narrow and very dangerous in wet weather; heavy vehicles are often bogged down for days at a time. Transport drivers would gladly pay a \$1 toll to be able to cross the bridge.

Owing to the great distances from main centres and outlets, freight is a very real burden that must be carried by the people of Eyre Peninsula as a whole, and particularly by people living in the Eyre District. We carry the extra burden of freight both inwards and outwards. Farmers pay thousands of dollars annually to get their grain to the outlets, as well as having previously paid for carting the same grain over very bad roads to the silos. Railway services in the Eyre District still require much work to be done on them if they are to keep up with the vast expansion programme that is taking place everywhere one looks. At present, railway services are the most economical when used for long hauls of grain and superphosphate.

Until such time as our highways and roads are sealed, road tax is an unfair burden on our people. Many trucks are seldom driven on bitumen roads. The bulk of the wheat and other grain carted from farm to silo in Eyre is carted over rough, often just dirt, roads (some are only tracks). It is a very costly business to keep our vehicles on the road at present. A vehicle that has travelled 40,000 miles on these roads is in a much worse condition than a vehicle having done 100,000 miles on sealed roads. No farmer or any other person in these areas can afford to be without a roadworthy car and truck. Therefore, we have to replace our vehicles much more often. Would not a fuel tax of, say, 2c a gallon be a fairer way of imposing a tax? It would have to be paid by everyone using the roads.

Surely some arrangement could be made with the Commonwealth Government to collect a tax of this nature. It now has the machinery set up for a tax of this nature: it has the monthly record of the amount of fuel sold by each company. Would it be very difficult to pay back to each State every month the amount that 2c a gallon would bring in? Filling out road tax forms during harvest, when one is flat out to get the grain in, can be a real nuisance. Trucks are used for water carting and various other jobs that have to be done around a farm. Under these conditions it is difficult to keep accurate records for road tax purposes. I believe that a petrol tax would be a much fairer way all round for everyone concerned. Several groups of farmers have asked me to push for a fuel tax and the abolition of the road tax.

I trust that the Government is going to come up with a stable answer on the question of land tenure. No responsible person who has had anything to do with the clearing of new land would impose such ridiculously high rents on new Crown leases. How can a young man make a success of his new block when he is crippled, right from the start, with impossible rents. Some of the rents on new leases near Cowell and Lock are as high as \$1,000 on 2,500-acre blocks of land. In one case at Cowell, the rent is \$900 for a block of 3,000 acres, of which the owner would be lucky to have 2,000 arable, 500 of the remainder being scarcely suitable for grazing.

In many areas on Eyre Peninsula it would be difficult to make a living with only 4,000 acres of land. I know of several cases of parcels of miscellaneous lease land of 9,000 to 11,000 acres where a person would be lucky to get 2,500 acres of arable land. The owners desire to have these blocks made over to perpetual lease, but they have been told that they cannot do this, because they have more than 4,000 acres. The way in which the Labor Government wanted to split these blocks would have meant that no-one would be able to make a decent living from them; it would be extremely hard to do so with the new high rentals.

There are many farms in the 11in. rainfall areas where it would be impossible to make a living on a 4,000-acre block. Farmers would need between 8,000 acres and 10,000 acres to make their farms a paying proposition. The day of the small farmer is fast coming to an end. He is being forced off the land by the

high purchase price of land, by high rentals for Crown lease lands, or by the high cost of production.

There are other farmers in the northern part of the Eyre District, west of Minnipa, who have had permission from the Land Board to clear miscellaneous lease lands. They had this permission, with the understanding that they could convert these blocks to perpetual lease. When they were ready to convert to perpetual lease they were told that they could not do so, because they would have had more than 4,000 acres. These farmers have gone out into rough country, bought expensive clearing equipment, built their own roads, and cleared these blocks. Now, they are being told that they cannot keep this land.

It is no fun clearing land at any time, without being told that, after the farmer has cleared it, he cannot keep it. Would you, Mr. Speaker, clear land just to let it go back to the Crown, because you could not sell it in a given time at a price that would cover the cost of clearing? I am sure that you would not. I know of farmers who are employing three or four share-farmers, all married men with families. These men have very little hope of buying their own farms for quite a few years. They are very happy to share-farm with a farmer who is giving them a good deal. Very often, this method of working is a lead to these share-farmers' owning their own land eventually.

There are hundreds of thousands of acres of good land, still to be cleared, on Eyre Peninsula. Most of it will be reasonably good country when brought into production. It is certainly non-productive in its present state, and therefore this land is not bringing in any revenue for the Government. Eyre Peninsula will very soon be the most productive cereal growing area of South Australia. At present, Eyre Peninsula is producing half the State's wheat, barley, and oats.

There is an urgent need, for another deep sea port on Eyre Peninsula. I was hoping that we would have had the findings of the commission investigating the deep sea port before this time. We have not received this report yet. If we can get another deep sea port, we are assured of another superphosphate works on Eyre Peninsula. This will help to keep up with the production needs of our vast expansion programme. I am quite sure that we can double our present production figures within 10 years.

There is plenty of room for expansion. Everywhere one looks there is clearing going on. By the use of better clovers and the greater use of fertilizers, the older land is rapidly increasing in productivity. Sheep and cattle numbers are increasing every year. As I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, lack of water reticulation, electricity, and roads is definitely holding back progress.

If, for instance, we had a deep sea port at Arno Bay, the farmers from the Buckleboo to Wharminda, and intervening districts, and from the districts around Lock would be saved up to \$500,000 a year in freight alone, in a normal year. Also, there would be a much faster turn-round at harvest time. There would be less overtime, less over-taxing for our railways, and a quicker turn-round at other terminals also. A deep sea port closer to where the grain is produced would mean less road and rail maintenance than is necessary when all this produce is taken to the Port Lincoln and Thevenard terminals.

One of the Opposition members was heard to say that the city is dependent on the country and the country is dependent on the city. Sir, this is very true. Neither city nor country can progress without dependence one on the other. I sincerely trust that all members will never forget this most important fact. Unity between country and city is essential, because one cannot get along without the other. Let us all remember that. United we stand, divided we fall. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): There are a few things I should like to say in this debate. We have had only one speaker from the other side, as far as I know. The Leader of the Opposition has been the only spokesman, I think, of any significance for the other side of politics so far. I know it is not unusual nowadays for him to arrogate to himself all the publicity for the Labor Party. We used to be accused, when the previous Government was in office, of being under a dictatorship, but, of course, the Labor Party is far more a one-man band than has ever been the case on this side of politics; the Labor Party has no choice, apparently, because there is no-one to follow the Leader of the Opposition in this debate, as we have seen.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: You will provoke them soon.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not think I shall; they have obviously been given instructions to keep quiet. There is another matter of some significance: what about their lack-lustre showing today, when we know the Leader of the Opposition is unfortunately well below par in health? We have had nothing at all from the Opposition, and the reason is clear: when the Leader is not here they cannot even try to do anything at all. In speaking for the Opposition in this debate, the Leader of the Opposition saw fit to reflect on a number of the actions that had been taken by members of this Government since it took office, and to reflect generally upon our record during what he was pleased to call the first 100 days in office.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: What about the Labor Government's last 100 days in office?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think the less said about that the better, judging from the mountain of work that was waiting for me in the Attorney-General's Department when I arrived there. I do not think the Labor Government did very much at all during the last few weeks it was in office. If the Leader of the Opposition sees fit, as he did on this occasion, to take Ministers to task individually, then he must expect that we shall exercise our right to reply to what he has said. I propose to reply to a number of the matters he raised in the debate. One of the first that he mentioned was the question of electoral reform. This is what he says:

The thing uppermost in people's minds in South Australia, as we have reiterated in this House on every day it has met, has been the electoral situation in this State.

He goes on to canvass that, and proceeds:

The present Premier has excused his lack of action in this matter, his refusal to meet us to discuss the matter, to get around the table, to get down to debating something effective—

Then he was interrupted and did not acutally ever come back to that train of thought. He went on, after the Deputy Speaker had pulled him up:

I have always been willing to discuss any Bill with anyone.

I may say that that strikes me as being strange, in view of the protestations of the honourable gentleman over the electoral Bill prepared for the last Government before it went out of office. He has presented a frenzied fury about my having read the Bill, yet said last week, "I have always been willing to discuss any Bill with anyone."

Mr. Casey: That's quite true.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is so contradictory of his attitude to me.

Mr. Clark: No, he just objected to the snide way you did it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I did not do it in a snide way at all: I did it properly. The honourable member did not listen to my Ministerial statement today.

Mr. Clark: I didn't agree with it at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is only one member making the speech, and that is the Attorney-General.

Mr. Casey: It's not a very good one.

The SPEAKER: That is a matter of opinion.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Frome has been a Minister, and he knows how departments work. He had three weeks in which to get to know the ropes and that should have been long enough for him, because he would be the first to tell us that he learned quickly. The point I desire to make, in quoting from the Leader's speech, is that the present Premier has excused what the Leader was pleased to term his lack of action in this matter. Sir, lack of action in three months? How long was the Labor Party in office, failing to take action on this matter? What are the facts? It is about time someone put them again in this House and to the public of South Australia.

The Labor Party Government came into office in March, 1965. It introduced a Bill on constitutional matters, of which the question of redistribution was only one of three, on July 1, some months after coming into office. The debate on that Bill took place not until January, 1966. I have in my hand a copy of the speech that I made on January 26, 1966. The Labor Government introduced a Bill at the beginning of July and it was the end of the next January, six months later, before the debate took place in this House. As I have said, that Bill contained a provision for redistribution of House of Assembly districts to provide for 56 members in this House. The Bill contained two other provisions, one being to resolve deadlocks between the two Houses and the other dealing with the franchise of the Legislative Council.

Sir, it is not surprising that that Bill passed here with a constitutional majority, because the Leader's predecessor as Leader of the Labor Party was able to gain, at the 1965 election, a constitutional majority in this



House. However, it is also not at all surprising that a Bill, which was so objectionable in form and which would have led, in 12 months, to the introduction of a measure for the abolition of the Legislative Council, was rejected in the Legislative Council.

Mr. Virgo: What nonsense!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Edwardstown says "What nonsense!" I do not know whether he was the author of that Bill or whether he had any influence on it at the time, but every member of this House knows that the deadlock provisions of that Bill were such that, had they been passed by Parliament, a Bill would have been introduced 12 months later to abolish the Legislative Council, and the Legislative Council could not have resisted it.

Mr. Casey: What a pity!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Members opposite may laugh. Are they denying that was the fact? It is in line with their policy. Why should they not put it in their Bill?

Mr. Rodda: Have they a policy?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: They have a policy, about which I will speak later.

Mr. McKee: They should have retired to the old gentlemen's rest home.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Port Pirie is entitled to his opinion. The point I make now is that the Labor Party could not reasonably expect that the Legislative Council would accept a Bill that contained such a provision.

Mr. Clark: Are you suggesting that we should have tailored it to suit the Council?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Perhaps I will persuade the member for Gawler to follow me in this debate. He usually does follow me. That Bill was defeated. If the then Government had really wanted electoral reform in South Australia, it would have, in either of the two succeeding sessions, introduced a Bill dealing only with redistribution of Assembly districts, omitting any reference to the Legislative Council, because only such a Bill would have had a hope of passing in the Legislative Council. However, what did we have from the Labor Government? Not another word was said about electoral redistribution of the House of Assembly districts during its last two years of office. During two-thirds of its term of office we had not another word in this House about it.

I challenged the Leader about this before, and what lame duck excuse has he given! All he can say is, "To work the deadlock provisions in the Constitution, we could not possibly introduce another Bill. We had to wait until after another election to introduce it again so that we could work the deadlock provisions." What absolute tosh! The Leader knows that that is quite inaccurate and wrong. He knows that the deadlock provisions have never been applied in South Australia. We do not know how they would work. That is the first point. The second is this: which was more important to him from 1965, or the beginning of 1966, until March 1968, waiting to see whether he would have a chance to work the deadlock provisions of the Constitution, or getting electoral redistribution for the House of Assembly districts?

Apparently, working the deadlock provisions was, to him, the more important matter. What an absurd excuse, but even that excuse does not hold water. I have located the place—it is section 41 of the Constitution. I have used my 1968 memory jogger, which was given to me by my opponent in the election. It was a useful purpose for which to give it to me. What do we find when we look at section 41 (1) of the Constitution Act? These are the deadlock provisions. I will read them, because when one does that one sees that the excuse that the Leader has put up is not an excuse for his inaction at all. The provisions are as follows:

Whenever—

- (a) any Bill has been passed by the House of Assembly during any session of Parliament;

That was the case with the Labor Government's Constitution Bill.

Mr. McKee: It's painful.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I know it is painful. I can see that the honourable member is disturbed by every word. This is the hardest thing he has had to do all day. The provisions continue:

- (b) the same Bill or a similar Bill with substantially the same objects and having the same title has been passed by the House of Assembly during the next ensuing Parliament;

If Labor had won the last election this could have been done, too. The provisions continue:

- (c) a general election of the House of Assembly has taken place between the two Parliaments;

That is fair enough. The next provision is as follows:

- (d) the second and third readings of the Bill were passed in the second instance by an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House of Assembly;

Had Labor won the election it could have done that. The next provision is as follows:

- (e) both such Bills have been rejected by the Legislative Council or failed to become law . . .

None of these five conditions would have precluded the Labor Party from introducing the Bill restricted only to electoral redistribution for the House of Assembly. If that Bill had gone through we would have had the last election fought on new boundaries, but the Bill was not introduced. Nothing was done during the 1966 or the 1967 sessions of Parliament.

Mr. Virgo: What makes you think that the Legislative Council would not pass it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If the Legislative Council had passed it we would have had the electoral redistribution which we are now all seeking. If the Legislative Council had not passed it, that would not have jeopardized the Labor Party's chances of reintroducing its original Bill.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: They could have still done it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, to work the deadlock provisions if they had won, and we would not be worse off if it had not been passed. If it had passed we would have had electoral redistribution, but the Labor Party made no attempt to redistribute the electorates in this State after the initial attempt in which the Bill was so bound by other matters that it had no hope of passing through Parliament. Why was this not done?

Mr. Riches: I think you said you would not support it no matter what provisions were in the Bill.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not think so. Perhaps the honourable member could check that, because I do not remember having said that. Why did we have no attempt to introduce electoral redistribution in 1966 and 1967? Obviously, the Labor Party thought that it would win the election due in March, 1968, on the present boundaries.

Mr. Virgo: We did, too.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member says his Party did, but it did not do what had been done by the late Hon. Frank Walsh in 1965—win a

majority of seats in this House. The Labor Party thought it was going to, or it would have pursued electoral redistribution. The sad fact for the present Leader of the Opposition is that in nine months he destroyed the work that had taken the late Hon. Frank Walsh 9½ years to do, that is, to gain a majority for his Party in this House.

Mr. Casey: Rubbish!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Does the honourable member deny that under the late Hon. Frank Walsh the Labor Party won a majority of seats in this House in 1965?

Mr. Casey: I don't deny that, but—

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Does the honourable member deny that at the election in March, 1968, the Labor Party lost two seats and nearly lost a third? Of course he does not deny it. The present Leader of the Opposition did not repeat the performance of his predecessor in March 1965, and members opposite can turn that fact any way they like, but they cannot get away from it. The Leader of the Opposition, in his over-weening self-confidence, hoped that he would win the election in March this year on the old boundaries and, therefore, he said nothing about electoral redistribution, and no attempt was made to introduce it in the last two sessions of Parliament. However, since then we have had an agony from him, a pouring out of propaganda on this matter. Why? Nothing has changed: the system is still the same as that on which he was content to go to the people in 1968.

Mr. Virgo: It is still as rotten as it ever was.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Then why was something not done by the honourable member's Party in 1966 or 1967? I should like that question answered. I have given a reason why nothing was done. Since March 2 the electoral system has been attacked by the Labor Party, but it did not bother to change it because it thought it would win on the same boundaries. However, let us consider other aspects. We are now told that at the June conference of the Labor Party in 1967 the Party was specifically given authority to compromise on this matter.

Mr. Virgo: Have you got the new book now?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. The member for Frome was to give me one but he has not done so, and I bought one this morning. The Labor Party now states that it was given authority in June, 1967, not to bring in the same Bill but to compromise

with us. Why then did that Party say nothing from June, 1967, to March, 1968, about the authority it had to compromise? Having looked at the rule, I questioned that Party's constitutional position in this matter but; when I did, a letter appeared in the *Advertiser* (the newspaper about which the Labor Party so often complains of not getting anything in) of April 4 this year signed by several quite prominent members of the Labor Party: C. J. Hurford, who is usually a Labor candidate at elections; J. P. Miles (I don't know him); H. D. M. Combe, who was at that time a public relations officer to the then Premier; J. D. Richards, who was also in the Premier's office; and J. B. Waters and J. D. Wright, no doubt members of the Labor Party.

Mr. Virgo: Who said they are?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Does the honourable member deny that? I wonder what internecine strife that implies! The fact is that in 1967 the A.L.P. expressly authorized the Government to move for or accept any reasonable compromise on electoral reform that substantially agreed with the principle of one vote one value. Yet no-one knew of that authority until after the election. The Leader of the Opposition now says, "What about having private discussions with us on this matter?" Why did he not come to us when we were in Opposition, knowing that he had the authority and, in sufficient time before the election to be able to do something about it, say, "We want a compromise"? The answer is that he thought he was going to win and that it was not necessary to compromise at that time. It was afterwards that he thought of this, and that is why we have had a flood of recrimination, propaganda, and denigration against the State of South Australia in every State to which the Leader of the Opposition has gone since the election.

Mr. Burdon: You have done it for the last three years.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: How a man can be so disloyal to his State as to do what the Leader of the Opposition has done since the election, I do not know.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. RICHES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that the statement that a member of this House has been disloyal to his State is objectionable, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Stuart has raised the point that the reference the honourable Attorney-General made

to the Leader of the Opposition's being disloyal to this State should be withdrawn. I ask the Attorney-General whether he is prepared to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, of course. I did not want to get heated in this debate, but I was beginning to get heated at the thought of it, and I certainly withdraw my remark at the request of my friend, the member for Stuart, who is the only Labor member in this House who has had a decent thing to say about me since I became a Minister. I certainly withdraw it at his request, and I regret it if it caused him any offence. Now that the heat has gone out of this, I will return to the point I was making. I had canvassed the fact that apparently the Labor Party was given authority to compromise but that this authority was kept secret from the public and from the then Opposition for about nine months.

Mr. Burdon: Don't you read the newspapers?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I did not find it in the press. However, what I have read is the 1967 Rule Book of the A.L.P. and there is no hint whatever in that publication of any deviation from the policy of the Labor Party that is printed there. This book sets out the policy of the Labor Party in June, 1967, on electoral matters, and there is no qualification to it. Mr. G. T. Virgo was the Secretary at the time, and no doubt it was his responsibility to draw this up; and we have not had any explanation from him as to why a hint of the compromise was omitted. My friends in the Labor Party told me (privately, of course) that it was a mistake, and I am prepared to accept that. I can only look at the document as it deals with the constitutional and electoral plank of the Labor Party at that time, and this is what I see:

1. Ultimate abolition of the Legislative Council. Pending the abolition of the Legislative Council, provision for adult franchise for this House and the limitation of its power to delay legislation insisted on by the House of Assembly to 12 months.

Well, that is the Upper House. It goes on:

2. The establishment of an independent Electoral Boundaries Commission to provide for:

- (a) A House of Assembly of 56 members representing single electorates elected with a simple majority by the cross system of voting;

That is something that the Labor Party has never exercised, although it is there in its policy; it does not believe in preferential voting. It goes on to say:

- (b) Electorates to be divided to provide for approximately equal voting strength on the principle of one vote one value, subject to a margin of 15 per cent over or under the average. In the remote areas of the State a wider margin to be allowed in order to provide effective representation where communications are extremely difficult and the area is sparsely settled;
- (c) Periodical redivision of electorates to provide for movement of population.

That was exactly in line with the 1965-66 Bill, and that is all we knew about the Labor Party's policy until after the election; and the then Premier in his policy speech did not do anything but refer to the earlier Bill and say that it would be re-introduced. Why was the authority to compromise kept secret? It was kept secret because the Labor Party thought it would win the election. But it does make utterly hypocritical all we have heard since from the Labor Party about the electoral system of this State, when it did nothing about it for the last two years it was in office.

Let us bring this matter up to date. As I said, I have now obtained a copy of the latest Platform of the A.L.P., and I find that it is significantly different from the earlier one. I think it is the first time this matter has been aired in this House, and it is about time people knew where the Labor Party stood, for this recent booklet sets out the position fully and accurately whereas the last edition, we now find, did not. On page 38, under "Constitutional and Electoral", this is how it has been redrafted, and this is what the Labor Party now wants to do:

1. The ultimate aim of a Labor Government should be an electoral system which to the greatest extent possible—

it has put in a bit of flexibility here—  
recognizes:

- (a) that as each citizen should be equal in the sight of the law so each citizen should have a vote of equal value to the vote of each other citizen in electing the legislators who make that law; and
- (b) that a second Parliamentary Chamber in South Australia is unnecessary and wasteful of public funds.

Well, we know there was some considerable debate on that matter at the conference. It goes on to say:

The immediate aim should be that the Legislative Council should be abolished after a favourable vote of citizens at an election at which abolition is an issue.

How on earth the Labor Party knows what the issues at elections are, I do not know. It is always a matter of opinion as to what are the issues on which people vote. However, I do believe there is the germ of a good idea here: I believe a referendum is the way in which this matter should be tackled, and perhaps the Labor Party will come to that in due course. It goes on to say:

Meanwhile, the Council should be reformed by: (a) altering its powers to conform with those of the United Kingdom's House of Lords; (b) providing adult franchise in the voting for this House; and (c) boundaries for the Legislative Council allocated on the basis of one vote one value.

That is the Legislative Council. It goes on:

2. The establishment of an independent Electoral Boundaries Commission to provide for:

- (a) A House of Assembly of 48 members representing single electorates based on a ratio of four (4) State Electorates for each of the 12 Federal Divisions, elected with a simple majority by the cross system of voting;

Apparently, this is already out of date, because the Leader said only last week that the Commonwealth redistribution had not quite panned out as he had expected and therefore this would have to be abandoned. The booklet goes on to say:

- (b) Electorates to be divided to provide for approximately equal voting strength on the principle of one vote one value, subject to a margin of 15 per cent over or under the average. In the remote areas of the State a wider margin to be allowed in order to provide effective representation where communications are extremely difficult and the area is sparsely settled;
- (c) Periodical re-division of electorates to provide for movement of population.

That is its policy now.

Mr. Virgo: Read us yours now, or haven't you got one?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Premier made an announcement last Thursday. I ask the member for Edwardstown to contain himself in patience; he will hear not only our policy but the contents of the Bill.

Mr. Hudson: Is it coming on today?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg is now in his fourth session, and if he does not understand the procedures of the House by now he will no doubt learn in due course.

Mr. Hudson: Why are you wasting time?

Mr. Langley: And you are.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Apparently members opposite—

Mr. Hudson: There is more garbage in *Hansard* now—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg can make his speech later.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If he is allowed to.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Apparently members of the Opposition are content to put their Leader up to speak for them all and to attack other Ministers but we on this side are not supposed to reply. That is the only conclusion I can draw from the barrage of interjections I have just had. They can give it, but they cannot take it.

Mr. Langley: You did not speak very often when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier.

Mr. Hudson: We want to bring on electoral reform; you want to talk about it without bringing it on.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No jolly fear: we want to bring it on too. However, I am not prepared to sit here and allow the Leader of the Opposition to speak as he did without it being answered. I think I have shown the bad faith of the Opposition in this matter.

I now want to say something about the detailed criticisms the Leader levelled at me in his speech. Other Ministers will be able to speak for themselves. I do not know whether his criticisms of other Ministers were as unfair and inaccurate as the criticisms he made of me in my three months in office, but I shall be listening with interest to see whether they are. What did he say first of all in his speech? He referred to the 100 days of Government; he said what a tremendous amount his Party had done in its first 100 days, and then he said:

If we examine what has been announced or undertaken by the present Government both in legislation and administration during its first 100 days of its being in office, we can only say that the opinion amongst members of the public is that this Government is lacking in both lustre and credibility: the scene is dull and barren.

Of course, the Leader spoke before the announcement made by the Premier in the House this afternoon of the decision of the present Government to introduce fluoridation. We have been in office for a little over three months and we have come to a conclusion.

The last Government was in office for a little over three years, and it did nothing whatever about this matter, which has been a matter of public interest for a long time.

Mr. Langley: You did nothing when you were in Government—32 years!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Let us stick to fluoridation. The former Premier cannot deny that he knew about this and that he had his own convictions on it, because in 1964 (the year before he came into office) I had the honour to preside over a Select Committee of members of this House to inquire into fluoridation, and the present Leader of the Opposition was one of the members of that committee. He and I and the present Minister of Education were the majority in favour of fluoridation, and on every point during the proceedings of that Select Committee the member for Norwood (as he then was) supported the majority in favour of fluoridation. Let us see some of the paragraphs contained in the committee's report.

Mr. Clark: Who was in Government at the time?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We were; but let us look at some of the paragraphs on which a vote was taken and which the Leader then supported. They are as follows:

Your committee believes that fluoride should be used as an aid to reduce dental caries and thus to improve dental health.

The committee believes that, because the costs of fluoridation are so low, the fact that perhaps less than 1 per cent of the water so treated would actually be drunk is of no significance.

It is desirable to add fluoride to water supplies of this State.

The former Premier declared himself on those matters in 1964, yet when he was in office for three years, successively as Attorney-General, Minister of Social Welfare and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, and then as head of the Government, nothing at all was done in this matter by the Labor Party. However, members opposite have the gall to say we have had a barren 100 days. They knew the score, yet they did not do anything at all. Their Leader had declared himself in this matter before he came into office, and he did nothing about it, yet now it has been left to an L.C.L. Government to make a decision on this important matter for South Australia. Let us be a little more careful when we say that the first 100 days of this Government has been dull and barren and lacking in decisions.

The Leader said not one word about the fact that the Premier had been overseas for three weeks of the nine or 10 weeks he had been in office, promoting the interests of this State. Of course, that would not occur to the Leader of the Opposition, because it was not one of those things he was pleased to do during his nine months in office. He did not offer to go overseas to sell his State, yet it was one of the first actions of the present Premier, and it was one of the first decisions of the new Government that the Premier should go overseas in the interests of the economic development of this State. We know (and the previous Government should have known) that there is no substitute whatever for a personal approach by the head of a Government. The Leader did not even make a grudging acknowledgment of the fact that the Premier had been overseas on a strenuous tour for three weeks to promote our interests in the United Kingdom and the United States. We know the Leader is not given to compliments, certainly not regarding his political opponents. Let us come now to some of the things he said about me. He said:

I turn now to the Attorney-General—

Well, that is I. This is what he went on to say about consumer credit:

For instance, we—

that is, his Government—

had a long-term research in depth in the credit sales area which we had undertaken at the request of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, and which was being undertaken by the research officers in the Attorney-General's Department, together with a research team at the Adelaide University.

He went on to say his Party had assembled material, and so on, and he then said the material was being processed "to come up with a revolutionary proposal about basic credit sales legislation in Australia". First, the report has not yet been published, so how he knows what the "revolutionary proposal" is, I do not know. By chance, I received a letter from Professor Rogerson, the Dean of the Faculty of Law (and the man in charge of this project), dated July 16, in which he refers to earlier correspondence in the matter. I had that correspondence dug out of the file. I do not know whether members opposite will say I was not entitled to look back through the files to get the letter (they have done it before when I have found out what my predecessor did); but, anyway, I have done it, and I will take the chance of their strictures. The following is a letter dated February 23, 1966, and addressed to my predecessor:

Dear Mr. Attorney, Thank you for your letter of February 18, 1966. We are much honoured that the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General should have wished to entrust this Law School—

not the Government of South Australia—with the task of undertaking an investigation into the law relating to money lending, credit sales and cognate transactions. This is a matter which is of great interest to some of us, and we will be delighted to undertake the task.

The request comes not through the Government but through the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. The letter continues:

As you say in your letter of February 18, 1966, the task is an immense one and if it is to be thoroughly done it would severely strain, or be too much for, this Law School's rather limited resources.

I hope the member for Glenelg, who is an academic when he is not a member of Parliament, will take particular notice of the following:

I wonder therefore if it would be possible for the Standing Committee to set aside some funds for the obtaining of necessary material and, if possible, for employing a temporary research assistant. We feel that we should draw as much as possible on the experience in these fields of other common law jurisdictions, particularly in Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, and there might be a good deal of material to be sifted.

He then goes on to discuss the control of any funds, and concludes:

We look forward to discussing the matter with you again as soon as it is convenient to you.

That financial assistance was never given. In his letter to me of July 16 (a letter which I received a few days before the Leader made his attack on me in the House last week), Professor Rogerson said:

When I and my colleagues of this Law School agreed to the suggestion of the Standing Committee that we undertake this work, I put to the then Attorney-General of South Australia, Mr. Dunstan, written requests for financial support in respect of research assistance and books, which were then our immediate needs. We were not in fact given any money for a research assistant but Mr. Dunstan was instrumental in securing for us a certain amount of documentary material.

I understand that documentary material was obtained by a solicitor on the staff of the Attorney-General's Department (Mr. Kenneison). The letter continues:

At the time he also undertook, verbally, to provide such copying and typing facilities as were necessary. Until recently, however, we have been able to manage by using the services of the secretaries of the Law School.

Our work has now reached the stage, however, when it is no longer possible to do this. I estimate that we will need the services of an efficient typist for three days each week during the next four or five months, but I should like to reserve "liberty to apply" if more is necessary.

Then he goes on to say that this is a matter of urgency and that, unless aid is forthcoming, they will be unable to get on with the report. Before the Leader had made his criticisms of me last week on this matter, I had sent the docket with this letter to the Public Service Board asking that arrangements be made for this assistance to be given; yet the Leader of the Opposition had the gall to imply that this project had been abandoned. He lauded himself for what he and his Government had done (of course, they did not give any help financially when asked), and implied that we were doing nothing about it when, in fact, we were complying with the only request we had had from Professor Rogerson in this field. I discussed this matter with him, telling him I would quote his letter, and he was happy that I should do so. I do not know whether in every other case the criticisms of the Leader are as hollow and dishonest as this one, for it certainly is hollow and dishonest. Having dealt with his reference to consumer credit, I will now deal with the following point he made:

In addition, we had undertaken the complete overhaul of the criminal law, both substantive and procedural, a project which was enthusiastically welcomed by the Law Society in South Australia as being long overdue.

True, the previous Government set up a criminal law reform committee, but the sad fact is that that committee, consisting of His Honour Mr. Justice Hogarth, Mr. Len King, Q.C. (who was nominated by the Law Society), and Mr. Kenneison from the Attorney-General's Department, was given no specific terms of reference at all on which to work. The only bit of writing I can find in my department on this matter is the letter that the former Attorney-General wrote on June 19, 1967, to the Law Society asking it to nominate a representative; the following was all that was said:

The purpose of the committee will be completely to revise the provisions of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the provisions of the Justices Act and Penal Statutes, so that the law on offences more nearly accords with the views currently held in the community that ancient and useless provisions are removed, and that the Supreme Court will deal

with the matters regarded by the community as serious and the Courts of Summary Jurisdiction with those which the community considers minor.

That is the only thing in writing that I can find at all. How on earth did the former Attorney-General expect that a committee could work on that, and that is the letter to the Law Society, not to members of the committee. I do not know whether Mr. Justice Hogarth, who was nominated as Chairman of the committee, ever saw it or was ever given anything in writing at all to direct him in his task. All I can say is that my predecessor may have intended to do something but that he failed lamentably in putting those intentions into action.

In fact, what has happened is that the criminal law reform committee (so called) has done enormous work at large and *in vacuo* not knowing what it should be doing or what have been its terms of reference; it has never been given any terms of reference. Within the next few weeks, I hope to be able to make an announcement on the whole question of law reform in South Australia that will put it on a satisfactory basis.

Mr. Hudson: Are you going to limit the investigations?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, I will make certain that those matters to be investigated are defined, as they must be if any proper investigation is to take place.

Mr. Hudson: What matters will you have investigated?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have already said that I intend to make an announcement on this whole matter in due course, and I hope the member for Glenelg will contain himself until then. The Leader of the Opposition then referred to my work as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, saying:

I want to know what the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs has done about improving the amount of reserve land available to the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

I shall be happy to tell him. One of the first things I did on coming into office was to make myself acquainted with members of the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

Mr. Hudson: You left out a few things in that quotation.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Does the honourable member wish me to go through them all?

Mr. Hudson: That is up to you.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: A little time ago the member for Glenelg complained that I was wasting time; now he apparently wants me to go through the lot. Perhaps he will allow me to make my speech and he can make a speech later, if he is allowed to do so. One of my first actions on assuming office was to meet the members of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, which I did a few months ago. I had the pleasure of meeting them again last Saturday at Block K near Point McLeay where I discussed this very matter with them. I went through with them (and the Director of Aboriginal Affairs was there) the various reserves in this State, and we discussed each one of them, discussing whether the time was right for a transfer to be made. Perhaps the Leader would be interested to know that I have now a request in writing from the trust for a transfer of several reserves; that request is now being considered. Therefore, let him not think, because I have not rushed into print on the matter, that nothing is being done. I am moving as fast in it as I think (and as others think) is prudent.

I now wish to deal with an even more wounding criticism which the Leader made of me: he said I had thrown the staff about in the department. He said, "The Attorney-General moved people about the very day he went into office." I know this will be of great interest to the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), who has been listening attentively to me. What was the position I found when I came into office? For some reason best known to himself (I have not been able to discover the reason), my predecessor set up a sort of second Crown law office as a direct off-shoot of the Attorney-General's Department. We have as the senior legal professional adviser to the Attorney-General the Crown Solicitor. As I say, he is the legal adviser to the Government and he represents the Government and Government departments on instructions from the Attorney-General. Under the Crown Solicitor is set up an organization of professional officers to give the maximum efficiency to this service. So far as I know we have had a Crown Solicitor for many years—certainly since way back into the last century. I believe that it is in that department that the legal professional advice for the Government should be found and that the Government's legal business should be conducted from there.

However, what did my predecessor do? For reasons which I know and which are well known to him he was not content with this.

He decided that he would have his own little kingdom, not in the Crown Solicitor's Department but in the Attorney-General's Department. He put on the staff of the Attorney-General's Department, directly under him, a solicitor and then another solicitor. By the time I got there, there were two solicitors and an articled clerk directly responsible to the Secretary of the Attorney-General's Department. This seemed to me to be a crazy organization, because I believed that all legal professional assistance for the Crown should be under the Crown Solicitor. What I have done has been done in the interests of efficiency, and I shall go on in a moment and say that it has also been done in the interests of the training of that articled clerk. I have transferred those officers to the place where they belong, the Crown Solicitor's Department, because I believe it is the proper and efficient way to carry out the legal business of the Government.

Mr. Hudson: Are they doing the same kind of work?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am glad the honourable member has come to that, because I shall be able to give him an assurance that they are doing the same kind of work, and they are doing it more efficiently than they were doing it before. What is the position? The officers concerned are Messrs. Kenneison, Liddy and Jennings. I have discussed this matter with the Crown Solicitor since the criticisms were made by the Leader of the Opposition. Incidentally, since we came to office we have appointed a new Crown Solicitor; I think it would not have been inappropriate for the Leader to have made some acknowledgment of the services of the former Crown Solicitor, Mr. Kearnan, and to have made some reference to the appointment of Mr. Wells as Crown Solicitor. He did not see fit to mention the matter, but that was one of the early actions of the new Government, something that escaped his attention. I have discussed the matter of staffing with Mr. Wells, and he has given me a minute about it. This is what he says about Mr. Kenneison:

Since Mr. Kenneison's transfer to the Crown Law Department, the duties allocated to him have been as follows:

1. To carry out his allotted work (where practicable) from an office in the Crown Prosecutor's section where his immediate administrative superior is Mr. Scarfe, Q.C.—



and, of course, Mr. Kenneison, being engaged on prosecuting duties, should logically be under the administrative control of the Crown Prosecutor: that is what he is there for. The report continues:

2. To conclude the preparation and presentation of those cases that he was working on when transferred:—

does that satisfy the member for Glenelg?—

3. To prepare, for the consideration of the Crown Solicitor, draft opinions on any company matters assigned to him;
4. To conduct prosecutions for offences under the Companies Act and associated legislation;
5. To deal with such other general matters as may be assigned to him.

I think that this sets out in fair detail the duties Mr. Kenneison is now undertaking, and I have no complaint whatever about the way he is undertaking those duties. I do, however, complain about the previous organization under which he was to act both as the legal man and as the investigator working with the companies office to clear up these matters and to ensure we were on the right track.

The Crown Solicitor had a conference with the Registrar of Companies, the senior investigator and a senior police officer, and I have approved the following scheme for the conduct of company investigations: if a complaint is made to me from outside the Government, then I will refer that complaint to the Crown Solicitor, who will refer it, if it appears likely or possible that a criminal offence has been committed, to the fraud squad (part of the Police Force) to investigate in the usual way. If a complaint originates in the Companies Office, as it often does, then I receive a short minute from the Registrar of Companies, which goes from me to the Crown Solicitor, then to the Crown Prosecutor and then either to an Assistant Crown Prosecutor, if it appears to be a criminal matter, or to Mr. Kenneison, if it is a technical company matter, for action and investigation in co-operation with either the police or the companies office, as appropriate. I do not know if any member complains about this or thinks I am not getting the job done; I personally believe it is being done in the way in which it should be done—under the supervision of the senior professional legal officer, the Crown Solicitor. It was for these reasons that I transferred Mr. Kenneison and Mr. Liddy. Perhaps I should say something about Mr. Liddy; this is what the Crown Solicitor has told me:

Since Mr. Liddy's transfer to the Crown Law Department—

and he is a graduate of only 12 months' standing—

he has, with other Crown Law Officers in his professional grade, been handling in Court and in the office the ordinary range of matters assigned to him. I have asked him also to work with Mr. Cameron on the preparation of Justice appeals: that work demands experience and practice. I hope that in a month or two he will be able to take over the preparation of Justice appeals—an important part of our department's responsibilities. From what I have seen of his work he is keen, willing to learn and conscientious.

So, it is obvious that Mr. Liddy is now thoroughly satisfactorily placed, but I was not satisfied in the few weeks I observed his work that he was fully occupied, placed as he had been, in the Attorney-General's Department. This is why I had him moved: because I did not think he was being extended to the full extent of his abilities.

We come now to Mr. Jennings, the article clerk, and it was he whom I did move, not on the day I came to office but a few days afterwards, for this reason: an article clerk has to be trained. The system of articles in South Australia allows for practical professional training, and it was perfectly obvious to me that Mr. Jennings was not getting the training that he should have been getting and which he deserved, as an officer in the Attorney-General's Department working under Messrs. Kenneison and Liddy. Their work was specialized (they themselves are quite junior practitioners) and I therefore sent him from the Attorney-General's Department to the Crown Law Office so that he could work under appropriate supervision and receive the training he should receive. It is not without significance that Mr. Jennings is article clerk, not to the Attorney-General but to the Crown Solicitor. I have discussed this matter and I am satisfied from my own observations that this is accurate; this is what Mr. Wells has to say about Mr. Jennings:

Since Mr. Jennings joined our group of article clerks,—

he is now an article clerk in the Crown Law Office—

he has carried out, under the immediate—

and I point out that the word "immediate" has been underlined in the minute—

supervision of an Assistant Crown Solicitor, the work and training of an ordinary article clerk. It seems to me—

note these words—

unlikely that appropriate training was available to him before. I must be in a position, when the question of his admission to the profession arises, to be able to assure the Board of Examiners that he has had a proper training,

and if he had continued with the sort of work he was doing previously, I am by no means sure that I could have conscientiously done so. Mr. Jennings seems to me to be a pleasant, conscientious and reliable article clerk who works in well with his colleagues. One cannot ask for more.

Do any honourable members think, in the light of this report, that my actions were unjustified? Do any honourable members think that the Leader of the Opposition was justified in the criticism he made of me in moving this boy? If they did before, I hope they do not do so now, because I believe I acted perfectly properly in transferring all these officers, in their own interests and in the interests of the Government's legal business. Certainly, in the case of Mr. Jennings, I was satisfied that he was not getting the training he should have received. That was the main criticism made by the Leader of the Opposition. The member for Glenelg can make faces if he likes to do so, but he knows I am right.

There are two other matters I want to mention. I really thought the Leader of the Opposition would have mentioned at least one of them when he spoke, or that some members of this House would have said something about it. It has been my sad duty, since coming into office, to accept the resignation of the Parliamentary Draftsman, on the grounds of ill health. Dr. Wynes retires at the end of this week. This will, as all members know, throw an added burden on the other officers of the Parliamentary Draftsman's Department. Personally, I very much regret that Dr. Wynes had to take this step. He served the Playford Government from 1959 until 1965, the Walsh Government, the Dunstan Government, and, in the last few months, this Government, to the utmost of his capacity.

Mr. Ryan: You criticized him.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: One would have thought that the Leader, a former Attorney-General, could find a minute while making his speech in which to say something about this. That Dr. Wynes was retiring was certainly public knowledge before the Leader spoke, yet there was not even one word of appreciation of Dr. Wynes's services.

Mr. Ryan: You didn't show much appreciation when you were in Opposition.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is another of the decisions we have had to make, and it was a very hard one to make, too.

Mr. Hudson: What do you mean—it was a hard one to make?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: When I came into office—

Mr. Hudson: Did he offer his resignation, or not? Why was it hard to make?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Because I did not want to lose a valued officer, and I am sure that the member for Glenelg agrees with me in that. Does he? I hope he does.

Mr. Hudson: Did you have a choice?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Sir, let me get on with the next matter. When I came into office, I found that the work of the members of the Full Bench of the Licensing Court was in a state that could only be regarded as chaos. They were months behind with the work, probably 12 months behind, and apparently there was no solution forthcoming from my predecessor to help the court with its work. Of course, there are only two full-time judicial officers in the Licensing Court, His Honour Judge Johnston and Mr. Marshall, S.M. To constitute a Full Bench, three members are required. Therefore, the Licensing Court had to try to borrow the services of another magistrate to do this work, and this was found to be absolutely impracticable and they were getting further and further behind with this important work. I am sure that all members agree that it is important work.

My predecessor had done nothing at all to relieve the situation. We had to find a third person who could sit as required so that a Full Bench could be constituted, and we were pleased to recommend the appointment (His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor made the appointment) of Mr. Eric McLaughlin, Q.C., as the third member of the court. As Mr. McLaughlin is a senior legal practitioner, we were lucky to get his services. I am happy to tell the House that the work of the Licensing Court is proceeding much more quickly than it was before. In case the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) or any other honourable member doubts what I have to say, I will read this report from Judge Johnston, dated today:

I advise that since April 16—

a date of some significance perhaps—the Full Bench of the Licensing Court has been sitting regularly. Mr. Pellew, S.M., has sat on 11 occasions and Mr. McLaughlin on 10 days.

Of course, Mr. McLaughlin was not appointed until some weeks after we came into office.

The report continues:

In that time, apart from the single member work being kept up to date, 42 Full Bench matters have been dealt with. In addition, a number of matters has been set down for hearing during August and early September. Accordingly, I can say that, while there are still many applications not yet set for hearing, the number has been substantially reduced.

This is just one other action that the present Government had to take, or did take, on my recommendation. It was something that was crying out to be done well before we came into office, yet my predecessor had not seen fit to take any action at all to alleviate a serious situation. However, he has the lack of charity to get up in this place, as the only spokesman for the Opposition, and go through, Minister by Minister, the departments of Government and cast aspersions on our lack of activity in 100 days. If he is prepared to do this (as he was), then we are prepared to get up in this place and give the answers to him, because in my case (and I am confident that it is so in the case of every other Minister) those criticisms were thoroughly unjustified. I believe the Leader knew that when he made them.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: You were on the Court of Disputed Returns, too.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: For five weeks of the 100 days, I was engaged as a servant of this House, a member of the Court of Disputed Returns. That is another thing that could be mentioned. There are so many things that one could mention if one chased into every burrow every rabbit released by the Leader of the Opposition to refute the criticism that the Leader of the Opposition saw fit, on behalf of his Party, as its only spokesman in this debate so far, to make of me and of the Government.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): First, I support the motion and, secondly, I reaffirm my loyalty to Queen Elizabeth II. Of late we have heard so much about members associating with Communists and we have seen in the last few weeks or so evidence of so many successful mass rallies that I think it behoves a member of this House to declare, quite openly, his allegiance to the Crown, the symbol of constitutional authority. One of the advantages of the Address in Reply debate is that it gives members the opportunity to ventilate grievances and to cover a wide range of topics. I remember one of my favourite parts of a nursery rhyme of my infant days, which was:

"The time has come," the Walrus said, "to talk of many things:  
Of shoes and ships and sealing wax, of cabbages and kings—  
And why the sea is boiling hot, and whether pigs have wings."

I will not go as far as Lewis Carroll suggests, but I wish to discuss a few matters pertaining to my district. However, before doing that, I express my sympathy formally to the family of the late Senator Hannaford. A Riverton boy, Senator Hannaford lived for many years in the area, making a great contribution to the public life of that district. Although one might not always have agreed with what the Senator said, one could not help but admire him for his courage. He could speak out and speak his mind, not caring who disagreed with him. I also express my regret at the passing of the former Prime Minister (Harold Holt).

I associate my name with those who have expressed regret at the passing of former members of this House. The late Frank Walsh was the only one of them that I knew well. I do not believe that they came any better than the late Frank Walsh, as a man. I welcome the new member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo). We heard much of him when he was the top executive in the Australian Labor Party, the man to whom all sitting Labor members of Parliament had to refer for policy decisions.

Mrs. Byrne: That's not right.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is, and the member for Barossa knows that well. The former State Secretary of the Labor Party, who now sits in this Chamber, was the top executive.

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

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Although we have now resumed after the dinner adjournment it seems that every Socialist in the Parliamentary building has failed to respond to the call to assemble in this Chamber.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member referring to the state of the House?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A quorum is now present. The honourable member for Light.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am pleased to see that we now have two Socialist members back. Before the dinner adjournment I criticized mildly the fact that the Australian Labor Party had chosen not to take part in this debate. I believe that this is a reflection on the Crown, and I deplore this tendency in the Parliamentary proceedings. I was welcoming the new member for Edwardstown, who was not in the Chamber at the time, and I had said how pleased we were to see him here. We are also pleased to see the man

who was a great power in the A.L.P. for about three or four years before he came in at the election a few months ago. I extend a cordial welcome to the fine team of new Liberal and Country Party members in this House. What magnificent members they are, and how pleasing it is to see working the democratic process that can return to this House men of the calibre of the new L.C.L. members. I remind the House that each new member on this side has been elected to Parliament by a popular vote of his constituents and by being endorsed by a popular vote of the members of the L.C.L. within the district.

I suggest that in every district that has returned a new L.C.L. member there would be more than 1,500 financial members of the L.C.L. The democratic process is working at grass roots level when the members of the Party in the district endorse the candidate and that candidate is eventually endorsed by the electors in the district. It is with much pleasure and with real satisfaction that I look around the L.C.L. benches and see the magnificent new L.C.L. members. We all know that the member for Edwardstown was not endorsed by any democratic plebiscite system, and the means by which he was endorsed by the A.L.P. are obscure, to say the least. I will not bore members on this side by explaining again how A.L.P. members are endorsed, because the method is well known to everyone in this House.

The member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards), who spoke so capably this afternoon, referred to the decline in rural population and said how unfortunate it was that so many people left rural areas to come to the city because they then received better amenities. He made out a strong case for the Government of the day to invest more money in the country so that people in country areas can have the amenities enjoyed by city people. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) spoke about the cost structure that is slowly crushing the man on the land, and pointed out that although rural production had greatly increased in the last 20 years our costs had increased to such an extent that they outweighed the benefit of increased production. Some blame for this can be attributed to the trade union movement and, in particular, to the leaders of that movement, who are more concerned with personal benefits than with the long-term benefits to their own members and to commerce and industry in this State. Henry Lawson aptly describes the attitude of some

A.L.P. members, particularly the trade union officials, in his poem *Too Old to Rat*, which I quote as follows:

I don't care if the cause be wrong  
Or if the cause be right,  
I've had my day and sung my song  
And fought the bitter fight.  
In truth at times I can't tell what  
The men are driving at,  
But I've been Union thirty years  
And I'm too old to rat.

Members opposite have had plenty of time to speak in this debate, but have insulted the Sovereign by deciding not to speak.

Mr. Clark: Your present speech is an insult to anyone.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not mind replying to polite and intelligent interjections.

Mr. Clark: Then make a polite and intelligent speech.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I turn now to the unfortunate remarks by members of the A.L.P. when speaking on the motion for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole during the Supplementary Estimates debate. The member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) said, and I suspect that his remarks applied to me—

The SPEAKER: Order! Under Standing Orders the honourable member is not allowed to refer to a previous debate during this session.

Mr. Clark: He wouldn't have a clue.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I was about to reply to some insulting references made about me.

Mr. Clark: Weren't they true?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I thought that they needed to be replied to in order to set the record straight. During the recent Millicent by-election campaign it was alleged by members of the A.L.P. that I referred to Mr. Corcoran, the A.L.P. candidate, as a Communist. These allegations were untrue, and I deny them categorically.

Mr. Clark: You will have to speak more loudly.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No member opposite who associated my name with calling Mr. Corcoran a Communist has had the courtesy or the grace to apologize for doing so. In Millicent I said that the Communist Party was officially supporting the A.L.P. candidate and, as proof of that statement, I quote part of the Australian Broadcasting Commission's news service on May 29. No member would accuse the A.B.C. of false reporting. The statement is attributed to Mr. Moss, Secretary of the Australian Communist Party, South Australian Branch, and is as follows:

The Secretary of the Communist Party, Mr. Moss, said this morning that his Party is not contesting the by-election but would do everything possible to ensure an A.L.P. win.

I have no doubt that doing everything it could to ensure an A.L.P. win meant supporting the A.L.P. financially, and probably heavily at that. I wish to quote what our candidate, Mr. Cameron, said at the declaration of the poll, because it was rather good advice, I thought, for the newly elected member. Indeed, I do not think any member of Parliament is so experienced and so knowledgeable as to be able to ignore good advice. At the declaration of the poll, after the Millicent by-election, Mr. Cameron said:

Mr. Corcoran is now charged by the people of this district with the responsibility of seeing that the South-East does not lose a seat and with seeing that country representation is maintained at an adequate level. I have heard on the radio that you and Mr. Dunstan—

and here, of course, Mr. Cameron had turned to Mr. Corcoran and was addressing him directly—

are to address a mass rally in Adelaide tomorrow night. I trust that, if this is so, you will remember that you are a country member of Parliament. I shall be breathing down your neck for the next unknown number of months or years and shall be ready to make you answer for any moves against country people's interests.

Despite this good advice, it was only a few hours later that the member for Millicent was so foolish as to address a mass rally on the steps of Parliament House. No-one in South Australia was more joyous than Mr. Cameron, the L.C.L. candidate, who was there with his camera snapping photographs as quickly as he could, photographs that he could use to very good effect at the next election. When the member for Millicent again faces the people they will not have much doubt about the association of Labor members of Parliament with subversive elements in South Australia who wish to overthrow constitutional Government by violent means. Before turning to matters affecting my own district, I remind the House that about 12 months ago I upbraided members of the Labor Party for boycotting a Captive Nations Week rally in the Adelaide Town Hall. Although I do not wish to speak at any length about the Captive Nations Week Committee, I point out that it is an organization that has been set up in South Australia to concentrate people's attention on the plight of people who live under the Communist yoke. Last year the Australian Labor Party completely boycotted the rally in

the town hall, and I upbraided them for doing so. This year it was ensured that the Labor Party members would be given written invitations and, in addition, the rally was widely publicized in the press, so that any Labor member of Parliament could not say he did not know anything about it.

Of course, when the subject of Communism is raised, A.L.P. members always adopt the soft line. We know where their allegiance lies, and anything that savours of an open confession of anti-Communism is not entertained by them because there is not much doubt that the A.L.P. is financially supported by the Communists. Although I do not wish to belabour the subject of Communism any further, I point out that last Friday or Saturday Mr. Jim Moss, in a letter published in the popular press, tried to point out that his Party was a democratic Party. As members opposite have taken such an active interest in this subject, I shall read part of the letter. It states:

Since 1951 the Communist Party has put forward candidates in every general Federal and South Australian election and promoted its programme through its weekly newspaper and by other publicity and activity.

When the Communist Party puts up candidates at elections it gives its second preferences to the Australian Labor Party. At the last Senate election the Australian Labor Party reciprocated and gave its preferences to the Communist Party.

Mr. Casey: That's nonsense.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not wish to become involved in a cross-fire of interjections from the former Liberal member for Frome. We all know his political leanings; he was a member of the L.C.L. for many years. He was even nominated at a meeting as Secretary or Vice-President of the Peterborough branch. He thanked the mover and said he would like to accept—

Mr. Jennings: What about DeGaris!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: He said he would like to accept the nomination—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The only reason he was unable to accept the nomination was that, as he said, he believed he lived too far away from the town of Peterborough to be an effective committee member. I turn now to the problems in my own district.

Mr. Jennings: If you had any respect for your district you'd resign.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Any member who has the interests of his own district at heart would naturally speak in the Address in Reply debate, because he is then able to discuss the problems concerning his district. The Cadell irrigation settlement is right on the easternmost end of my district. My district extends literally from the Murray River to the Adelaide Plains.

Mr. Casey: What about eggs!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am invited to get on to the subject of eggs. For all the advice on eggs that I gave the previous Labor Minister of Agriculture, he did not take it, and where is he now? He is an ex-member. If the previous member for Murray had taken my advice on matters pertaining to the egg industry, no doubt—

Mr. Nankivell: Or his successor, the member for Frome!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Perhaps, although we were not able to speak to him in time! The Cadell irrigation settlement, in terms of its white settlement, dates back to about 1880 or 1890. Its early history was not a happy one: it was one of the original village settlements in South Australia. The village settlement idea was another of these early socialistic schemes for settling people in parts of South Australia which it was believed should be developed. These schemes were based on a communal idea: no-one owned anything and everyone shared his wealth. As one can imagine, like all other Communist activities (connected with agriculture, at any rate), it was a complete failure. The white settlement did not recommence at Cadell until after the First World War, when Cadell was made the venue of a soldier settlement irrigation area.

No doubt, when the early settlers went to Cadell they were attracted by the obvious excellence of the site as an irrigation settlement. On one side it is bounded by a low mallee island and on the other it is bounded by high cliffs. The soil types appeared to the early settlers to be ideal for irrigation farming, but not as much was known about irrigation then as is now known. The soil types at Cadell appear superficially to be good, but at about 1ft. below the surface there is a thick band of clay which makes drainage difficult. I have already issued an invitation on behalf of the Cadell settlers to the new Minister of Lands to pay a visit to the Cadell area to study the conditions there for himself. Of course, I know that he will be good enough to do that.

The Cadell irrigation settlement is a fact of life; it needs much capital spent on it to maintain the drainage in a reasonably workable condition. I believe it is the responsibility of the Treasury to look after the interests of these people at Cadell.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Colonel Dean played an important part in the scheme during the war at Loveday.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: That could be so. On Friday of last week I called at the Cadell packing shed to discuss its activities with the manager. This is a co-operative, and like many other co-operatives on the Murray River its management level and general efficiency are high. The manager told me that the quantity of fruit being taken by the co-operative was increasing rapidly for two or three reasons. The horticultural activities at the Cadell Training Centre are now reaching the stage where considerable commercial fruit is able to be sold. Also, a large irrigation area called Sunlands (a few miles from Cadell) is coming into production. To give an idea of how production at Cadell has increased, the packing shed manager told me that, in 1965, 63,936 bushels of citrus was taken in, whereas this year the estimated figure is 100,000 bushels. The value of dried fruit dealt with at the packing shed has increased from \$45,630 in 1965 to an estimate of \$71,000 this year. Those figures indicate the role being played by the Cadell settlement in the economy of South Australia. I believe that the Government has a responsibility to ensure that these settlers are placed in no worse a position than settlers on other irrigation settlements along the Murray River.

The manager of the packing shed also told me that he believed that citrus would be the fruit concentrated on in the Cadell area; it represents by far the biggest sector of the co-operative at present. As many large areas of citrus are coming into production in the Cadell-Sunlands district, no doubt citrus will continue to be a major part of the economy of the Cadell irrigation settlement. There is a serious drainage problem at Cadell, the significance of which I believe the Minister will appreciate when he inspects the site. I regret that no drainage is provided at the Cadell Training Centre. In fact, the seepage appears to be flooding into the main drainage basin of the old settlement, overloading and embarrassing the drainage system that exists in the settlement. Finally, the Cadell packing shed is a substantial employer of labour,

employing about 35 people some of whom are on a casual basis. However, when one realizes that Cadell is only a tiny settlement, a packing shed employing 35 people at peak seasonal activity is a real help to business and commerce generally in that area.

I now wish to refer to the railway service between Adelaide and Morgan. This also affects Cadell. I know there are many problems with this service mainly because of lack of patronage, but it is necessary for an area such as Morgan-Cadell to be sure of having a reasonable freight service. On Friday evening last week I attended a public meeting called at Morgan to discuss the future of the Morgan-Adelaide freight service. The Minister of Transport had written to the Chairman of the Morgan council on July 3 giving him some information on the amount of business conducted on the Morgan-Eudunda section of the line in the last four or five financial years.

One of the principal freight items on the Morgan-Eudunda line is firewood. Most of the firewood used in the metropolitan area comes from this line. I now wish to quote the following letter from the Minister of Transport to the Chairman of the Morgan council as follows:

With regard to firewood, inquiries show . . .

Mr. Jennings: What about having the letter incorporated in *Hansard*?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I ask leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it a letter from the Minister of Transport to the Chairman of the Morgan council.

Leave granted.

#### FIREWOOD AND SUPERPHOSPHATE FIGURES

With regard to firewood, inquiries show that the following tonnages were received from stations east of Eudunda, over the last five years:

Year	Morgan Tons	Mount Mary Tons	Bower Tons	Total Tonnage
1962-63 . . . . .	1,775	2,667	600	5,042
1963-64 . . . . .	2,926	3,855	630	7,411
1964-65 . . . . .	2,389	5,137	678	8,204
1965-66 . . . . .	1,892	4,440	424	6,756
1966-67 . . . . .	1,229	2,349	196	3,774

It will be seen that there has been a substantial drop in this business. For the current financial year it is expected that the total figure will reach 3,600 tons. For the year 1956-57 dispatches of firewood from beyond Eudunda totalled 12,178 tons. Inquiries indicate that cutters are finding it increasingly necessary

to seek timber farther out from the Eudunda-Morgan line. In confirmation of this is the fact that the forwardings from Robertstown have increased from 401 in 1962-63 to 1,384 tons in 1966-67. Superphosphate tonnages over the last five years are as follows:

Year	Morgan Tons	Mount Mary Tons	Bower Tons	Sutherlands Tons	Total Tons
1962-63 . . . . .	282	1	—	—	283
1963-64 . . . . .	314	—	—	—	314
1964-65 . . . . .	292	—	—	44	336
1965-66 . . . . .	327	—	—	15	342
1966-67 . . . . .	288	—	—	11	299

The average quantity of 300 tons of superphosphate a year could quite easily be handled by one train a year. With regard to the proposal mentioned by you for bulk superphosphate handling at Morgan, no details of this have as yet been submitted to the South Australian Railways. It is considered, however, that the activity would be on such a small scale as to result in its economics being queried.

The last inquiry made to the South Australian Railways in respect of gypsum was in September last year, but no traffic has eventuated. It would appear at present that the inherent advantages held by the gypsum operators in the Kevin field could prejudice the success of any activities in the Morgan area.

In due course the Transport Control Board will conduct inquiries under the provisions of the Road and Railway Transport Act, into the closing of the railway line between Morgan and Eudunda.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I point out that the Chairman of the council tells me that the 1966-67 figure of 1,229 tons of firewood for Morgan is probably an error, his records indicating that the correct figure is 1,504 tons. As this subject concerns people in the Morgan area, I have ventilated it in the House, as is my democratic right,

during the Address in Reply debate: that is what the Address in Reply debate is for. I referred to the letter to indicate that firewood is the principal economic product of the Morgan district. The firewood industry has been stimulated because the Railways Department has, in the past, provided a cheap rail freight of about \$2.20 a ton. This has meant that people in this area have been able to compete with their product in the metropolitan area. One of the fears of woodcutters in the area (and they represent 25 or 30 families) is that, if the freight trains are abandoned, they will be forced to use road transport which will place this area at a disadvantage on the Adelaide firewood market. In fact, they will be unable to get their firewood to Adelaide at a price sufficiently economic to compete with other types of fuel. I believe there is a good case for the Minister to take special note of the economic circumstances of these firewood cutters, who have in the past made their living by sending cheap firewood to Adelaide. The 25 families involved may not seem many to some members, but the livelihood of these people is affected and I believe that in a democracy every person must be considered, whatever his way of life and whatever his contribution to our economic welfare.

I turn now to a major problem existing at Watervale: the lack of a reticulated water supply to the township and immediate district. Ever since I became a member I have brought forward the case of these people for a reticulated water service, and I must thank a previous Minister of Works (Hon. G. G. Pearson), who listened to my pleas with generosity and during his term of office set the machinery turning for the Watervale people to enjoy this amenity. To my disappointment, the scheme envisaged by the Hon. Mr. Pearson did not incorporate a reticulated water service that would come from Clare or from the Auburn trunk main; the scheme in his time was based on a bore water supply near Watervale. During his term of office two or three bores were punched around Watervale, all of which yielded large quantities of water, but in each case the salinity level was too high to be acceptable for a township supply.

During the term of office of the subsequent Minister of Works (and I thank him for his interest in the scheme) the proposal reached the stage of the allocation from Loan funds of moneys to commence the scheme. Somehow or other it seems that the Labor Government was rather short of money during its last 12 or 18 months of office and the Watervale water

scheme was shelved. I am not blaming the former Minister of Works, who, I know, did the best he could; but the Labor Government, I am told, spent money like a drunken sailor, so there was no money to spend on the amenities for my people at Watervale. The new Minister of Works submitted the following report, dated June 27, 1968, in response to my request:

Further to your inquiry regarding a water supply scheme for Watervale, I set out herewith the present situation:

Several schemes have been investigated to provide a water supply to Watervale. Various schemes were investigated during the period 1948 to 1958 for providing a water supply to Sevenhill, Penwortham and Watervale based on extension from the Clare system. These proposals in all cases could not be recommended because of inadequacy of the supply system. In 1958 a scheme for Watervale only was designed, based on supply from below ground. The Department of Mines, however, was unable to locate satisfactory borehole supplies and this proposal had to be abandoned.

Recently an overall scheme based on extension northwards from the Warren trunk main has been designed and preliminary estimates indicate that very considerable sums are involved in any of the proposals considered, for example:

	\$
(a) Supply to Leasingham and Watervale . . . . .	210,000
(b) Supply to Leasingham, Watervale and Penwortham . . . .	300,000
(c) Supply to Leasingham, Watervale, Penwortham and Sevenhill . . . . .	370,000

In August, 1967, a request for further examination of the scheme to supply water from the Clare system was received from Mr. P. H. Quirke, member for Burra. This request has received attention but it has again been found that it is not possible to supply from this source economically. All water would have to be pumped from Morgan and to provide sufficient water for such an extension would require the relay of much of the trunk main between Hanson and Clare.

Currently investigations are still being carried out on the proposal to supply water from the Warren trunk main from which source, under favourable conditions, much cheaper water will be available. Alternative routes are being examined to ensure that the maximum number of consumers would be served and that maximum revenue be obtained.

It must be pointed out that with such proposals the closest examination must be made; otherwise, there is very little chance of being able to give them favourable consideration. The staff of the Chief Valuer, Engineering and Water Supply Department, previously made an assessment of revenue, and this is currently being updated and varied to suit the most favoured alternative route, which follows closely the main road. The foregoing information has also been supplied to the District Council of Upper Wakefield.



The report is signed by the Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe, Minister of Works. I thank the new Minister of Works for his interest in the Watervale water scheme, and I stress how disappointed the Watervale people have been that they have not been given the simple amenity of a reticulated water service. One may think that in such a high rainfall area (it is favoured with an annual rainfall of about 27in.) these people might very well punch their own bores or have their own rainwater tanks. Of course they could punch their own bores, but it is hardly realistic, economically, to request a large number of townspeople to supply their own water from underground supplies when they should be getting the same amenity that is received by 98 per cent of their fellow South Australians.

Mr. Nankivell: Most South Australians turn on their taps in their kitchens and enjoy a reticulated water service.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes. About three years ago there was a serious garage fire in Watervale and, had there been mains water available, it would not have got out of hand, as it did, and the garage would have been saved. Because there was no reticulated water in the area there was no water pressure to control the blaze. Most of the breadwinners of the families in the Watervale township are employed in one of the two wineries in the area, and they do not have the resources to provide expensive bores on their own. I appeal to the Minister to consider the need of these people; I think they have a very real case for the Minister to consider.

I now turn to Kapunda, about which members have probably heard me speak before. One of the principal towns in my electoral district, Kapunda, made a great contribution to the infant colony of South Australia when copper was discovered there in the 1870's. The mineral discoveries at Kapunda and Burra enabled the infant colony of South Australia to get under way as successfully as it did. Kapunda, about 48 miles from Adelaide, has a keen and active local government body. The natural features and beauty of Kapunda are such that it could easily become a dormitory town for industrial Adelaide. The District Council of Kapunda wrote the Minister of Local Government on June 7 this year, setting out what I thought was a good case for Kapunda to be considered on two or three matters. I read these extracts so that they will go in *Hansard*:

This council appreciates that the population increase in this State over, say, the next 20 years means an appreciable expansion to the metropolitan area, because a majority of the State's secondary industry and commercial centres are located in that area. This population explosion and metropolitan expansion indicates, in our society, that the number of motor cars and other vehicles will increase possibly by a greater ratio than population (family) increase, particularly in this heavily populated area.

These points appear to reveal that the increase in motor traffic may further add to the traffic accident rate on roads, and furthermore the increase in vehicular traffic will demand that high expenditure be incurred on the provision of safe standard roads for vehicles and walkways for pedestrians. My council wishes to present a challenge to the Government and its departments concerned, as follows. This challenge would also apply to this council and its citizens.

This is the challenge:

That the State Government give urgent and serious attention to establishing a pilot scheme in Kapunda by constructing, say, at least 100 houses in the Kapunda township for purchase or tenancy: to improve the existing rail service from Kapunda to Adelaide, thus giving the wage or salary earner in the families that would occupy these homes the opportunity to travel from a nearby, well established township to their place of work, which may be at and between Gawler and Adelaide: that the public be made aware of this opportunity to live in a country town and commute to their work by rail. There is no doubt that the provision of homes for commuters is virtually useless unless the rail service is improved. Likewise a good rail service is uneconomical unless patronized. My council believes that such a proposal is attractive and the scheme has great promise, not only in Kapunda, but also in other established towns, close to Adelaide, which can be served by rail, and yet do not appear to attract industries at present.

I remind the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) that she, too, has an interest in this commuter rail service. The letter continues:

To support this challenge, your attention is respectfully drawn to the following points:

- (a) The need for decentralization, of which the Government is no doubt aware.
- (b) The cost of, say, 100 houses, which may be purchased or produce revenue from rent, and a speedy, safe and efficient commuter rail service, which will bring in revenue and certainly be required in the future, in any case, compared with the very likely increase in the road traffic accident rate and road construction costs. Both of the latter points certainly do not mean that accidents would not increase, nor high road expenditure costs be reduced by such a scheme only.

However, if the number of persons travelling by road vehicle in the metropolitan area was not increased unnecessarily this would affect these two points.

My council believes that at present many workers living in the metropolitan area take as long to travel to their place of work by car or public transport as one would take living in Kapunda and travelling by rail to, say, Elizabeth. It is likely that two services each way may be necessary to suit wage earners and salary earners. At present a slow old rail car leaves Kapunda for Adelaide at approximately 6.30 a.m. and 7.00 a.m. and departs Adelaide at 4.40 p.m. and 5.20 p.m. arriving at Kapunda at 6.16 p.m. and 6.49 p.m., respectively. This type of service does not appeal to commuters, schoolchildren or others.

- (c) The working force required in the industries in Elizabeth and surrounds when the present population is near to, or in retirement. Will the present working generation leave and live elsewhere to provide homes for the future workers? Surely some of the workers can be settled in areas outside metropolitan Adelaide.
- (d) The establishment of additional industries as this State develops. Will such new industries find a suitable site in the metropolitan area? Perhaps better sites are available in country towns, all other factors being equal, particularly a satisfactory work force.

I think that the problems of the town and district of Kapunda are not dissimilar to the problems of other country towns that are about the same distance from Adelaide: they are close enough to Adelaide for a commuter service to operate between the town and the metropolitan area, yet they are not so far away as to make such daily commuting an unreasonable burden. I urge other country members to adopt towards their towns a progressive attitude similar to that adopted by the district council of Kapunda.

I am sorry that Australian Labor Party members opposite are not paying due respect to the Sovereign and that they are not making use of this opportunity to represent their districts and voice problems. I am sure that every member has problems in his district. No district can be so well represented as not to have problems, and that is particularly so of districts represented by members opposite. It would be more in keeping with the stature of the debate if Opposition members were to

make a contribution on behalf of their districts. I remember vividly that the former member for Chaffey was reluctant to voice the problems of his district, and I frequently had to help him out. However, now that we have new and fine members for Chaffey and Murray, those districts will be much better represented in the House than they were in the last six years. I am delighted to have on my side of politics members of the Liberal and Country League who have been endorsed and elected by a wide and popular franchise at a free and open ballot and I know that these members will make a great contribution towards the betterment of South Australia and their districts.

I have one or two other pearls to cast before members opposite. Unfortunately, the Socialist member for Glenelg is not here at present. I have been waiting for an hour for him to come back to the Chamber. One pearl is such a gem that I must cast it before members opposite. It appeared in the *Advertiser* of May 7 last, under the heading, "Busy time at A.L.P. talks." Anybody who knows anything about the Australian Labor Party knows that A.L.P. talks are busy times indeed. This is the gem:

The Glenelg branch of the A.L.P. has submitted motions calling for the setting up of a school of ethics for members of Parliament.

No branch of the A.L.P. could probably know more about the lack of ethics (and I do not mean to be unkind) among Parliamentary members than the Glenelg branch, but I am not picking out that branch: I am merely giving it as an example. When the motion got to the general conference, it was very effectively suppressed, but I thought it was amusing that there could be such a lack of respect among rank and file members of the Labor Party that they wanted to set up a school of ethics for members of Parliament. Another interesting item I noticed was that the Oaklands-Dover branch of the A.L.P. wants a 65-member House of Assembly.

From my weekend reading about the Labor Party, I get much entertainment and also education on Socialism. Indeed, I recently read an interesting book entitled *A Prime Minister Remembers*, the memoirs of the Rt. Hon. Earl Attlee, who was one of the great men in the Labor movement. When his Party was elected to Government in Britain with a landslide victory, it received only 42 per cent of the total popular vote. He ruled with a big majority in the House of Commons, and

no-one could say that his Government was not a legitimate one. I will read a little from his memoirs because he has some caustic things to say about the A.L.P. Indeed, he was critical of the way in which its administration in this country chooses its Cabinet Ministers. Although I remember the member for Glenelg trying to make out a case for the election of Ministers by the Parliamentary rank and file, I point out that the Trades Hall hierarchy really makes these decisions. At page 85 of his book, the Rt. Hon. Earl Attlee states:

Actually in 1931 there was a movement in the Labour Party, because of the feeling about MacDonald, to set up some sort of group that would have a say in choosing Ministers. They were to be elected by the Parliamentary Party—a body of three or four senior men to advise. Well, it fell by the wayside, partly because most people soon forgot about it, partly because of the time factor. The fact that I had to get over to Potsdam at once meant there was no time for lengthy confabulations or for going through a process of electing various people who admired each other. It wouldn't have worked. The Australian Labor Party do something of the sort, you know. Awful business.

I stress that—"awful business". Continuing: They elect a certain number of people as Ministers, and then they're handed over to the Prime Minister and he's told to fit them into the jigsaw. It's quite possible that someone with particular technical qualifications may get left out because he doesn't happen to be popular. I don't believe in that at all. You must have confidence in the judgment of the man in charge. If he hasn't got that confidence, he's not fit to be Prime Minister. There, Earl Attlee, one of the great men of the Labor movement, states his own strong views on the Australian Labor Party's method of selecting its Ministers. The A.L.P. chooses its Ministers by the means of Trades Hall selection because it does not trust the man it elects as its leader.

Although the evidence of a rift may not be so evident in the South Australian Parliamentary Labor Party, there is no doubt in anyone's mind about the extent of the rift in the Parliamentary Labor Party in Canberra. I conclude my remarks by confirming my loyalty to the Sovereign and by expressing my regret that members of the Australian Labor Party in this Chamber have insulted their Sovereign by refusing to speak in this debate. I welcome the new members to this House and wish all of them long and illustrious careers.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE (Minister of Works): In supporting the motion I join with other members in expressing my loyalty to the

Sovereign and expressing my condolences to the families of former members. I also congratulate the new members of this House who have in this debate presented their maiden speeches to the House. All members on both sides look forward to hearing fine contributions from these new members when they speak on numerous occasions in future debates.

We all join in paying a warm tribute to the late Frank Walsh for his kindness and for his friendship over the years when he was a member of this place. As a personal friend of his, I got to know him well and, although I may not have agreed with him on everything, we always had an opportunity to talk to each other and to have a drink together. I think the world is poorer for his passing.

I rise, too, to reply, on behalf not only of myself but of the departments that I administer, to certain criticisms made by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech. Although honest criticism is valuable, and Parliament is the place where valid and constructive criticism should be expressed, some of the Leader's statements were, in my opinion, at least slanted. If they were not downright careless, then they were a deliberate twisting of the facts. This is why I have risen to speak at this time: I want to put the records straight regarding the various departments I administer.

I refer to the Leader's reference to water rates. He said, at page 231 of *Hansard*:

During the L.C.L.'s period in Opposition—

this time the Labor Party was in Government—there were some increases in total water bills as a result of the normal periodic re-assessment of properties, which must take place under the Waterworks Act as required by the Auditor-General—

they are not required by the Auditor-General, by the way—

and a minor alteration was made to the amount of rebate water available under the rating system, but no other alteration was made to the rates—none whatever!

This is what the Leader said. He said that a minor alteration was made to the amount of rebate water available under the rating system.

THE SPEAKER: Order! I take it the honorable Minister is referring to the Leader's speech in the Address in Reply debate?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I am using the Leader's speech in the Address in Reply debate, which can be found at page 231 of *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister is in order.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The Leader of the Opposition said that no alterations had been made whatever, yet the plain facts are that increases were made. Under the last Liberal Government led by Sir Thomas Playford the rates charged were 25c for each 1,000 gallons of rebate water, and 22.5c for each 1,000 gallons of excess water. On July 1, 1965, the Labor Government, under the authority of the then Minister of Works, increased the rate on both excess water and rebate water. As members are aware the charge for rebate water was increased to 30c and that for excess water was increased to 25c. This happened on July 1, 1965, but the Leader, in his statement, said that no alterations were made to the rates, none whatever. Either one or the other statement is wrong, because I am quoting the official figures, which the member for Hindmarsh (then the Minister for Works) authorized at that time. On July 1 this year, with Cabinet authority I authorized an increase in the excess rate from 25c to 30c to bring it into line with rates in most of the other States. We now have parity between the charges for rebate water and for excess water. When I publicly announced this increase I said that as there had to be some increase in charges it was better to have an increase for excess water rather than an increase in the charge for rebate water. Also, I said that there would be no further increase in the basic charge for water, and that the increase for excess water would encourage economy in the use of water.

Mr. Riches: I think you are mistaken, and we will have to take you to task.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I will be pleased if the honourable member does, because I am taking the Leader to task.

Mr. Riches: I am not querying your statement, but your judgment in doing what you did.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I said that, rather than have an increase on the basic charge for water, which should remain unchanged, the charge for excess water should be increased in order to encourage economy in the use of water. I realize there are other anomalies. I understand a problem has arisen concerning the council in the honourable member's district, and that I shall have to consider this. The statement was criticized because it was suggested there would be less need to pump water in the coming financial

year. I know that this will be so and I am pleased about it, as I imagine all members and all South Australians will also be pleased, because most metropolitan reservoirs are now overflowing, and I hope that they will all be full soon. This position has not applied in the State for many years, but it would be a narrow view to consider this position in relation to this year only. Although we may start a summer with all reservoirs full, much pumping has still to be done to augment the supply to the metropolitan area extending far to the south of Adelaide and to the Gawler area in the north. Also, when we consider how dependent other parts of the State are on mains and pumping we realize the enormous amount of pumping that has to be done, and that this pumping will have to be increased yearly.

Although we have drawn water from the Murray River for the metropolitan area through the Mannum-Adelaide main, this scheme is to be augmented with larger impellers and larger pumps. These additions were approved some years ago by the Public Works Committee and are to be carried out soon, so that more water will be pumped. The Murray Bridge to Hahndorf main is now being built and tenders have been let for the first eight miles of pipes. When this main is constructed a further increase in pumping will be involved. The Morgan-Whyalla main has been duplicated, and we are now installing the remainder of the pumping stations. Also, with the construction of the Swan Reach to Stockwell main, the Tailem Bend to Keith main, and the start on the Poldo-Kimba scheme we realize that each year there will be an increasing pumping commitment. I believe that the Leader's statement was misleading: it certainly was careless when he said:

In the Labor Party's term of office there were the normal periodical reassessments that occurred, but there was no change whatever in the rates except for minor adjustments for rebate water.

Contrary to that statement, the charge for rebate water was increased by 5c and the charge for excess water was also increased. Comparing our figures with those in other States, we find that in Sydney the charge is 30c for rebate and for excess water, in Brisbane it is 35c for both, in Melbourne the charge for industrial water is 30c for rebate and for excess and 25c for domestic rebate and for excess water. However, I emphasize that in those States in addition to the higher charges the basic rates are higher, because

properties are valued much higher in those States. This situation increases the amount that has to be paid by each consumer. Furthermore the availability of water in South Australia has been better than that in other States, mainly because of the foresight shown many years ago in providing mains and a reticulation system. We enjoy a better water supply system and have far fewer restrictions. This situation applied even during last summer, which was one of the worst we have had for many years. With low reservoir holdings and a low Murray River we were able to cope with the situation without water restrictions. However, in Melbourne, with a much higher rainfall, severe water restrictions were imposed and they were imposed in Sydney also.

Mr. Riches: Will the Minister consider the effect of the increased charges on vegetable growers in the Flinders Ranges area?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I shall be pleased to do that. The Leader also criticized the administration of the Labour and Industry Department on the question of unemployment, and said:

At the end of May, South Australia had 1.7 per cent of its work force unemployed, a figure considerably above the figures of unemployment in the work force that were bitterly criticized by members opposite during the Labor Government's period of office. When we were in Government, they said that 1.4 per cent unemployment was far too much but, now that the figure is 1.7 per cent under their Government, what do we find? During the period we were in office, the average figure of unemployment was 1.5 per cent of the work force: it is now 1.7 per cent.

I closely considered this figure, because it did not ring true to me, and I consulted the official figures of the Commonwealth Statistician. The Leader said the present figure was 1.7 per cent of the work force, and so it is. He said that this was worse than the position under Labor, but 12 months ago at June 30, 1967, under Labor, the percentage of unemployed was 1.9.

Mr. Jennings: What was it in 1962?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I have obtained the figures for the quinquennium in order to illustrate the actual position. It commences towards the end of the term of the previous Liberal Government under Sir Thomas Playford. At June 30, 1964, South Australia had one of the lowest figures of unemployment of any State in the Commonwealth, but today it has one of the highest. These figures are most informative: at June 30, 1964, 1.1 per cent of South Australia's work force was unemployed; at June 30, 1965, it was 0.8 per cent;

June 30, 1966, 1.7 per cent; June 30, 1967, 1.9 per cent; and at June 30, 1968, it had come back to 1.7 per cent.

Mr. Ryan: This is still the highest in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It was 2.2 per cent at one stage early in the year.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I know, but I have taken the five-year period as at June 30, of each year, in order to be completely fair. The Leader said that under his Government 1.5 per cent of the work force was unemployed; now, it is 1.7, but 12 months ago it was 1.9. Under the Liberal Government, the average unemployed in this State was either equal to or below the Australian average in this period. When Labor took over, the figure rose above the Australian average: 1.1 per cent as against 1.1 per cent in 1964; 0.8 per cent as against 0.9 per cent in 1965; 1.7 per cent as against 1.3 per cent in 1966; 1.9 per cent as against 1.5 per cent in 1967; and now it is back to 1.7 per cent as against 1.3 per cent.

Mr. McKee: Go back to 1961!

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I should be delighted to, but I do not have the figures here.

Mr. Ryan: It is still the highest in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I know what the honourable member is leading up to, and I am as perfectly aware of the figures as he is, but the Leader of the Opposition was taking a triennium, and he said that whilst he was in office the average figure of unemployment was 1.5 per cent of the work force. Of course, it was, when one takes in the figures, under the Liberal Government, of 1.1 per cent and 0.8 per cent and equates that to the high figure of 1.9 per cent. I refer to these figures deliberately to show that in these two instances the Leader is patently wrong in the statement he has made in the House in criticism of this Government. Why has he made these wrong statements? He has twisted his facts to try to score a political point. This is the place to make constructive and valid criticism. Indeed, that is one of the things for which Parliament is here but, when distorted facts are put forward as the basis of a political point, they must be exposed, and I have risen this evening to show the correct position.

When I commented publicly on the release of these latest figures, which were produced about two weeks ago, I said that I was encouraged by the increase in employment in the

heavier industries, and I think this is significant for South Australia. Each month we get fluctuations: employment in some trades goes up and, in others, goes down. However, I was pleased to see an increase in employment in the heavier industries (non-electrical, motors, engineering, and automobile works, etc.). Having checked the position in the last three or four months, I point out that since March, when the election took place (and I am taking two typical examples), Simpson-Pope, which is one of our larger appliance manufacturers (manufacturers in a big way in the pressed metal industry), has increased its establishment by about 370 employees. Chrysler Australia Limited has increased its work force in the same short period by about 220 persons. In fact, the number of people actually registered at present for unemployment with the Commonwealth Employment Service is slightly less (125 less) than it was 12 months ago. I think that these figures are important and show up in contrast to the wild claim made by the Leader of the Opposition during the Address in Reply debate last week.

The other point the Leader made was in regard to the public works programme. The Estimates will be brought into this House as soon as possible (the Loan Estimates and then the Revenue Estimates). The Estimates will disclose what is being done regarding public works. Indeed, I hope that they will disclose an expanded programme of public works, that some of the works that have been reported on by the Public Works Committee may be carried forward, and that a number of other projects (which because of their size do not have to go before the Public Works Committee) will also be announced (regarding water and sewer works, harbours, and a whole range of public buildings). A number of financial measures will also be announced at that time.

The Government intends to honour its election promises, in contrast to one particular promise made by the Labor Party at the 1965 election which it conveniently forgot. I refer to the promise to amalgamate the Savings Bank and the State Bank. What happened to that brainchild? It was one which we all imagined and believed was the brainchild of the member for Glenelg, but it apparently proved unworkable or was highly unpopular, and it was dropped like a hot stone.

The Leader spoke about the 100 days, and went on to refer to Labor's first 100 days as though it were a planner's dream. He enumerated promises made and things that

were done but, if we look carefully at the Leader's speech, we shall see that he carefully intermingled announcements and facts. From scanning his speech briefly, we imagine that a terrific amount was done in Labor's first 100 days, but when we analyse the speech we see that the Leader brought some things forward that did not occur until the third year of the Labor Party's term of office. What happened in the 100 days? Some announcements and some statements of intent were made. One thing certainly happened in that first 100 days in 1965: the Labor Party started its slippery way down to the financial morass it soon got into. It was at this time that the State went from a credit balance to a \$9,000,000 deficit.

In His Excellency's Speech, the present Government announced what its legislative programme would be, and it is a pretty solid programme. We are laying the foundation now: later we shall introduce many legislative matters announced in the Speech. We have a solid programme for a three-year continuing scheme. As many of these measures as can be introduced in this session will be introduced; others will be introduced as we go along. We are laying a foundation now: we are not making airy-fairy suggestions of the type made in 1965: we are getting down to work and laying a solid foundation for the next three years. Several vital Bills are on members' files; some are urgent, some overdue, and some novel innovations. Measures to be brought into the House by the Treasurer will attempt to arrest the deterioration in the finances of the State. I hope our programme will start an upsurge in confidence, investment and spending in the State at the same time as we carry out an expanded programme of public works.

I have spoken tonight to answer criticisms made by the Leader of the Opposition. Some of the things he said were not true and I have endeavoured to correct them. During the debate we have heard some interesting speeches by new members on this side of the House. The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) delivered his maiden speech in an earlier debate to which I cannot refer. However, new members have shown their ability and I believe we shall hear a great deal more from them in the next three years of this Parliament. I have much pleasure in supporting the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Stirling.

Mr. Jennings: Hear, hear!

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): Every time I get up to speak, shy and trembling, my friend opposite always cheers me up, and this assists me in what I say. First, I pledge my loyalty to the Crown and pay my respects to His Excellency Sir Edric Bastyan and Lady Bastyan who have now left South Australia but who did a tremendous amount of good work while they were here. I have the pleasure of representing the area with the finest scenery in South Australia—Victor Harbour—where Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan enjoyed so many good times. We hope that, with the new Government, more assistance will be given to the tourist industry in that area than was given in the last three years and that it will be made even more beautiful than it is now.

I congratulate members who have made their maiden speeches in this debate. I am sure they will add greatly to the value of contributions made in this House; the member for Light will have good support in the various statements he makes to the House. When he was speaking he overlooked one matter which he has asked me to mention. Apparently a resolution was carried in the area represented by the member for Glenelg to maintain a balanced sex ratio in Australia; apparently this was discussed at a Labor Party conference. I hope something can be done about this, then people might not have five daughters and one son as I have had. However, I am proud of my five daughters.

What the Leader of the Opposition said about the first 100 days of this Government's term of office is an example of the silly statements that are made. I wish to refer to one matter affecting the former Minister of Agriculture. When the Labor Government took office the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board was supposed to be a semi-governmental body. At that time it certainly had its difficulties but it was paying its way and was self-supporting. However, at the end of 1966 it had its first loss—\$33,000. By 1967 it had run up a loss of \$312,000. Up until then there had not been much interference by the Government in the management and control of that body. I do not want it said that I am talking behind the back of the former Minister of Agriculture, seeing that he is no longer here. I argued this matter with him in the House often. Once he reprimanded me, saying that I was only playing politics. However, I was merely trying to get some sanity into the control of the abattoir.

While it was in office, the Labor Government appointed a new Chairman to the board. At meetings of the board, the Chairman always said, "I am here to carry out what the Minister of Agriculture has told me to do." I have argued over the years that a heterogeneous body, such as this, with members representing various sections of the community and meeting only once a fortnight, is an inefficient type of board. The Chairman said that he was there to do what the Government told him to do, and the directions appeared to be coming from the trade unions through to the Chairman. This caused interference in management and in the control of the men and the board got into difficulties which resulted in financial losses. Charges were increased during this period, but despite this a loss was made. The only result of the increased charges was that the board could not compete with abattoirs in other States. Examples such as this show why the departures from South Australia last year were greater than the arrivals.

Sheep were bought in South Australia, taken by W. Angliss and Company (Australia) Proprietary Limited and Borthwick, Thomas and Sons (Australasia) Limited to Melbourne, killed and brought back here. There is no logic in this: the board should become more efficient so that it is able to compete with abattoirs in other States. An iniquitous 1c levy is now placed on meat coming from other States: it is called an inspection charge. At this rate the cost for a 600 lb. beast would be \$6, and for that rate inspectors should kill the beast and dress it as well. Under section 92 of the Constitution, the imposition of this fee is illegal if it is not placed on smaller abattoirs in South Australia. The fee was introduced when the member for Frome was Minister of Agriculture and now it has been levied on the Port Lincoln Abattoir, a Government department.

The member for Eyre has been pleading about the difficulties experienced by his constituents; either they have to carry this 1c charge or the consumer in Adelaide has to pay it. This is purely a levy to cover up the inefficiencies of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, which was aided and abetted by the Labor Government when it was in power.

The Labor Government's idea of reform is to give hand-outs to sections of the community. The Labor Government claimed that it had brought in law reforms, but many of the reforms were the ideas of the then Premier and his clique; I think he had two men in his

department assisting him to work out these ideas, and the salaries of these men were paid by means of an extra company tax that the then Premier imposed. The President of the Law Society of Australia told me that the society once suggested many reforms to the then Premier, but he completely ignored anything that was not his own idea. Probably, when we remember all the departments of which he was in charge, he would not have had time to consider them, anyway.

I pay tribute to Sir Thomas Playford for the tremendous amount of work he did and for the way in which he assisted me when I first became a member of this House. I hope he has many years of well-earned retirement. Returning to the subject of the abattoirs, I point out that they were still in difficulties when the present Government took office. The new Minister of Agriculture immediately appointed a man from Victoria who was experienced in dealing with country abattoirs and in methods of delivering meat to the city. He was aware of what was involved in decentralization. We used to hear from members of the Labor Party that we were not putting into effect the policy of decentralization, but I point out that it was the Labor Government that placed a levy on country abattoirs. When Mr. Bywaters was Minister of Agriculture, what did he do to his own town of Murray Bridge? He imposed a ½c levy on the meatworks there; it was established during the term of office of the Playford Government, which amended the Abattoirs Act so that we could get decentralization. This firm was assured that it could send meat to the Adelaide market. It was not told anything about any levies.

Mr. Casey: It was told.

Mr. McANANEY: Did it agree to the levy?

Mr. Casey: Yes.

Mr. McANANEY: When the member for Frome gets up he can say how it agreed to it.

Mr. Casey: It was quite happy about it.

Mr. McANANEY: It agreed to it only after a certain degree of blackmail: it was threatened that its licence would be suspended if it did not pay the levy.

Mr. Casey: You said the firm did not agree to the levy, and I said it did. Talk sense! Don't talk nonsense.

Mr. McANANEY: I have looked over the abattoirs. Only last Wednesday I was with the owners of this meatworks. I have seen

them at least six times in the last two years and they have stated their case. The Managing Director of Metro Meat Limited was hostile about this. We have asked questions in the House. The cutting down of the quota it is allowed to bring to Adelaide and forcing them to accept it is a different matter.

Mr. Casey: Its quota was completely revised.

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member can speak later. I am saying that this is the evidence that was placed before Mr. McCall, the man that the new, energetic, livewire Minister of Agriculture appointed.

Mr. Casey: No-one is denying that.

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member has a guilty conscience about something.

Mr. Casey: You said Metro Meat Limited wasn't in favour of the levy.

Mr. McANANEY: The Murray Bridge company acquired the abattoir in July, 1963. Subsequent to this acquisition the premises were reconstructed to export requirements and became registered in 1966. In July, 1963, 13 men were employed, but by December, 1967, the total number of employees was 203. That was a big increase in the number of people working for the company, and it aided in the decentralization of industry. The company has a normal killing capacity in an eight-hour day of 2,000 to 2,200 sheep and lambs and 90 to 110 cattle and the works include a modern boning-out room, with associated blast freezing installations.

This operation was of tremendous assistance during the drought period. Had it not been for the establishment of Metro Meat Limited and the Murray Bridge meatworks, it would not have been possible to cope with the many sheep that had to be killed last year because of the drought. About 1,000,000 sheep would have either died on the farms because of starvation or depreciated considerably in value but for these works. These meatworks are doing all the boning-out for export, because the loose control at present existing at the Metropolitan Abattoir does not enable the production of a pack satisfactory for export. Despite what the member for Frome says, I have seen both works in operation and I know the managements of both works well. The companies cannot afford to put the meat through the Gepps Cross abattoir. The former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Bywaters) cited the amount of boning out carried out at the metropolitan abattoir. It was practically nil, because the quantity of



lean meat required could not be secured unless there was strict supervision at the metropolitan abattoir, and there was not that supervision. I have seen 90 lb. wethers at the Murray Bridge meatworks with fat 2in. thick on their backs, and that has been cut down and exported under satisfactory conditions.

The process of killing for export requires accuracy, because if killing is not done under satisfactory control money may be lost. For example, 2c or 3c a pound can be lost on each slice of 2 lb. or 3 lb. that is needlessly cut off steak. This company will be in difficulty because of the ¼c a pound levy. The cost of meeting this charge will be \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year, and the company has \$500,000 capital. Therefore, that cost represents 1 per cent of the company's capital, and the matter is serious because of the present keen competition. This is the type of thing that will concern this new, energetic, livewire Government, which is well experienced in industry, law, farming, and all the things necessary to control and run a State efficiently. It has been said that the Leader of the Opposition claimed to be responsible for amazing improvements and reforms, yet during his Administration last January the young people leaving school were unemployed. What did that energetic Government with the new form of administration do? More than \$200,000,000 worth of work had been passed by the Public Works Committee; it had \$9,000,000 in the Loan funds kitty, which it should have spent to provide work. Of course, not only that \$9,000,000 would be involved, because that sum, when put into circulation, would spread out and start another industry, which would then further spread out into other fields. One could see how our economy could be boosted in this way. However, that money was left lying idle, and the then Premier got up on television and said, "It is all right, boys; if I draw a cheque on the trust funds I have used for other purposes, I can pay it tomorrow, because I can balance the Loan Fund." What sort of statesmanship is that? Is that a new form of finance? It is almost unbelievable when one thinks about it.

Now, in these 100 days the plans are being made, wheels are beginning to turn and we will see a boost of confidence in this State instead of a declining population. When the Labor Government was in office only one State was having difficulty in maintaining its population. I refer, of course, to Tasmania, which has had many difficulties, not the least because

it has had a Labor Government in power for 30 years. Of course, they have other problems as well. With a State like South Australia which, through the genius of the great reformer (Sir Thomas Playford), was built up with a strong foundation, it is only a matter of getting confidence back again.

The Leader of the Opposition said that South Australia was the backward State regarding social services. Admittedly, unemployment in 1961-62, which was a very bad stage in South Australian history, was high. However, it certainly was not the highest in Australia, and at that time we were reasonably well off. Let us examine the extent of expenditure per capita on universities in South Australia. In New South Wales, \$2.54 was spent; in Victoria \$1.29 was spent; in Queensland it was \$1.66; and in the backward State of South Australia our expenditure a head of population was \$3.59. No other State spent that much.

The total amount spent on education was \$31.42 a head of population in New South Wales; Victoria, that wealthy State, spent \$29.89 a head; and South Australia spent \$33.06 a head of population. That is the backward State in social services that members opposite talk so much about. These figures have been obtained from the Commonwealth Statistician, if members have any doubts about them.

Mr. Casey: For what year?

Mr. McANANEY: For 1961-62, the grand total expended on relief for the aged, law, order and public safety, education, public health, etc., in South Australia was \$55.63 a head of population. New South Wales spent \$55.64, so that State beat us by only about 1c a head. The total in Victoria at \$53.93 was \$1.70 below.

Mr. McKee: That is understandable, because it was a Liberal Government.

Mr. McANANEY: In 1961-62 there was a Labor Government in New South Wales, which was one reason why there were difficulties in the Commonwealth Government's taking over education, because it would have required many dollars to bring schools in New South Wales, with a Labor Government, up to the standard of schools in other States. It was backward with a Labor Government. The Leader of the Opposition spoke about the tremendous boost on social services when the great reform Labor Government took office in this State. For 1962-63 expenditure on social services increased by 13.5 per cent. In

that year this State received less money from the Commonwealth Government but there was an increase in our income of 5.7 per cent. For 1963-64 there was an increase of 11.25 per cent in expenditure but the increase in income was 10.8 per cent. For 1964-65 there was an increase in expenditure of 12.6 per cent, with an income increase of 12.3 per cent. The Labor Government then had received an additional sum from the Commonwealth Government to help, but it still got into financial trouble.

Mr. McKee: What about the drought?

Mr. McANANEY: The Commonwealth Government provided \$60,000,000 for drought relief in three years, but when the then Premier wrote a three-page letter applying for drought relief he himself had not allocated any money for it and, as a result, this State received only \$1,000,000 out of the \$60,000,000.

Mr. McKee: You don't think the drought had any effect on the economy of the State.

Mr. McANANEY: The last drought did, but the Labor Party cried "drought" the first year it was in power when there was nothing to cry about, as we had a record wool cheque. Each time the Labor Government ran the State further into debt it cried "drought".

Mr. Corcoran: Where was the drought?

Mr. McANANEY: The Labor Government in this State cried "drought" when there wasn't one.

Mr. Corcoran: Was there a drought in the Eastern States?

Mr. McANANEY: In 1965 there was.

Mr. Corcoran: What effect did that have on the economy?

Mr. McANANEY: They kept their employment figures up and went very well. Car sales in South Australia were much reduced during that period. In 1965-66 there was an increase of expenditure on social services of only 5.4 per cent in this State. No doubt that was caused by the Labor Party using Loan funds to make up the difference instead of using money it received from the Commonwealth Government. Money was used for wasteful things such as a Liquor Royal Commission Report that cost \$250,000 but was not used.

I was in the House at the end of a session when a particular debate was in progress. I had not read the report of the Royal Commission into the Licensing Act. Indeed, I had not intended to read that report before

the relevant measure came before the House, but a certain gentleman became excited about it and said that I should have read the report. However, when the Licensing Bill was introduced, that gentleman ignored the report: as far as he was concerned, the measure became the "Hotelkeeper's Bill", because he frequently had to rush to the head of the Australian Hotels Association to see what he could do. This is the sort of instance in which money was wasted.

Mr. Casey: To whom are you referring?

Mr. McANANEY: The gentleman is a sportsman who comes into my area occasionally.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest the honourable member has his conversation after the House adjourns.

Mr. McANANEY: What I have said gives the lie to the statement that the Labor Government was responsible for such a tremendous expansion in social services and education. Whilst on the subject of education, I support what the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) said today in one of the finest speeches made in this House for a long time.

Mr. Hudson: You certainly need someone qualified to be Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. McANANEY: He was very constructive in what he said, particularly regarding education. I, with the honourable member, am on the Public Works Committee, and it seems to me (although I am not trying to say that the standard should be reduced) that savings could be made regarding many schools: schools could be built to a price yet still provide good accommodation. Land has been bought for a new high school at Victor Harbour, but it will be a long time before that high school is built, and the present school will remain congested. Those concerned are trying to improve conditions at this school. If schools are to remain for only another few years, it seems that a change of policy ought to be adopted in this regard. This might afford the opportunity for other schools to be brought up to the required standard.

The Workers' Education Association residential college at Goolwa first received great assistance, by way of a subsidy, from Sir Thomas Playford, and it has now reached the stage where it must expand. The need to expand also applies to the association's classes in Adelaide. Admittedly, there are three groups of adult education service in South Australia: the Education Department

itself, which is very good; the Adult Education Department at the Adelaide University; and the Workers' Education Association. All three institutions provide a useful service to the community in catering for different types of people. These three bodies now work in co-ordination, and I think they are an effective force in our education system and provide a good service. The Workers' Education Association is providing a particular sort of education for a particular type of person, who would not receive such education in normal Education Department classes. At present these people receive an education at a much lower cost, I imagine, than they would otherwise, but more assistance given in this regard would be valuable indeed.

To show the value of the residential college, I will refer to some of the organizations conducting classes: Summer Painting School, South Australian Chess Association, Festival of Arts, Australian-Indonesian Association, Wattle Park Teachers College, South Australian Rural Youth Association, Farm Management School, and so on. Every weekend and during some weeks many people attend the college, which is a valuable adjunct to activities in the area. I believe this organization deserves consideration when the Budget is being prepared, because assistance from the Government would enable it to provide additional accommodation. The organization works for itself by running the book room at the university from which it makes considerable funds to which any assistance from the Government would be added.

In New Zealand, France and other countries only the totalizator form of betting is used at race meetings, which results in a better type of racing. People who bet with bookmakers do not make the same contribution to State funds as those who bet with the totalizator. Some of the leaders of racing in South Australia have now concluded that racing here would be better off if there were no bookmakers. I believe that their abolition would be a good move, as I have suggested before. If only totalizator betting were used, all people having a bet would make the same contribution to the State finances and also to racing.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Bookmakers do not operate in New Zealand.

Mr. McANANEY: New Zealand and France do not have them, and racing is much more successful there. Although the roads in South Australia have been developed greatly, I want to make a criticism. Although I am not an engineer and do not understand what is needed

to construct a modern road, I cannot help wondering, as I drive through the Adelaide Hills (as I do at least twice a week), why it has been necessary to make a cutting in the hill at the Measday Hill site. Previously at this site there was a straight section of road one mile long. To the layman, the logical thing to do appeared to be to build another straight section alongside the section already there. It appeared that this could have been done cheaply with the other road being used while it was constructed. However, the new road has a curve in it, which seems unnecessary. Months were spent in cutting the hill; apparently some difficulty arose with the rock. This has probably cost twice as much as a road straight up the hill would have cost. I admit that some engineering reason may exist for what has happened but, if things like this are done, a public relations officer should be employed to explain to the public why they are done. Actually, the department built a road alongside a property that I used to own; they installed 2ft. pipes with expensive concrete head walls. I have been there for 45 years and there has never been such a quantity of water, nor do I think such a quantity will go through there during the next 45 years.

Mr. Corcoran: You would be the first to complain if the water got through.

Mr. McANANEY: If that happened my house would be submerged and I would be swimming flat out for Sturt Point. There is no watercourse within five miles of the property; a cloudburst would be necessary to provide the necessary quantity of water. Although I should not like to interfere with activities in the District of Millicent, I must tell the House something I heard when I was in Robe recently. When the Highways and Local Government Department widens roads it acquires land, and at the location of a bend there is much land left and this becomes infested with noxious weeds that the landowner must clear.

Mr. Corcoran: Must he?

Mr. McANANEY: I think he must clear his half of the road.

Mr. Corcoran: Look at section 21 of the Weeds Act.

Mr. McANANEY: If that is true, the honourable member should tell his council that it is the case. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 9.32 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 31, at 2 p.m.