

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 2, 1968

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

COMMONS VISITORS

The **SPEAKER**: I draw the attention of the House to the presence in the Speaker's Gallery of Mr. Cyril James, B.A., and Mrs. James. Mr. James is a Deputy Principal Clerk of the House of Commons and is attached to the Commons Select Committee on Education and Science. On behalf of members of the House of Assembly, I warmly welcome Mr. and Mrs. James to South Australia, and I trust that their short sojourn in this State will be both enjoyable and beneficial.

QUESTIONS**RENTAL-PURCHASE HOUSING**

Mr. **HUDSON**: On September 18 the Minister of Housing, in reply to a question I had asked a few weeks previously in relation to rental-purchase housing, gave certain figures about actual expenditure on housing by the Housing Trust last year as against this year. However, he did not explain why there was such a dramatic difference in the proportion of rental-purchase housing in the total trust programme, or even as a proportion of the total rental programme. For 1967-68 the rental-purchase programme represented almost 50 per cent of the total, whereas for this financial year the rental-purchase programme covers only about 25 per cent of the total. That seems to me to involve a substantial change in policy by the trust. I am concerned to find out why such a change of policy may have been made: whether the rental-purchase programme has not been going as well as the trust had originally hoped, or whether a deliberate change in policy has been made by the Minister himself. Will the Minister explain to the House the reason for this drastic curtailment of the rental-purchase programme, both in absolute figures and as a percentage of the total trust programme or of the total rental programme?

The Hon. G. G. **PEARSON**: I will examine this matter again, at the honourable member's request. I recall his raising it earlier. There has been no administrative interference on my part with the trust's policy or programme.

However, I will re-examine the matter and see whether I can bring down to the House, probably tomorrow or early next week, anything further that would be of value to the honourable member or to the House.

RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. **McANANEY**: Can the Treasurer say whether the approach to the investment market by the Australian Resources Development Bank, publicized while the Electricity Trust loan was on the market during the latter half of September, was approved by the Australian Loan Council in accordance with a gentlemen's agreement, and whether the approach interfered seriously with the Electricity Trust's borrowing?

The Hon. G. G. **PEARSON**: I invited the honourable member to ask me a question along these lines because I wanted to comment to the House on these matters. The Australian Resources Development Bank, although formed with the approval and support of the Commonwealth Government and the Reserve Bank, is not a statutory body but a corporation jointly owned by the trading banks. It therefore was not required to seek the approval of Loan Council in respect of its approach to the investment market as to timing, amount, or terms of the borrowing. It is, however, clear that the Australian Resources Development Bank is amenable to the influence of both the Reserve Bank and the Commonwealth Treasurer in these matters. It is to be regretted that the approach was permitted at that particular time and at such relatively high rates of interest, particularly as I had been at pains to ensure that both the Commonwealth Treasury and Reserve Bank were made aware of the exact timing of the Electricity Trust's operation. I was even more disappointed at the lack of co-operation with Loan Council in this matter, as successive Treasurers in this State have consistently used their influence to co-ordinate the borrowing activities of the South Australian Gas Company in conformity with Loan Council procedures, although the company is not a statutory body bound by those procedures. It is recognized that the resources bank has a very valuable part to play in the development of the Australian economy, but the extraordinary diversion of funds to the extent of a reported six times over-subscription on opening day does indicate that its rates of interest are very seriously out of line with the rates payable by statutory bodies. Obviously, the resources bank operation seriously interfered with the success of the trust's loan, and I will take up the matter

again with the Commonwealth Treasurer. In this I am sure I shall have the support of the other State Governments.

The ultimate success of the trust's \$2,000,000 loan was, in the circumstances, most gratifying. The loan was the largest for many years and apart from the intervention of the resources bank there was a variety of other difficulties to be overcome. It followed one of the most severe droughts in our history when loanable funds were seriously reduced. At this particular time there is a large diversion of funds from the lending institutions to the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority. Also, extraordinarily heavy calls are being made on the market by a number of large industrial and financial concerns. In all the circumstances, the ultimate filling of the trust's loan within the allotted fortnight was a most gratifying achievement. This reflects the public's confidence in the trust and its recognition of the vital part the trust plays in the life and development of the State. I believe a feature of the loan was the large number of small subscriptions from the general public, in particular resulting from a direct approach by the trust to its ordinary domestic consumers.

For the information of members, the amount of the loan sought by the Australian Resources Development Bank was \$10,000,000. I understand that on the first day on which the loan was open for subscriptions the bank was offered \$60,000,000 and that it intends to take up \$20,000,000. The Australian Resources Development Bank offered to the public an interest rate of 6 per cent for seven years and 6½ per cent for 10 years. The Electricity Trust loan was offered to the public on the basis of 5½ per cent interest for up to 10 years and 5¾ per cent for over 10 years. I give this information so that members will have before them the precise terms of the two loans to support the statement I made which was critical of the Australian Resources Development Bank for the action it took, at a time when the Electricity Trust loan was before the public, in advertising in the South Australian press the terms of its offering.

NORTHERN MAGISTRATE

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As the Attorney-General will know, there has been a great expansion at Whyalla, the population of which now exceeds 28,000. Will the Attorney-General consider appointing at Whyalla a resident magistrate who could also perform similar work at Port Augusta

and Port Pirie? If that request could be acceded to, I am sure this would facilitate court matters considerably in those three northern cities.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I wish I could give an unqualified answer "Yes" to that question, because I should like to see something like this happen, but at present we are finding it extremely difficult to attract to the magistracy legal practitioners whom it would be appropriate to appoint. This is not new, but is something which has been apparent in the last five years or so.

Mr. Clark: Have you ever thought of making a magistrate's status higher?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have, and I intend to make certain recommendations to Cabinet, I hope within the next few weeks or months, regarding this matter. I think I have referred to it in the House before.

Mr. Jennings: What about resigning and taking it on yourself?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This would be one solution to that problem, but it would cause other problems. I think probably, on balance, I will not do that. However, as it would be one solution, I thank the honourable member for the suggestion. We must do something drastic in regard to our judicial system in South Australia unless it is to break down altogether, but that is a rather wider matter. I will certainly do what I can in this regard because I agree with the honourable member that northern towns as a group deserve to have a resident judicial officer (if I may put it that way).

MITCHAM GIRLS TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about playing fields for students in Mitcham and Unley who attend the Mitcham Girls Technical High School?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: This is a most important school for the honourable member's district and that of the Attorney-General, and I know that this matter has created great interest there. I am pleased to inform the honourable member that public tenders were called and closed on July 23, 1968, for demolishing an old residence and preparing the area for grassing at the school. A section of new fencing and the construction of an area of new pavement have also been included in the project. I approved of the acceptance of a tender for this project on

Monday last, but the successful tenderer has not yet signed the necessary tender documents. I confidently expect that the work will commence as soon as that is done.

CEDUNA ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Mr. EDWARDS: Can the Minister of Works say whether it is possible for a town such as Ceduna to receive assistance for the establishment of single wire earth return services in country districts not connected with an Electricity Trust supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Electricity Trust has a definite policy on the installation of s.w.e.r. lines. Whether or not this applies to the town to which the honourable member refers I do not know, but I will examine the matter and inform the honourable member as soon as possible.

TRAIN PASSES

Mr. VIRGO: My question is complementary to the one I asked yesterday regarding railway passes for railway employees, but on this occasion I am referring to retired railway employees. I am informed that a retired person is not entitled to any interstate passes but that he is entitled to two "destination intra-state" passes for himself and his wife each year. In addition, he is entitled to 12 privilege tickets: that is, tickets at a special concession rate. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to consider increasing the number of these passes, and also to negotiate to have them extended for travel to other States, particularly as there would be no cost whatever to the railways systems?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am glad that the honourable member has raised this matter, because I raised somewhat similar matters during the life of the previous Government but, alas, unsuccessfully. I shall be very happy to discuss the question with my colleague, and I hope that this time there will be a better result.

MAIN ROAD No. 30

Mr. McKEE: On September 25 I asked a question regarding Government grants for work on Main Road No. 30 at Port Pirie, in reply to which the Minister said:

Arrangements are being made to seek approval for the transfer of funds from projects of lower priority to enable reconstruction to be completed. Subject to approval of the transfer it will be possible for work to proceed in the fairly near future.

Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, say whether this transfer has been approved and, if it has not been, will he obtain a report on the progress of negotiations?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not know, but I will try to find out.

HOPE VALLEY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on September 19 regarding the Hope Valley Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Because of the situation of the Hope Valley school on a small area on Grand Junction Road, and because of its position in relation to other schools in the area, the Education Department plans its replacement at some future date. Before the school can be closed, schools will be required at Highbury and Vista to serve the whole area. Sites are held for this purpose including the one mentioned by the honourable member in Beckman Avenue, Highbury. A survey is being carried out at present to assess the need for a school at Highbury, but it is not possible to state when either this school or the one at Vista can be erected.

With regard to the second part of the honourable member's question, it is true that replacement of Hope Valley school has been in mind for some years, as it is not centrally or ideally situated in relation to the rapid development which is taking place in the district. Modbury South, which opened in 1967, was the first stage of a plan to establish a pattern of new schools in the area surrounding Hope Valley. Highbury will be the second stage but the Hope Valley site cannot be abandoned until Vista is also built. The project to replace Hope Valley has therefore not been altered, nor has it been deferred.

FORESTS DEPARTMENT LAND

Mr. CASEY: I was pleased at the statement by the Minister of Forests in another place yesterday that the Government was negotiating with councils in the Adelaide Hills about the purchase of land for development by the Woods and Forests Department. However, I was rather puzzled to read in the *Hansard* proof the Minister's statement that the department bought its land at ruling prices (meaning, of course, at current value on the open market), that there was no compulsory acquisition and that the Government paid Land Board prices for the land it purchased.

The Government cannot have it both ways: it cannot operate on the open market and also pay Land Board valuation. Will the Minister of Lands ask his colleague how much land in the Adelaide Hills the Government intends to purchase, and whether it intends to buy at open market value or at Land Board valuation?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think the honourable member has perhaps misunderstood this matter. All land bought by the Woods and Forests Department is bought under the general supervision of the Land Board. The board delegates the authority and the department operates quite freely in buying the land, although generally under the supervision of the board. It is a commonly held but mistaken view that there are such things as Land Board value and market value and that the Land Board value is the lower. The Land Board valuers are extremely experienced and I think they are more likely to be correct than is anyone else. A Land Board value would not be settled upon as between vendor and purchaser in all cases, but it would be a basis for negotiation, and I am sure that is what the Minister meant. He did not mean that he was referring to Land Board value as a compulsory acquisition value.

GRAIN PRODUCTION

Mr. VENNING: As in the last few days we have received what must be regarded as being the most beneficial spring rains on record, will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Agriculture the estimates of the quantities of wheat, barley and oats that will be delivered this year?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I gave an estimate to the House recently, but I will obtain more up-to-date information.

JAMESTOWN BUS SERVICE

Mr. ALLEN: The co-ordinated bus service from Jamestown to Riverton connects at Riverton with the Broken Hill express three mornings a week and with the Terowie service three mornings a week. It is quite common for these trains to be late, and I have seen women with children on the platform crying because they have missed their appointments in the city. Will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, take up this matter with a view to continuing the road service on to Gawler when trains

are late, to connect with other trains, rather than having passengers waiting around at Riverton?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: In view of the circumstances outlined, I will certainly do this.

BUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the number of buildings being constructed and the number of buildings proposed to be constructed for the remainder of this financial year by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Commonwealth Department of Works has advised that the number of buildings under construction by that department as at October 1 was 46 and that a further 58 buildings are proposed for the remainder of the financial year. These numbers do not represent all buildings under construction in South Australia, as certain instrumentalities such as the War Service Homes Branch and others would have their own programmes. The figures I have given represent the basic main Commonwealth Government construction programme.

COOMANDOOK SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Education Department intends to build a new headmaster's residence for the Coomandook Area School? If it does, when is it expected that this work will be carried out?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to obtain the information for the honourable member.

FLUORIDATION

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I move:

That in the opinion of this House a referendum should be held to decide whether action should be taken by the Government for the addition of fluoride to the water supplies of this State.

On July 30, 1968, the Premier issued a Ministerial statement that Cabinet had decided to approve the addition of fluoride to the public water supplies. When this statement was made in the House I was stunned by the Government's arbitrary action in this matter.

Mr. McKee: A minority Government.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes. The statement meant that Cabinet had made this decision (which may not have been a unanimous Cabinet

decision, as it could have been that only five Cabinet Ministers were in favour of fluoridating the public water supplies). At the last State election no reference to this subject was contained in the Liberal and Country League's policy speech, nor did it appear in the Australian Labor Party's policy speech, so it was not an election issue. When the public of South Australia voted, this matter was not taken into consideration. Had it been considered, it may have affected the way in which some people cast their vote at the election. Therefore, the Government has no mandate for this move, which affects every person in the State.

It could be rightly argued that the Government has no mandate for anything, seeing that it recorded only 43.82 per cent of the total formal vote in this State, whereas the Labor Party recorded 51.98 per cent of the total formal vote and should, therefore, rightly be the Government of the day. I submit that the present situation is unjust enough, but when it could mean that five Cabinet Ministers who would not be members of the Cabinet if electoral justice existed in this State could impose their will on every person in the State, it is outrageous, undemocratic and incorrect.

Therefore, my first point is that the public was not consulted on this matter. My second point is that, if the public was not consulted, their Parliamentary representatives should have been consulted. This, of course, has not been the case. In his Ministerial statement the Premier said:

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.

When making this statement the Premier knew full well that this procedure would achieve nothing. Questions have been asked by members in this House and the information that has been given has been appreciated by the members concerned. Some answers have yet to be given. However, no good purpose has been served by the questions. Also, some members raised the issue during the Budget debate: some spoke for it and some against it. Again, this has achieved nothing. The question, of course, can be raised by a member by moving a motion of some kind, and this is what I am doing now. But, even if such a motion is carried, it will not necessarily mean that the Government has to take any notice of the resolution.

The Government knows that any resolution can be only an expression of opinion not binding on the Government, although any Government believing in Parliamentary procedure should pay proper respect to a majority vote of Parliament. If Cabinet or the Government had been sincere in its offer as outlined in the Ministerial statement of July 30, it would have followed a different course from the beginning and it would have brought the matter before Parliament for discussion in the first place. Such a course would have been well within the scope of the Standing Orders. The only possible argument the Government could advance in support of its action was the following conclusion of the Select Committee that was appointed in 1964:

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

The committee's report was dated October 21, 1964. This Select Committee comprised the present Attorney-General (Hon. Robin Millhouse), the present Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan), the present Minister of Education (Hon. Joyce Steele) and the members for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) and Hindmarsh (Hon. C. D. Hutchens). Incidentally, it is most unfortunate that the Hon. Mr. Hutchens has been taken ill and has had to go home.

The committee heard 19 witnesses, 17 of whom lived in South Australia. Eleven of the South Australians were opposed to fluoridating our water supplies and six were in favour of it. Thirty persons wrote to the committee or submitted documents, and 28 of those people were opposed to fluoridation. The committee members were divided on 13 sections of the report. The members for Yorke Peninsula and Hindmarsh voted against the recommendation, whilst the present Minister of Education and the present Leader of the Opposition voted for it. The motion was carried on the casting vote of the Chairman, the present Attorney-General. However, on August 26, 1964, when advocating in this House the setting up of the Select Committee, the present Attorney-General said:

In spite of what I personally believe (and I would be hypocritical if I did not admit at this stage that the great weight of authority is that fluoridation is beneficial), there is still vocal and persistent opposition to fluoridation.

Therefore, it could be alleged that the Attorney-General had decided this matter before he attended at the Select Committee meetings and before he had heard any evidence. I do

not deny that the Attorney has as much right as any other member to hold views of his own, but I consider that, for this reason, the finding of the committee was, in some respects, a farce. We all know that this is a controversial subject. Obviously, Government members are divided on this issue, as is evidenced by events that have taken place recently in another place, and Opposition members are not unanimous in their views on the subject.

Professionals and laymen are divided, worldwide authorities with wide academic qualifications have advanced fluoride's good effect as a public health measure, but equally eminent health authorities say that fluoride has a detrimental effect on the human body. Some countries have fluoridated their water supplies, other communities have abandoned fluoridation after giving it a trial, and others have declined to use it. All these groups cannot be right; therefore, who is right and who is wrong? Since the Premier's Ministerial statement on July 30, and even before that, I had received considerable correspondence, many telephone calls, and much literature on this subject, from the pro-fluoride groups and from the anti-fluoride groups. I emphasize that most of the individual letters I have received have been from people who mainly oppose fluoridation.

Since becoming a member of Parliament I have never received so many private letters and telephone calls on any subject coming under the jurisdiction of the State Parliament, although during that time some extremely controversial matters have been decided, for instance, the State lottery, the extension of liquor hours, the Totalizator Agency Board, dog racing control, and Sunday sport. I received a small quantity of correspondence on those subjects compared to what I received on fluoridation. Also, any decision of this House on these controversial matters did not mean that the people of the State had to participate in these things, whereas all persons will have to consume fluoridated water whether they want to or not if this present decision is carried out: there is no alternative. If people install rainwater tanks at their houses they still cannot avoid the intake, as fluoride will find its way into vegetables, milk, meat, and fruit; it will be in soft drinks and beer; and if a person visits his relatives, neighbours, clubs, restaurants, or hospitals, and no rainwater tanks are installed there, he will still have to drink fluoridated water.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: It is already contained in some foods now.

Mrs. BYRNE: In these circumstances, perhaps people who are opposed to fluoridation could carry their own water supply, but this would be bordering on the ridiculous. It would be impossible for persons to avoid this intake. In making a Ministerial statement on the matter, the Premier said:

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.

I am concerned with the latter portion of that statement, namely, the dental health of South Australian children. However, this move affects adults as well as children. If the Government wished to provide this extra health measure for children, it could have done so in another way: fluoride tablets could have been supplied free, or at low cost, and distributed, for example, through chemists or schools, and administered through schools or parents, or both. This would give the opportunity to parents who do not favour fluoride to decide for their children whether they should have fluoride. At present free milk is provided at schools, and this is a wonderful scheme, although children are at liberty to bring a note from parents stating that they do not have to drink milk. I realize that what I have suggested may mean extra work for the teachers, but I am sure they would not complain. Nothing is impossible, and a satisfactory scheme that was acceptable to everyone could have been arranged. However, it is apparent from the reply received to a question on August 14 in another place that this avenue was rejected, one reason given being that it was more expensive to supply tablets.

Yesterday, in reply to a question asked in this House on notice by the member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) we were told that the capital cost of fluoridating water supplies was \$160,000, and the total annual operating costs were \$46,000. The total annual cost of supplying fluoride tablets to all children up to 14 years (328,465 children) was given as \$192,000 to \$240,000, depending on probable discounts. These sums were quoted as the basic cost of tablets (distribution costs), and wastage would probably at least equal the basic cost, according to the Minister's reply.

Mr. Riches: Many children wouldn't take the tablets.

Mrs. BYRNE: These figures are, of course, based on the premise that all children would be taking these tablets, but that would not be the case. I am sure that the sum involved would be substantially less, as tenders would be called by the Government, which would buy in bulk. If the purpose of fluoridation is to build up a person's bone structure, improve teeth enamel and prevent dental caries, this can be achieved in other ways, for example, by following a correct diet. I am opposed not to fluoride but to its addition to the water supply, for I believe that the only additive to the water supply should be for the purpose of purification. I believe that the freedom of the individual to choose his own diet and method of health treatment should be preserved, not taken away. I am therefore against the compulsory element involved in the Government's proposed action and, incidentally, I am not alone in this respect. When the House was considering the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into fluoridation in 1964, the former Liberal Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) said on August 26 of that year, at page 602 of *Hansard*:

In many instances it becomes a matter of conscience. I have grave doubts about whether it is in the interests of this House to have teeth treated in this way by compelling many people to have treatment they do not desire. I have grave doubts whether this House should force medical treatment on anyone who does not desire to have it. If the motion had been worded that the House should confirm this treatment, I would have opposed it. I could not support something that went against a person's privilege to have the treatment he considered the best for him.

I concur in those sentiments. I therefore submit that a referendum should be held so that all members of the public may have the right to decide for themselves whether or not to accept the addition of fluoride to our water supplies. I commend the motion to the House.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. RICHES: I second the motion *pro forma*.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

AGE OF MAJORITY (REDUCTION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 25. Page 1231.)

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): As there is apparently some ambiguity concerning the remarks I made last week, in that according to a report I heard I was said both to have

supported the principle of the Bill and to have opposed it, I wish to make it clear that, although I am not opposed to the basic principles contained in the Bill, I am opposed to the idea of having three or four matters included in the one measure.

Mr. RICHES: Two bob each way!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No. I am trying to make it clear, so that even members opposite may understand. I am not opposed to the principles of the Bill, but I am opposed to the lumping together of all these provisions within the one measure.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My authority for opposing the Bill in its present form is the remarks made by my learned colleague, the member for Mitcham, now the Attorney-General, and, as such, the principal law officer in South Australia, who says—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Under Standing Orders only one speech is allowed at a time in this House.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is no accident that the member for Mitcham became the Attorney-General, because he was so brilliant in his own field that there was no choice in the selection. If it is sufficient for the Attorney-General to say that it is undesirable to have all these provisions contained in the one Bill, it is sufficient for me also. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): On behalf of the House, I should thank the member for Light for this afternoon being mercifully brief because I am certain that, had he continued with his plaudits of the Attorney-General much longer, I would have had to leave the Chamber and would not have been in a position to rise when he sat down. It appears obvious what Government members' tactics are about this Bill. I support it. I noticed the member for Light telling us that he was trying to express his views clearly enough to be understood by the Opposition. We know his position clearly, even without his speaking at all. He did not have to open his mouth—we knew he was making a specious excuse for not doing something he ought to have done. Last week, I think the member for Light even recommended that 16-year-olds should be licensed to drink. If he wanted to hit the headlines, he did.

Mr. Freebairn: There is a little more behind it than that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light has made his speech.

Mr. CLARK: No-one is more in need of headlines than the member for Light.

Mr. Langley: And what a speech it was!

Mr. CLARK: This Bill aims:

. . . to confer on persons who have attained the age of eighteen years the rights, privileges, responsibilities, and obligations of persons of full age.

It is not only concerned with 18-year-old voters, because this Bill attempts:

. . . to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1965, the Electoral Act, 1929-1965, the Licensing Act, 1967, and the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1967.

Before I say anything in particular on the various aspects of this Bill, I want to comment on some remarks made by members opposite. We find that so far, with only two exceptions, all of them support the principles of the Bill but do not support the Bill. No matter what sort of excuse they make, this is just plain silly. Let me quote a sentence or two from the remarks of the Premier, because I think this sums up his attitude towards this legislation. In his speech he said:

However, I have nothing against a reduction in the voting age, provided it can be introduced uniformly. On this basis I oppose the Bill.

I claim that that is an excuse, not a reason. It seems to me it is perhaps the only excuse the Premier has. Perhaps he would have been wise to take a leaf out of the book of a former Premier. During the last Parliament, when we introduced a measure aimed at restrictive trade practices, Sir Thomas Playford proposed an amendment that it should not become operative until adopted by all States. Had the Premier, and other members who have spoken in the same strain simply because he did, been serious in their support of 18-year-olds voting, they could have moved an amendment and, with their numbers, they would have had no difficulty in getting it accepted. I cannot understand why this was not done. It appears that it is an excuse rather than a reason. Even then, it is not a particularly valid excuse because, on checking the *Hansard* reports of other States, I found that only a fortnight ago a motion to this effect was moved in the Upper House of the Victorian Parliament; and I understand that as recently as last week a similar motion was moved in the Western Australian Parliament. I admit that in both cases,

from the point of view of the Governments in those States, the motion was introduced from the wrong side of the House, as is the case here. I believe that was the real reason for the Government's opposing this Bill, that it came from the wrong side of the House. I need say no more about the Premier's remarks, because the two sentences I quoted sum up the core of his argument in opposition to the Bill: he likes the principle of 18-year-olds voting but he would not support it because it came from this side of the House.

The Attorney-General is a brilliant young man, according to his colleague for Light. When I said that he was appointed Attorney-General by accident, I was not reflecting on him as a person: I meant that the Government was most fortunate to be occupying the Treasury benches at the moment and that, if it was not there, the present Attorney-General would still be a vociferous young man on a back bench digging spurs into the Government.

Mr. Langley: Now he is standing for the plebscite for Boothby.

Mr. CLARK: That is past history. I am sure the Attorney-General would not like me to remind the House about it and, being polite, I shall not. However, we can sum up the Attorney-General's opposition to this measure in a few words. I shall make a short quotation from his own speech:

We do not oppose—

I do not know whether or not that is the royal "We", whether it applies only to him. I do not think it does. I think it applies to all. He said:

We do not oppose the general principle of reducing the age of responsibility from 21 years to 18 years but we consider, first, that the Bill is no good—

he did not quite tell us why it was no good—and, secondly, that this matter should be dealt with not in a package, as the Bill purports to do, but sector by sector of the law.

I do not think that is an argument at all or that he even convinced himself of that. I wish he had bothered to explain the first part of it: "The Bill is no good." It is only an excuse and I think it was summed up by the member for Millicent, the Deputy Leader of the Labor Party in this House, when he interjected in true Australian at that stage and said, "Why not be fair dinkum about it?" In fairness, the Attorney-General might have risen and said briefly, "I do not like this Bill because it comes from the Opposition benches. Therefore, I oppose it."

Then we come to the member for Stirling with his own inimitable and not always comprehensible style. I can say this safely (I do not think he will object to my doing this) and quote from his own words to explain his opposition to this Bill, because this sentence sums up his opposition to it, whether or not he can understand it any better than I can:

I support the general principle of reducing the age of majority. This is happening throughout the world, and there is no doubt that it must come.

And it must come from the Labor Opposition. He continued:

If such a move could be implemented uniformly throughout Australia—

he is back on the uniformity racket—

I should be prepared to support it.

There was nothing else there; there was but a feeble excuse. Sir Thomas Playford, who had long experience over many years here and whom we all detested at times but admired at other times, was much smarter than that.

Then we come to the member for Eyre. He opposed the Bill and began by saying:

I am sure that most 18-year-olds are not stable enough in their thinking to be given voting rights.

He is sure of that. That sums up his speech. It needs no further comment from me. He made his position clear, and we know where he stands. However, I wish to refer to one remark made by the honourable member, because it is the first thing he has said in this House with which I agree, and I know he said it after much consideration. He said, "Young people of today are the citizens of tomorrow." I agree with that. Now I come to the member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles).

Mr. Corcoran: A very broad-minded speech!

Mr. CLARK: I will not have much to say about his speech. I listened to him carefully and I believe what he said was well-intentioned and based on his own personal feelings on this issue. I cannot agree with what he said but he has the right to his own opinions, and at least he is voting against the Bill because he does not like it and not because he does not like us. Finally, I come to the remarks of the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn). We all know he is usually a scholarly and thoughtful type; at least he looks scholarly and thoughtful but seldom proves his scholarliness or thoughtfulness when he speaks. He did not say anything today except to comment on what a wonderful chap the Attorney-General was,

something we all know. However, last week, after he had said something about legalized drinking for 16-year-olds (which of course is nonsense), he said, "I am in sympathy with what is contained in the Bill." However, he will not vote for it for the same reasons as were given by the Attorney-General who, I suppose, was pleased that somebody else followed his line of thought—that the Bill should not be a package deal. Frankly, I do not think the Attorney-General succeeded in explaining just why parts of the Bill were unnecessary.

It is obvious up to date, unless one of the members opposite drops a bombshell before the conclusion of the debate, that, except for one or two who are downright against it, all Government members will be sympathetic to the Bill but will not be prepared to support it. As I have said, I have not heard a sound reason for this opposition. I suppose that, considering the numbers in the House and considering the way members have spoken up to date, the result of this debate will depend not on the debate or on the vote of members on both sides of the House but on the vote of one man. Therefore, I suppose it might be wise if I sat down now and said no more about it. However, after all, I believe this is something worth fighting for. Those of us who bother to read history know that through the ages most moves for reform have been despised and jeered at. If somebody had not fought for lost causes we would still have slavery, child labour, women dragging trollies through coal mines, and voting rights restricted to a handful. Therefore, I will say a few more words about the matter.

Members will recall (and the Attorney-General in particular will remember this, because he had a certain amount of pride in it, as he should have) that in the last Parliament we amended the law to allow 18-year-olds to make valid wills and to deal with real property. I remind the Attorney-General that, after all, this Bill is concerned with the same sort of thing. The Leader of the Opposition opened this debate with a most illuminating speech. Anyone who went to the trouble of reading that speech would be converted to the idea of 18-year-olds voting and doing other things as well. I urge all members to go to the trouble of reading this speech because in it the Leader referred to a recent report of a committee on the age of majority in the United Kingdom, a most informative and comprehensive report. Members who have read this report will know that

the committee concluded favourably on the general age of majority being 18. We must remember, as somebody was reminded last week by the Attorney-General, that this is not the only provision in the Bill, which also contains provision for people to drink at the age of 18. Frankly, I am not one and I never have been one to encourage young people to drink more liquor, but I do not think this provision will bring this about. Young people between the ages of 18 and 21 (and indeed often younger, if they are big enough) drink now. Over the years publicans well known to me have often asked me, "When on earth are you going to do something about this?" I am sure that fairly generally people under the age of 21 who want a drink have one now, and many have one in hotels. It is well to remember that there is a great difference between young people of the ages of 16 to 18 and those of the ages 18 to 21. I have always believed that the age of 18 was a particular point or watershed in the lives of most young people, and I do not believe this provision would encourage them to drink more: I think those who want to drink are doing it illegally anyhow.

We have been asked whether young people mature earlier than they used to do; I believe they do, but I do not think this is altogether the point at issue. Although I will not read several pages, as is sometimes done in this place, I wish to give one short quote from the report of the British committee as follows:

The point is not whether the law fits young people better or worse than it once did, but whether it fits them as well as it should. Much more important than comparing today with yesterday is the straightforward task of observing the young as they actually are now.

I am afraid that, particularly over the last few years, we are being flooded with all sorts of false ideas about young people. I believe many of us (it is hard not to do this), when we read some of the stuff published in the press and periodicals, tend to judge all young people by a few (shall I say?) outlaws. We must remember (and this does not apply only to young people of 18 or 19 years) that those who make the most noise in the community are not necessarily the best people. I submit that probably applies in this place also. It appears to me that most young people lead ordinary, normal, decent lives, as young people always have done. How often have we seen elderly fellows of my age (or older, and even younger) nod their heads wisely and heard

them say that young people are not as they used to be? I submit that there is not much difference between young people today and young people when I was younger. The only difference is that young people today have an opportunity to get about more quickly than we did. However, the position is that some of the things most of us did when we were young we would not be happy about doing now. Such things are not basically wrong, and young people are not too old to feel like doing them.

We must remember, too, that most young people nowadays spend more time at school than young people ever did before. Also, they spend more time studying in their own time, after their formal schooling is finished, than young people have done before. Therefore, they do more work, attend more classes, and do more study in their own homes than was ever the case before. Much of this studying is being done by the very people that other people in the community tend to rail at. That is contrary to the story we were told by one honourable member last week about a certain young teacher who, like Peter Pan, wanted to stay at a certain age forever. Obviously, this young person is not qualified to get the vote anyway.

I am sure that most young people are eager to accept responsibility, and the more responsibility that is given to particular people, the more responsible they will be, and I am quite sure it would be good for 18-year-olds to have this responsibility. It is amusing when one remembers that the 21-year-old vote and the 21-year-old restriction on many things goes back a long way, when the ability and the strength to wear and carry armour was the criterion in these things. Most members will remember that back in the good old days (or back in the bad old days, depending on one's views) knights, when loaded down with armour, and having been dislodged from their horses, could not perhaps get up without assistance. Apparently a man was not strong enough to carry armour until he was 21, and it must seem absurd to all who think about it that the weight of armour, which was the criterion a long time ago, is still the criterion today. This is a little like the time when swords used to be worn in Parliament and when members occasionally used them instead of using their tongues, as we do now. This is a great blessing because I do not fancy myself at all with a sword.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I sometimes wonder.

Mr. CLARK: The Minister might make a very efficient swordsman, but he does not do too badly with his tongue on some occasions. Many conservative people in the community, most of whom are not very young, will hold their hands up in horror at the idea of 18-year-olds being given the right to vote. If one bothered to read old volumes of *Hansard* one would find that there have been some conservative people in this Parliament, and if their spirits haunted their former habitat, I am sure, if we listened carefully enough, we would hear their shrieks at the idea of giving 18-year-olds the right to vote. I refer to people like the Attorney-General, who appears to be young but who in many ways has old ideas. I believe the main opposition to this legislation that we are seeking to put on the Statute books is the horror of many members opposite at the idea of giving 18-year-olds the right to vote. Although they are not saying this (because it is not the right thing to say) I am sure they would prefer the system of voting that prevails for the Upper House in this State. They would prefer every limit possible in voting, and they would prefer that voting be not compulsory.

Mr. Casey: You do not think it is because the other States have not got it?

Mr. CLARK: No, I do not believe that at all. I remind members that this Bill amends four Acts: the Constitution Act, the Electoral Act, the Licensing Act, and the Lottery and Gaming Act. I believe it is right and proper that young people of 18 years should be entitled to these privileges, and I ask all honourable members to think seriously about this and vote in favour of the Bill.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

WATER RESOURCES

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Nankivell:

That, in the opinion of this House, a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into and report upon the water resources of South Australia, the effect of drainage thereon and the possibilities of conservation, and to make recommendations for the effective utilization of such water,

which Mr. Corcoran had moved to amend by striking out "a Royal Commission" and inserting "consultants", and which the Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe (Minister of Works) had moved to amend by striking out "a Royal Commission" and inserting "an expert committee".

(Continued from September 25. Page 1404.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): In rising to speak to this motion it is understood that I am closing this debate.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member speaks he closes the debate. The honourable member for Albert.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to draw attention to that, and I thank you for raising the matter before the House because this motion has been a matter of considerable interest and members of both sides have contributed to the debate. I thank honourable members opposite as well as my colleagues on this side of the House for the thought they have given to this motion.

I introduced this matter because water is vital for the further development of this State. At present there appear to be considerable supplies of water in some areas of the State, so much so that in the South-East we have entered into a comprehensive system of drainage. One may ask whether we can afford to let this drainage water go to sea or whether there is not some better use to which this water could be put. Indeed, one could also ask whether the supplies from which this water is tapped are limited; where do they come from; together with aspects of water conservation not only in the South-East but in the Poldia Basin on Eyre Peninsula; the question of storage on the Murray River; and the volume of water that is available; as well as the amount of development that can take place as a consequence of the water that is available. All this information is vital in planning the further development of this State.

I thank the member for Millicent for suggesting that this matter should be referred to consultants. There is certainly a need for consultants to take part in an inquiry such as this, because some of this work will be beyond the resources of the State Government departments, and some of it will need to be done fairly comprehensively and quickly if any worthwhile results are to be achieved from an inquiry of this sort. On the other hand, I do not believe that consultants should be entirely responsible for the full inquiry. I believe that an inquiry should take place, and that is why I recommended the appointment of a Royal Commission, because such a tribunal is a co-ordinating body which would be able to take and sift evidence, and furnish a report.

I accept the Minister's amendment that this could also be done by a specialist committee comprising not only Government officers but also people with specialized knowledge in the fields of engineering, hydrology and geology, so that someone was co-ordinating a programme of research and so that someone was deputing the work to various Government departments or inviting consultants to undertake the work. Then, it would be its responsibility to report to the Minister or Parliament on its findings, so that the Government, whichever Party it might be at the time, could decide what action needed to be taken and introduce any remedial legislation that might be necessary. I again thank members who have supported the motion in principle, and I ask the House to consider the matter in the general context that this is an exercise that needs co-ordination. I particularly ask the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) seriously to consider not opposing the appointment of a Select Committee, because such an appointment takes into account that consultants definitely will be invited to take part in the inquiry, and this partly covers his proposal.

The House divided on Mr. Corcoran's amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran (teller), Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell (teller), Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Teusner, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe's amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

CHOWILLA DAM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Hudson:
(For wording of motion, see page 633.)

(Continued from September 25. Page 1408).

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): When the debate was adjourned last week, I had almost completed my remarks. The motion is worthy of the support of all members, particularly Gov-

ernment members, if they want to be consistent and progressive and if they have any respect for their promises during the election campaign. The Premier tried to blame the Labor Government for the deferment of the Chowilla dam project, but he did not tell the House what the motion sought to do. Until he gives a more satisfactory explanation, every member should support it.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Works): First, I will deal with the specific points made by the member for Glenelg and then I will expand on several aspects of the Chowilla dam proposal, particularly regarding the matters which the member for Glenelg raised in his speech but which are outside the wording of the motion. I want to give the House as much information as possible because of the interest that I know most members have taken in this subject, which is not only of local and State interest but also, I hope, of some national interest. The South Australian Government firmly believes that Chowilla must be built, that it is essential to the future life and well-being of everyone in South Australia, and that all sections of the community—irrigationists, country and metropolitan domestic users, and future industrial users—depend on Murray River water of assured quality and quantity.

Mr. Casey: Should Chowilla be built now, or later?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: We have to build Chowilla, and the sooner we get it built the better it will be. At the conclusion of my comments on the motion I intend to move an amendment which, I believe, will more fully express the true position relating to the matter we are discussing and, I hope, the feeling of the House. This motion, like the curate's egg, is good only in parts, and it took the member for Glenelg two successive Wednesday afternoons to express himself. He touched on many matters, and I hope to refer to all of them.

The motion is in three parts. The first paragraph is simply a repetition of the motion carried by the House last year; the second paragraph is completely false and erroneous, as I will demonstrate later; and the third paragraph calls on the Government to take a course of action that the previous Labor Government failed to take. I intend to deal with each of these points in logical sequence, and to touch on other points referred to. The member for Glenelg claimed in the second paragraph of

the motion that the present Government withdrew instructions given by the previous Government to South Australia's Commissioner to vote against any deferment or indefinite postponement of Chowilla.

Let us look at what the instructions were and at what happened. The instructions were given in March, 1968, prior to the March, 1968, meeting of the River Murray Commission. The then Minister of Works instructed Mr. Beaney (the South Australian Commissioner) that at the coming meeting of the commission he was not to agree to any decision that would in any way interfere with a dam at Chowilla being undertaken by the commission, and that if the commission discussed any move to undertake alternative works in place of Chowilla or relegated any work at Chowilla to a purely minor undertaking, then he was to disagree. If the matter was taken to a vote, he was to vote against the decision, and thus create a dispute in terms of the River Murray Waters Agreement.

That instruction has never been withdrawn. It has not been withdrawn by me, as Minister of Works, or by the present Government, and Mr. Beaney has stated officially to me that it has not been withdrawn. I say that to give the lie direct to the motion, which states that the present Government has withdrawn instructions given by the previous Government to the South Australian Commissioner to vote against any deferment or indefinite postponement of Chowilla. The first assumption by the member for Glenelg is false and unjust.

Mr. Riches: Did he vote against it without instructions?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will come to that later. I intend to give the House the fullest information I can. The first half of the assumption in the second paragraph of the motion is wrong. Regarding what happened after that, I quote from *Hansard* of June 26, when (as reported at page 138) I gave an explanation of what happened at the April meeting of the River Murray Commission, which was held seven days after this Government took office. On the previous day the Leader of the Opposition asked me what the position was, and I said:

I had a report prepared this morning by Mr. Beaney who, besides being Director and Engineer-in-Chief, is also the South Australian Commissioner on the River Murray Commission. The report, which covers the aspect on which the Leader has sought information, states:

The South Australian Commissioner went to the April meeting of the River Murray Commission with the clear direction that he should not support any resolution to cancel or indefinitely defer the construction of the Chowilla dam. This was given in confident expectation that the issue would not be forced to finality at the meeting. It was realized that the upper-river alternative site had not been investigated to a stage where a reliable estimate could be made of the cost of the alternative—

the alternative that was agreed to in the previous year—

and it was understood that further work would have to be done to justify the most enthusiastic supporter of such a project—

the Mitta project—

in any attempt to substitute it for Chowilla on a short or a long-term basis. Prior to the April meeting an interim report had been received from the consultants to the commission suggesting that Chowilla did not provide adequate salinity control. At the meeting the South Australian Commissioner challenged the data on which this report had been produced and received authority from the commission to make further inquiries from the consultants. This was subsequently done and the consultants agreed to re-examine the whole basis of their interim report. To date, this has not been completed.

It was realized prior to the April meeting that any attempt to put the matter to arbitration at that stage would invite any arbitrator appointed to put the whole matter back to further inquiry into the whole range of benefits sought from Chowilla and to require documentation of proposals made for an alternative. The present situation is that the commission has requested the Snowy Mountains Authority to investigate the physical practicability and the cost of an alternative at Dartmouth on the Mitta Mitta River. On verbal advice it appears unlikely that this investigation will be completed before the end of 1968.

This statement was made when I replied to a question by the Leader of the Opposition about the action South Australia's Commissioner had taken and the views the Government had expressed to him. The House can see from this that our Commissioner was advised to go to the meeting with a clear direction that he should not support any motion to cancel or defer indefinitely the dam's construction. In his motion the member for Glenelg implies that these instructions have been withdrawn, but the statement I have just read shows that this is not so. Let me go further: members will realize that the River Murray Commission has not been presented at this stage with any motion to change the policy initiated at the August,

1967, meeting, when the deferment was agreed to and it was decided to investigate alternative proposals.

Mr. Hudson: Would you have created a dispute in August of last year?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: That is a hypothetical question, because I was not able to do so.

Mr. Hudson: But if you had been able, would you have done so?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I do not answer hypothetical questions. The honourable member was not in that position and I was not, either. I have already said that it is the Government's firm intention to press for the Chowilla dam, and later I may have something to say on how this can be done. All I want to say now is that the commission since the August, 1967, meeting has not been presented with any motion to change the policy to carry out an investigation into the whole study of the benefits to be derived from any new storages on the river. The previous Government had an opportunity to do this, but the opportunity was not taken. This could have been done at the meeting in March of this year. The instruction referred to was given to our Commissioner prior to his attending this meeting. This action was not taken by the previous Government, yet now the honourable member is trying to criticize this Government for not taking it.

The 1963 amendment to the regulations under the River Murray Waters Act, which this House agreed to, included the Chowilla dam in the River Murray Waters Agreement. The first obstacle, as every member will realize, to the immediate construction of the Chowilla dam was cost: if the cost had been reasonable—in the vicinity of the estimate—the dam would have been well on the way by now. If one goes there today one can see the camp site and the preliminary survey works that have been started. Today, the site is like an old mining ghost town; it is a tragedy to see the conditions there and to realize that this work, which was to be the hope of South Australia, is now absolutely dead, with only a caretaker on the site. The first obstacle to the immediate construction of the Chowilla dam lay in this greatly increased cost, and the commission had, of course, by clause 28 of the agreement, the power to programme all the work and to determine "the order in point of time of the construction of particular works". This was the

commission's responsibility. If the honourable member had studied this subject more closely he would have realized that this was the position and that part of his motion was false and inaccurate. In the latter part of paragraph (b) of his motion the honourable member says that the Government has created a serious conflict with the Commonwealth Minister for National Development, Mr. Fairbairn, and that this is "inconsistent with the resolution and contrary to South Australia's interests", yet last week the honourable member, I think in a question, almost advocated the reverse.

Mr. Hudson: I said I had doubts about the words used in this motion and that subsequent events in the last few weeks had almost led me to the stage where I regarded the Commonwealth Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member has now changed his mind a little. How does any move by this Government conflict with last year's resolution, which is the first part of this motion? All the resolution does is to state that South Australia has certain rights and that assurances must be given. I have spoken to the Hon. D. Fairbairn, the Commonwealth Minister for National Development, several times since I have been Minister of Works; indeed, I knew him before I took this office. We have had several discussions, which have been fairly frank and open, and until now we have got on fairly well together. There has been no great dispute between us. I know that he is in no doubt about the attitude of this Government and, certainly, about my personal attitude and that of the Premier on this matter.

Mr. Hudson: Or of the feelings of the Opposition.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I am trying to debate the honourable member's motion, and he has accused this Government of creating a serious conflict that is against the interests of South Australia. The Commonwealth Minister and I have had some fairly frank and open discussions and I have made it perfectly clear that South Australia wants the Chowilla dam. The honourable member, having criticized this Government for creating a dispute, said the other day (perhaps he has now changed his mind) that perhaps we should have a dispute. I say emphatically that, if it is necessary to have a disagreement with the Commonwealth Minister to get the Chowilla dam, I will certainly disagree as hard as I

can—make no mistake about that. In his motion the honourable member is trying to criticize the Government for creating a conflict. I am prepared at any time to have a dispute to get the Chowilla dam.

The honourable member then went on to criticize the Government about the River Murray Waters Agreement: he said that we should before now have invoked the arbitration clause that is clearly set out in the agreement. The previous Government did not invoke the clause, yet the honourable member criticizes this Government because it has not done something the Labor Government did not do. Those members who were in this House when the 1963 agreement was passed (as it was passed by the Parliaments of the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victoria) will recall some of its details. The Chief Justice of Tasmania, or his nominee, was to be the arbitrator. It was said that he came from a State that had not the slightest interest in the Murray River. All the other States, except Western Australia, did have such an interest. To clarify the position, I have obtained the following opinion from the Crown Solicitor:

The provision as to arbitration is clause 58 of the agreement. Before there can be an arbitration, there therefore has to be:

- (i) a difference of opinion among the commissioners;—
that is, the four commissioners—
- (ii) a resolution proposed to the commission by one of the commissioners; or
- (iii) a failure of the commission to concur upon the resolution within two months of it being moved.

Following that an arbitrator could be appointed, but on what basis would arbitration occur and on what basis would the arbitrator decide? No specific instructions are provided in the Act about his terms of reference and what his directions should be. Nothing is shown in the agreement about how the arbitrator should decide and, in the absence of any directions, he must decide according to his view of what is right and proper, having regard to the interests of all parties to the arbitration. This would necessitate a full and detailed examination of all technical evidence for and against Chowilla and a consideration of possible alternative schemes, a task that would be time-consuming and perhaps take six months or longer. The arbitrator must have something to arbitrate between: he cannot arbitrate on Chowilla but must arbitrate between Chowilla and something else, because this is why the arbitrator is called in.

The views I have suggested are further amplified by Mr. Reddoch, the New South Wales Commissioner, on page 8 of the minutes of the River Murray Commission, a copy of which I handed to the member for Glenelg the other day. The arbitrator would have much difficulty in assessing Chowilla alone on its merits; he must compare it with something else. The time to invoke this clause, if it is necessary and desirable (and I hope we do not have to do so) is next year after the investigations have been completed. If it had been invoked earlier we might have lost any safeguard we had and the project could have been a complete flop. Now, we have reserved our rights and powers to have arbitration. Before there can be arbitration there must be something with which to compare the scheme. The alternative proposal, as was agreed in August last year before this Government came into office, is now being investigated. It is confidently expected on the latest advice received that the technical committee's report will be available at the end of this year or early next year and, consequent on that announced result, the arbitration could more properly take place, if we have to take that step. I hope we do not, but we still have an ace up our sleeves. We still have the power; we have not dissipated it as could have been done in the past. It would then have been unsuccessful, because the arbitrator would have been restricted and would not be able to carry out his power according to the intention of this Parliament and the other agreeing Parliaments.

Another aspect of the rights of this State under the agreement was not discussed by the member for Glenelg, although he should have been aware of it. Mr. Reddoch indicated in the minute that I have given to the member for Glenelg that he recognized Mr. Beaney's problem and that Mr. Beaney was entitled to cast a minority vote, but he suggested that in this event it was not likely that an arbitrator appointed under the provisions of clause 58 of the agreement would be competent to decide a policy matter as whether Chowilla should be built as set out in the agreement, or some other storage. Mr. Reddoch expressed doubt whether a difference of opinion on this matter would be a difference of opinion under clause 58. Therefore, there is some feeling in the commission on this matter.

The 1963 agreement added Chowilla as one of the works to be carried out under the agreement, as specified in clause 20. The works then pass to the jurisdiction of the River Murray Commission, which can direct how and

when they are to be carried out. No State can withdraw Chowilla from the agreement without the consent of the other parties to the agreement, and to do this legislation would have to be passed by all parties confirming the withdrawal. This is an added safeguard and I have no doubt that Sir Thomas Playford, as one of the early negotiators, if not the initiator of the proposal and legislation, showed much foresight in the way the agreement was drawn, because it is evident from these points how South Australia's safeguards have been expressed should a disagreement arise. The member for Glenelg then criticized the issue by this Government of the pamphlet, *Fourteen facts about Chowilla*. He criticized and damned it; the only thing he did not do was to call it "*Fourteen damn facts about Chowilla*". This pamphlet has been fairly widely distributed and well received, and its purpose was to set out the basic facts about Chowilla in a simple and readable form.

Mr. Virgo: The Commonwealth Minister did not receive it too well.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I am not worried about that.

Mr. Virgo: You should be. He holds the purse strings.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I am glad that the honourable member is with us again. It was specifically designed to be a simple, readable pamphlet dealing with the 14 basic facts about Chowilla, and was to be followed with a more detailed explanation of these facts, a copy of which I have given to the member for Glenelg. I would appreciate, and I know the Government and its members would also appreciate, the member for Glenelg's assistance and co-operation in promoting and distributing this material, which I am sure he will give. This material should interest members and be of general interest to the public, and its distribution will be arranged shortly. The first question asked in the pamphlet relates to the location of Chowilla. To this the following reply is given:

The reservoir would extend across the border up to Lock 10 at Wentworth. The existing Murray River works comprising Lake Victoria and inlet channels in Frenchman's Creek and the outlet in Rufus River would be completely inundated by the full waterspread. Most of the land covered is at present used for pastoral purposes, relying on natural rainfall and native growth for the growth of food with stockwater provided in some cases from the river. Small areas of intense development would also be covered, particularly in the Lindsay Point and Berrebi areas in Victoria.

In reply to the question about how big the reservoir will be, the pamphlet states that it is designed to be 55 miles long and up to 20 miles wide and it will cover an area of 530 square miles. This is the significant thing: about 45 square miles of the dam will be in South Australia, 215 square miles in New South Wales, and 270 square miles in Victoria, and the water depth adjacent to the main structure will be 55ft. in the submerged river channels, and 35ft. over the river flats; the average depth of the whole water body will be about 20ft. The capacity of the reservoir is 5,060,000 acre feet, which is equivalent to 1,380,000,000,000 gallons, and that is 38 times the storage capacity of all metropolitan reservoirs serving Adelaide. The dam wall, of course, is about 3½ miles long.

The question has often been asked, particularly by people in other States: who will benefit from Chowilla? I have already touched on South Australia. Both New South Wales and Victoria will gain by an increased water yield of about 589,000 acre feet a year, and that water would be available to those States by virtue of the storage in Chowilla supporting the needs of South Australia in the summer months, thus releasing for upstream diversion much of the storage of the Hume dam. The Hume dam does not fill every year, but I have given these figures to illustrate the effect of Chowilla. South Australia needs further regulation of the Murray River to ensure its full allotment of water under the River Murray Waters Agreement. Last summer our supplies were seriously restricted by the lack of water available to the commission for distribution, and the supply to this State was only able to meet our basic needs. There is a difference between the needs of South Australia and those of Victoria and New South Wales: the needs of each of our neighbours are undoubtedly great and real, but equally so are our requirements for our irrigationists and for pumped water.

But there is one basic difference: the whole of our future requirements rely on the Murray River. The whole of many of our country towns, whether it be Whyalla or other towns to the north or, eventually, Keith, plus the whole of metropolitan Adelaide, rely on water from the Murray River. Sydney does not get a drop of water out of that section of the Murray River that flows in New South Wales, nor does Melbourne from the section that flows in Victoria. Therefore, South Australia's needs are completely different from those of

both Victoria and New South Wales. Our diversion needs in this State are simple. Of course, in the drought year we have just experienced, the barrages at Goolwa were closed for a considerable time, allowing us in South Australia to do some accurate river gauging. We have been able to determine the volume of water that is required for pipelines. We are reaching the stage where the proportion of population living in country towns and in metropolitan Adelaide that relies on Murray River water is reaching 90 per cent. Added to this is the volume required for irrigation purposes, and the balance is required for dilution purposes, that is, for the water that runs down the river and through the barrages into the sea at Goolwa for the purpose of cleansing the river and keeping it fresh. We know these figures now, and they are alarming: in a year of restriction, South Australia, with its present population requirements, is facing a real difficulty. The position in a few years' time, with expanded population and industrial works, is worrying to forecast, unless we get Chowilla. The other States are worried about the irrigationists; we are, too, but many other people in this State depend on the Murray River, whereas the other two States are not so dependent. In fact, we read in the paper this morning that, with the new dam constructed outside Sydney, that city is assured of its water supply for many years to come. I have heard that statement before. When I was a boy, I heard it said about Millbrook and, later, about Mount Bold, but those reservoirs do not supply Adelaide today with the volume that we require.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Compared with South Australia, both New South Wales and Victoria have very large areas already under irrigation.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: That is so. The question was also asked: Is this site practicable? Anyone who has seen the site on the Murray River will agree that there is a definite limitation concerning the site of the dam wall, but everyone is agreed that the proposed site is the correct one for this dam. Question No. 5 in the pamphlet referred to earlier is, in effect: Who said that this was so? The authorities that are listed in that pamphlet are completely in agreement on this issue. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has, under the terms of the agreement, the responsibility to develop the design, and the department had consultations with both the United States Army Corps of Engineers and Soil

Mechanics Limited of London, which company was employed for over four years investigating the foundations. The Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electricity Commission gave advice on the matter, and all agreed that this was a good wall; mechanically and hydrologically, the project was feasible and would meet the requirements.

What about evaporation? Evaporation from that storage would be considerable. Let us not blind ourselves to this matter: it would vary, of course, with the depth of water in the reservoir. While evaporation could amount to 1,450,000 acre feet in a year when the reservoir was full, it could be as low as 110,000 acre feet when the reservoir was low. At present the annual average flow of water to the sea is about 9,000,000 acre feet, and the evaporation from Chowilla is consequently not regarded as a major problem. The pamphlet then deals with salinity and in this regard I hope, as I said earlier, that the consultants' report will be much better than the interim report indicated. To the end of July surplus flows of good water amounting to 350,000 acre feet have already been allowed to pass out to sea at the Goolwa barrages. I refer to this deliberately, because at this stage the Hume dam, which is being promoted in conjunction with the Dartmouth scheme above it, is only partly filled, and it is filling slowly. The Hume dam has not filled in every year.

The Dartmouth proposal is upstream of the Hume dam. What is the point in putting much money into a dam that is upstream of a reservoir which does not fill every year? We want this dam to be at Chowilla, which is downstream of all the tributaries of the Murray, including the Ovens River in Victoria and the Darling, Lachlan and Murrumbidgee Rivers that flow into the Murray River. We want the dam downstream of these rivers and not upstream of a reservoir that fills only once in a while. The cost of Chowilla has, of course, been a problem from the beginning. The estimate received was \$68,000,000 as the all-up cost of the tenders and ancillary works. It has been agreed that the boat lock can be deleted. This will take \$6,000,000 off the cost, bringing it down to \$62,000,000. Then we must appreciate that about \$6,000,000 has already been spent on preparatory site works; so, if we subtract the sum already spent, the amount of new money to be found is reduced to \$56,000,000.

There has been much talk and conjecture about what the Dartmouth dam is likely to cost. The figure I heard in conversation not

so long ago was between \$45,000,000 and \$50,000,000. It is a site of 1,500,000 to 2,500,000 acre feet, whereas at Chowilla we are talking of a 5,000,000 acre feet dam. Where is the comparison in cost, bearing in mind that already some of the work has been done at Chowilla? In my view, there is no comparison.

Mr. Riches: Our only concern is why the people who said they were going to build Chowilla do not do so.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I hope the honourable member appreciates it is of concern to us. The people who are parties to the agreement have never said they are disputing this project: the dispute is entirely on the grounds of cost, and the clause of the agreement dealing with costs is the one they are hanging their hats on. Those people having expressed their opposition or dismay, it is our job here to make sure, first, that everybody in South Australia is seized with the importance of Chowilla and, secondly, that we try to convince other people who at present are wavering that Chowilla is in the best interests of this part of Australia.

The question is asked: is South Australia still committed to Chowilla? South Australia's needs are a complete assurance that the full allotment of water will be available to this State in all years, and that this water should be of the highest possible quality. Nothing so far developed by way of an alternative has been shown to give South Australia an equal assurance and, from this point of view, the Chowilla dam must be regarded by everybody as essential to South Australia.

The comments I have just made are the basis of the extra material I have had prepared following the pamphlet of which I have given the member for Glenelg a copy. This is the pamphlet he chose to criticize in his speech. Having produced it, I look forward, as I know I shall have it, to having the co-operation of the honourable member in promoting this material. I appreciate the assistance he is giving me on another committee but I am talking today about this motion.

Then, having dealt with that topic, the member for Glenelg commented upon the problems associated with the minimum flow past Mildura and its possible effect on Chowilla. The base flow concept for Mildura is essentially a device to maintain acceptable

salinity levels at the downstream end of Victoria's irrigation demand. The minimum flow at Mildura sought by Victoria at 800 to 900 cusecs was reduced in the later studies to 300 cusecs. In this, New South Wales is adversely affected by the maintenance of the high flow level at Mildura for the Darling, as it prevents the exchange of water from the Menindee Lakes scheme, which is on the Darling, for Murray water that they may want for diversion farther upstream above the Menindee Lakes, because the outlet for these lakes in South Australia.

The problem to which the honourable member referred (the minimum flow past Mildura) has been largely solved. Victoria wanted a rate of 900 cusecs. South Australia did not agree. In particular, it was New South Wales that objected to this rate, and I believe that a figure of about 300 cusecs will form the basis of future minimum flow. This 300 cusecs eliminates much of the technical criticism about the efficiency of the Chowilla dam. This is a major breakthrough because, if we can maintain this acceptable limit, many of the technical difficulties and objections to Chowilla will disappear. This is one of the things on which the Victorians were hanging their hats. It was a solid bogey and quite a red herring.

Mr. Ryan: But the biggest red herring was your statement that you were going to build Chowilla, irrespective.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: One of the bogies in this House is the honourable member. Possibly, he did not hear what I said at the beginning of my speech. I think the words I used were, "We want Chowilla; we must have it, and we are going to see that we get it."

Mr. Ryan: You said that you would build it, irrespective.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: What I am trying to postulate today is an indication to this House of this Government's intention to press on with Chowilla. If a storage is developed above Albury without Chowilla, the flow at Mildura will exceed this minimum of 300 cusecs for most of the time. No final arrangement for minimum flow at Mildura seems likely, however, until the salinity consultants to the commission have delivered their findings to the commission, which will be about the end of this year (perhaps a little later), and they have been fully examined. I hope this 300 cusecs minimum flow can be accepted.

The honourable member then touched on matters of both salinity and evaporation. I have touched on these myself and do not want to go further on this until the consultants to the commission have brought down their report. I feel confident that the final report on salinity will be much more favourable than the interim report was. I said that the South Australian Commissioner did not accept fully some of the findings of that committee. In fact, he thought that some of the bases of its calculations were erroneous. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has itself undertaken much work and submitted the results of its investigations to the commission's consultants, who have programmed them on their computer. I do not want to expand on this at the moment but am confident this matter will prove to be much more favourable, or less adverse, for us than was at first thought. This looks like eventuating at about the end of the year.

Mr. Riches: Has there been any change of heart about Chowilla on the part of any of the engineers?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: There has been no change of heart on the part of the E. & W.S. Department's engineers. I personally, as I have said, have spoken to the Commonwealth Minister and to my counterparts the Minister of Works in Victoria and the Minister of Works in New South Wales. I have had conversations with Mr. Reddoch the New South Wales Commissioner, and with the acting Commissioner for Victoria. What their engineers are talking about I do not know and am not competent to speak on, but there is no change of heart on the part of the South Australian engineers.

Further, many private engineering consultants, too, have expressed their desire to support Chowilla. There is no question in the commission about whether the dam wall is technically possible or feasible: all are agreed that it is correctly designed and will do the job. The only difference that has occurred has been at another level—the level of the cost.

I have spoken at length on this matter because Chowilla dam is probably one of the most important matters to come before the House in a long time, and decisions taken by the House and by the River Murray Commission over the next few years in relation to it will have a great effect on the future of the State. If we can get Chowilla, we will ensure the expansion of the facilities of the State,

enabling more people to come here to live in various parts and enabling industry to expand. However, if we do not get Chowilla we could stagnate. Let us not delude ourselves in this regard—we cannot expand without Murray River water.

The alternative site at Dartmouth now being examined by the commission is so far above Renmark that from the day the water was ordered to be released from that dam it would take about six weeks at least to reach Renmark. What we need are immediate supplies which we can see at our border and which we can physically regulate and control. The States of Victoria and New South Wales will receive undoubted benefits (which they were prepared to accept before) from the building of Chowilla, with the water pushing back into those States. However, the people concerned in those States are thinking that, with Dartmouth, they might get some added benefits more cheaply. I believe this is doubtful indeed.

Mr. Riches: It is not security for South Australia, is it?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: No, I agree entirely. Chowilla will give security, future prosperity and development to South Australia, but without Chowilla we could stagnate. I would be happy if, after Chowilla were built, Dartmouth were built, and possibly it would have to be built. However, my order of priority would place Chowilla first. Anything I can do to promote Chowilla I shall be happy to do. I can say that this Government firmly intends to take the view I have taken today.

At the outset of my remarks I said that I intended to move an amendment to the motion that would express the views, hopes and desires of all members of the House (in fact the desires of everyone in South Australia) more properly than would the motion. I have shown today that parts of the motion are simply not true: their concept is erroneous. I have quoted chapter and verse to prove that. Therefore, I move:

To strike out all words after "House" and insert "supports the action taken by the Government to secure for the people of South Australia the benefits of the Chowilla dam proposal."

This means that the motion will read as follows:

That this House supports the action taken by the Government to secure for the people of South Australia the benefits of the Chowilla dam proposal.

If the amendment is carried (and I hope it will be), it will mean that the House affirms the action the Government has taken, and will continue to take, to secure for everyone in South Australia the benefits of the Chowilla dam proposal. If it is not carried, it will mean an expression by the House that we do not want to secure for the people of South Australia the benefits of this proposal. I hope the amendment will be carried.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I have listened attentively to what the Minister has said this afternoon. In his opening remarks and towards the end of his speech he said that the Government favoured Chowilla and intended to see that it was proceeded with. What he said was very different from the type of statements made by members of this Party before the election on March 2. The type of speech he made today was the type of speech that should have been made before the election rather than the promises that were made by the Premier and other members opposite, promises that were expressly intended to mislead the people on the Chowilla proposal. I do not need to stress the importance of this motion which calls on the Government to take those actions necessary to assert South Australia's fundamental and legal right to the Chowilla dam in line with the 1967 resolution, and to honour the promises made by the Premier to the people of South Australia in February last, that one way out of eight to get South Australia moving was to build the Chowilla dam.

Mr. Riches: And that they would build it.

Mr. HUGHES: I was coming to that, because of what the Minister said today. He demonstrated a completely different outlook from that taken by Government members when in Opposition. Before the election, an advertisement in the local newspaper in my district, the Premier made eight promises. I understand these election promises were inserted in a number of newspapers throughout the State. However, I wish to quote from my local paper. The only decent thing I could see in the advertisement was the photograph of the Premier. It was headed "Eight Ways the L.C.L. will get South Australia Moving", and the seventh of these ways was said to be by "Improving water supplies by completing the Chowilla scheme". At that time, when the then Leader of the Opposition was setting himself up as an alternative Premier, he should have realized that he had limited knowledge on the subject and would not be able to honour that promise.

This is further substantiated in the policy speech that the Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, made prior to the election when he said, referring to Chowilla:

My Party started the Chowilla dam plan and obtained the approvals of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth, Victoria and New South Wales for it in 1963. The Walsh-Dunstan Government, its gaze on other things, was caught unprepared for interstate resistance in 1967.

Now, after agreeing to a deferment of its building, the Premier talks of a vague delay, while our householders, our industrialists, and potential investors ask the vital question, "Has South Australia enough water for its foreseeable future development?" We ask for your support now to complete the Chowilla project. In Parliament—

I presume he is talking of last year—

we urged the Government to appoint an expert committee to investigate our water needs and resources. Their answer was to defeat the proposal and then turn around and appoint an overseas firm to carry out an identical survey: This is what we shall do: get on with the Chowilla plan and take every sensible action to safeguard the quality of Murray River water:

Mr. Riches: But they didn't say when.

Mr. HUGHES: No, they did not, because they knew perfectly well, in setting this up in the policy speech, that they would not be able to carry it out without the assistance of the other States and of the Commonwealth Government. Yet the present Premier went out to the people of South Australia and said, "We will get on with the Chowilla dam", knowing all the time that he would be unable to proceed in any way unless he had the whole-hearted support of the other States and the Commonwealth.

A short time ago the Premier became very annoyed when I said in this House that members of his Party had made statements during the election campaign that if the people elected an L.C.L. Government positive action would be taken to build the Chowilla dam. However, I was only reminding the House of what the Premier had said. I do not know whether the Premier was annoyed with members of his own Party or whether he was annoyed because I reminded the House of promises that had been made by him and his colleagues, promises that each one knew to be phoney and of the lowest kind of electioneering I have known during the 11 years I have been privileged to be a member of this House. Not only did the Premier give an unqualified undertaking in a paid advertisement to complete the Chowilla scheme, but in the Kadina Town Hall on February 12 last he is reported as having pledged his Party

to build a large water storage, meaning, of course, Chowilla. Again, I quote from the *Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta Times*, in which the following article appeared:

Mr. Hall pledged that if his Party were elected to power, a large water storage would be built. South Australia must have a large enough supply to provide for several dry years.

Again, that was an unqualified undertaking given by the Premier of the State. He would have had the people believe that his Party would build the Chowilla dam and that there was no difficulty in the way.

Mr. Rodda: That is not correct.

Mr. HUGHES: That is true. The Premier's speech and other speeches made by members of his Party in the district I represent were specifically designed to mislead people into thinking that if an L.C.L. Government were elected to office it alone would complete Chowilla; it was as simple as that. No mention was made about the River Murray Commission, New South Wales or Victoria, and there was no mention about the support of the Minister for National Development through the Commonwealth Parliament. Oh no. They said, in effect, "All you have to do is to go L.C.L. and leave the rest to us; we will complete the Chowilla scheme."

Members interjecting:

Mr. HUGHES: It is all right for members opposite to become excited. I can understand that, because here is a paid advertisement in which the Premier promised to improve water supplies by building the Chowilla dam.

Mr. McAnaney: We are getting nauseated.

Mr. Burdon: You have touched on a soft spot.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, a very soft spot, because members opposite hate to be reminded—

Mr. Riches: — of the lies they told.

Mr. HUGHES: No, I would not say that. I am not in the habit of referring to them as liars. However, how can they lie their way out of this paid advertisement?

Mr. McAnaney: We are getting South Australia moving.

Mr. HUGHES: What we on this side of the House are concerned about is getting Chowilla going.

Mr. McAnaney: Aren't you interested in getting the whole of South Australia going?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, we are interested in the whole State but this debate concerns the Chowilla project, and that is what I am referring to, and I am not going to let dumb clucks like the member for Stirling lead me off the question. Regarding the paid advertisement and the misleading statements that were made in the Wallaroo District prior to the election, one L.C.L. speaker at Moonta Bay stooped as low as a snake wriggling on the ground, and that is putting it mildly. He tried to say that the former Minister of Works (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) was responsible for Chowilla not being built by wasting his time in having washers fitted to leaking taps. This member from another place knew perfectly well that the fitting of washers to taps by Engineering and Water Supply Department employees had no bearing on the building of Chowilla but saved this State from severe water restrictions during last summer, not by the amount of water saved through the fitting of washers but by the excellent publicity it created throughout the State, making people conscious of the need to conserve water following one of the driest seasons on record. This same person would have been the first to condemn the Minister had water restrictions been introduced in this State. Instead of criticizing the former Minister of Works, he should have been applauding him for the excellent manner in which that Minister handled an extremely serious situation. I maintain that, despite what the present Minister of Works has said, the Premier should be doing much more than he is doing about having the Chowilla dam proceeded with.

It may be that, after making two serious blunders, the Premier is at a loss to know what to do next. First, he tells the people of this State that he will complete Chowilla, and then he promptly proceeds to withdraw instructions previously given by the former Government to the South Australian representative to vote against any deferment or indefinite postponement of the Chowilla dam; secondly, he produced an attractive pamphlet, *Fourteen Facts about Chowilla*, which only brought down the wrath of the Minister for National Development and which, from the report in the *Advertiser*, has made that Minister an enemy of South Australia, particularly regarding Chowilla.

I am concerned to learn from the Minister for National Development that the 15,000 pamphlets distributed (as the Premier told the House) through the magazine of the Murray Valley Development League and to

members of the Commonwealth and State Parliaments, at a cost of about \$1,000, are inaccurate. This information was released to the press by a member of the Commonwealth Parliament who belongs to the same political faith as the Premier. Therefore, I consider that what Mr. Fairbairn said must be true. Before quoting the remarks of the Minister for National Development, in support of my statement I want to refer to page 180 of this year's *Hansard*, which contains a question by the member for Glenelg seeking information on the printing of the pamphlet, and the Premier's reply, as follows:

Mr. HUDSON: Concerning the pamphlet entitled *Fourteen Facts about Chowilla* prepared by the Government, can the Premier say to what audience this pamphlet was directed, whom it is designed to convince, how many have been printed, and at what cost?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will obtain the exact figures tomorrow but, from memory, 15,000 have been printed at a cost of about \$1,000. Distribution through the magazine of the Murray Valley Development League has been about 8,000, and it has been sent to members of the Commonwealth and other State Parliaments. It is not a pamphlet designed to convince some people, although some need more convincing than others; but it is already evoking interest, and I have already had a Labor Senator writing for more information following the issue of this pamphlet.

Mr. Hudson: Did any of your colleagues write in and ask for further information?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, we have received much correspondence. This is a non-Party effort to show those who read the pamphlet that this Government is still interested in the project and that there are simple facts that can be used to correct the misconceptions that have been evidenced, in the Commonwealth Parliament, for instance.

Apparently Mr. McLeay, M.H.R., had received one of the pamphlets on the 14 facts about Chowilla and was anxious to have it checked with the Minister for National Development, because he would be one of the members charged by the Premier with misconception in the course of the Premier's reply to the member for Glenelg, who interjected, "Did any of your colleagues write in and ask for further information?" It is quite evident that members of both Parties in the Commonwealth Parliament are sick and tired of the false promises and inaccurate statements made by the Premier and his colleagues; hence this press release of August 2 last:

Challenge on Chowilla: The Minister for National Development (Mr. Fairbairn) has taken the Premier (Mr. Hall) to task over the accuracy of a pamphlet printed by the State Government on the Chowilla project. In a

letter to Mr. McLeay, M.H.R., Mr. Fairbairn says the pamphlet, "*Fourteen Facts about Chowilla*," contains only one non-controversial fact—the location of the dam site.

It was written in reply to a letter from Mr. McLeay seeking clarification of the official attitude to Chowilla. The reply says: "I have always stated that no decision will be made by the River Murray Commission at least until the end of this year when . . . our studies . . . will be far enough advanced for the commission to make a decision on technical grounds. Until that time any discussion of the subject must lack a full knowledge. At the outset I repeat how disappointed I am that the Government has seen fit to produce this pamphlet." Mr. Fairbairn's letter says the average depth would be 16ft. at full supply level, a point of major significance in relation to evaporation losses.

Previously, in referring to the pamphlet Mr. Fairbairn had said that it gave the depth of the Chowilla dam as "up to 55ft." The report continues:

The pamphlet quotes the Snowy Mountains Authority, Soil Mechanics Limited, of London, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Engineering and Water Supply Department as backing the feasibility of Chowilla. Mr. Fairbairn says the outside organizations were only consultants to the Engineering and Water Supply Department on individual features of the project. On salinity, the letter says: "We are looking to our consultants to advise on this point. However . . . I cannot conceive that, in the long run, the average salinity downstream could be other than increased by the presence of Chowilla reservoir."

The ill-timed pamphlet to which the Minister for National Development has taken umbrage could be the let-out that he has been waiting for, the let-out to the local pressures that doubtless he has been subjected to in the District of Farrar, which he represents in the Commonwealth Parliament. I am not agreeing with the Commonwealth Minister on his statements in connection with the Chowilla dam: far from it. What I am concerned about is that the Premier, because of lack of experience, rushed out a pamphlet which brought down the wrath of the Commonwealth Minister and put him off-side regarding this State.

It is well known that part of the district the Minister for National Development represents has shown a tendency to cold-shoulder the idea of proceeding with the building of Chowilla, and this lack of support has been further evidenced by the actions of other Commonwealth Government members, such as the member for Mallee and the member for Riverina, who believe that the building of Chowilla will increase the salinity content in

a dry year. This opinion was evident from the questions raised by delegates from other States on August 1 at a Murray Valley Development League inspection of the Chowilla site.

Mr. Shannon, Engineer for Construction, Engineering and Water Supply Department, was asked at the inspection whether the question of salinity had been overlooked in the earlier investigation. He said, "It was considered at that time. We do not think there is a problem." He also said other things that are published in the *Advertiser* of August 2 this year. He was asked what action could be taken if the commission decided to proceed first with the Dartmouth dam on the Mitta Mitta River. Mr. Shannon said that the decision had to be a unanimous one. He also said that even if only one Commissioner held out the work could not proceed.

Despite the assurances that were given by that very competent officer, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the E. & W.S. Department, last March that Mr. Fairbairn's views on Chowilla were not shared by the River Murray Commission, the South Australian Government or himself, people in other States are far from satisfied. However, it is the responsibility of this Government to convince people in other States and the River Murray Commission that Chowilla will not increase salinity problems. One of the highest ranking engineers and administrators in the field of water engineering was adamant that the building of Chowilla would not increase salinity problems in South Australia. I refer to Mr. J. R. Dridan, former Engineer-in-Chief of the E. & W.S. Department. A report in the *News* of April 4 states:

Former Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Mr. J. R. Dridan, says the Chowilla proposal must be viewed in its right perspective. For while the cost is apparently \$70,000,000 it should be remembered that one authority, the Metropolitan Water, Irrigation and Drainage Board, was prepared to spend about \$80,000,000 within the past 12 years on the construction of Warragambo dam, with about a quarter of the capacity of Chowilla, and serve Sydney and its environs only. Chowilla, with a capacity of 5,000,000 acre feet would be of immense benefit to three States, and each State would be called on to bear only one-fourth of the cost. One great advantage of Chowilla over all other sites is its location below all tributaries of the Murray River which means that all surplus water, irrespective of its source, must flow into the giant reservoir.

Mr. Dridan pointed out that although storages had been built on the Darling River and its tributaries, there were occasions when it discharged large quantities of very high

quality water which could not be impounded in any reservoir above the junction of the Murray and Darling Rivers at Wentworth. There were also occasions when substantial, uncontrolled flows in the Murrumbidgee, Goulburn and other tributaries entered the Murray and none of these could be stored in a reservoir above Albury, he said. Chowilla is the answer. Mr. Dridan said that Chowilla would not increase salinity problems. He said that Chowilla would lose 20 per cent of its water each year, which would increase salinity in ratio of about five to four. Even if there was no inflow in two years in succession—and there would be some inflow every year—salinity would rise about 50 per cent, but the water would still be of very good quality.

I believe that the sentiments expressed by Mr. Dridan would be supported by the present Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Beaney), but unfortunately he had his former instructions withdrawn by this Government with the result that he supported the move that the commission undertake studies of an alternative storage. He is well aware of the serious situation that faces this State if Chowilla is not built, and would most certainly have voted against the other Commissioners to undertake operational studies on alternative storage on the Upper Murray and allowed the matter to be decided in court if the instructions given by the Labor Government had not been withdrawn. It was the opinion of those who had followed the proposal from its inception that the Commonwealth and the States did not want this to happen. As all major decisions of the commission require the concurrence of all four Commissioners, it required only the dissenting voice of the South Australian Commissioner. The *News* of April 4 further states:

Now, for the first time in 53 years, the commission, which has worked with "goodwill and co-operation," faces its first big test. Under the River Murray Waters Agreement the decision on Chowilla will have to be unanimous. If it is not, then the respective Governments will have to select and agree on an arbiter within two months. If they fail to do this, then the issue will be decided by the Chief Justice of Tasmania. It more than likely would be the first major legal dispute over the Murray River. And this is what the Commonwealth and three States certainly want to avoid. An authority on water told me this week that litigation over water accounted for most American courts' revenue, and that between 600 and 800 lawyers in America were obtaining most of their income from cases over water rights. It was also suggested that if ever a really desperate water situation developed, it was likely that South Australia would be in grave danger of not receiving its allocation. Supposedly, we would have a legal case under the agreement, but insufficient water.

It can be seen from those quotations that the Commonwealth and the other States did not want South Australia to force the issue in a legal way, because they knew that if this happened not only would Chowilla be built but each State represented on the River Murray Commission would never again accept the word or any other agreement drawn up between them. When Victoria became aware of the increased costs attached to the building of Chowilla, steps were taken to arouse suspicion among South Australian fruitgrowers that the building of Chowilla would result in increased salinity. This theory is supported in the article written by Brian Francis. It states:

Chowilla dam may soon be a mere whisper on the winds in the valleys of the Murray River. April 24 is the big day. That is when four men, comprising the River Murray Commission, will sit at a table in Canberra to decide the fate of what would be the largest water storage in Australia.

Rumblings were heard before the walls of Chowilla were even built late in 1966, when South Australian fruitgrower organizations joined interstate counterparts in asking that its construction be deferred. They said they feared increased water salinity if the dam were built. They were led, apparently, by a Victorian organization called the Sunraysia Anti-Salt Action Committee which wanted plans for the dam scrapped altogether.

Mr. Arnold: Which fruitgrower organizations?

Mr. HUGHES: The article refers to "South Australian fruitgrower organizations". Apparently I am bringing the honourable member up to date on several matters this afternoon. A number of people who are taking an active interest in the Chowilla project are prepared to place their views before the public.

Mr. Lawn: Even Government members are very interested in your remarks.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes.

Mr. Clark: You are educating them.

Mr. HUGHES: They certainly need educating. The member for Chaffey should already be familiar with all the articles that have been written on this subject over the last few months. He should have taken this trouble not only in the interests of the people of the whole of South Australia but particularly in the interests of the electoral district he represents.

Mr. McAnaney: Get on with your reading.

Mr. HUGHES: I am upsetting members on the Government side because I am placing the truth before the House. Referring to the charge in the article I have quoted, I think Mr. Dridan, the former Engineer-in-Chief,

answered it very effectively and removed any fears previously held by fruitgrowers that there would be increased salinity if the dam was built. A meeting was held in the Chaffey electoral district, I think, within the last fortnight. I know the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) attended it. One of the resolutions was that the meeting hoped the dam would be built. Mr. Dridan has allayed the fears formerly held by the constituents of the member for Chaffey. Members opposite have not taken the trouble to follow what has been going on regarding this vital matter. I refer particularly to the member for Chaffey, because he has admitted, by interjections, that he is not at all familiar with the article, nor is he familiar with Mr. Dridan's statement.

Mr. Arnold: But I am familiar with all the grower organizations.

Mr. HUGHES: I hope so, because after my speech they will take some convincing that the honourable member is familiar with this subject.

Mr. Rodda: You are a rare bird.

Mr. HUGHES: Members opposite cannot laugh their way out of this. The following resolution was passed unanimously by this House in 1967:

That the State of South Australia has a fundamental and legal right to the construction of the Chowilla dam without further delay . . .

The action of the Government gave an opportunity to the Minister for National Development for making a statement to the House of Representatives, which statement was reported in the *Sunraysia Daily* on June 5, 1968. It is evident that members opposite have not taken the trouble to follow the trend of opinion in other States about this project. Because they have not done so, they are not helping their case at all and they are not supporting the Minister's statement this afternoon that he will see that we get the Chowilla dam. I shall line up with the Minister on that one, because I want the Chowilla dam as much as he does. It will be of great benefit to South Australia.

Mr. McAnaney: Read his speech tomorrow and you will learn a lot.

Mr. HUGHES: If the honourable member does not want to learn, it may be difficult to get through to him, but other members may be interested in building the Chowilla dam and will listen. The article in the *Sunraysia Daily*, headed "Chowilla dam will probably be scrapped", stated:

The Minister for National Development (Mr. Fairbairn) yesterday clearly indicated that the Chowilla dam project on the Murray River would probably be scrapped. He did this when commenting on a seven-year-old report and resolutions of the River Murray Commission. Increased costs and the likelihood of an aggravated salinity problem were against the Chowilla site, he told the House of Representatives. Mr. Fairbairn tabled the report and resolutions in the House following a request from the Senate for all documents about the dam to be made public. Mr. Fairbairn said attention was now being concentrated on a site at Dartmouth, on the Mitta Mitta River, upstream from the Hume Weir in New South Wales.

The increased cost and likely aggravated salinity problem were against the Chowilla site in South Australia. Mr. Fairbairn said the original estimate for the Chowilla dam was \$28,000,000, but when tenders were called it was apparent that it would cost at least \$68,000,000. The high evaporation rate at Chowilla would probably increase the severity of salinity in the river as it flowed into South Australia.

It was only a few days ago that the Leader of the Opposition here said that he had written to the Minister for National Development expressing his concern that the Minister was making such statements in Parliament that could only prejudice the thinking of the other Commissioners, and that it was not fair that he should be doing this. The article continued:

Investigations have since been proceeding on feasibility and cost studies of a number of such sites, together with associated hydrological investigations. Mr. A. S. Luchetti (A.L.P., New South Wales) said Parliamentarians were uneasy because they were not being given the information to which they were entitled on the project. "The dam now appears to have been abandoned, and the alternative site is said to satisfy the needs of the States involved, and particularly South Australia," he said.

It would seem from the article that Commonwealth Parliamentarians in other States have been convinced by the Minister for National Development that, because of the severity of salinity in the river as it flowed into South Australia (brought about by Chowilla), the commission had decided that an alternative storage must be investigated. Again I remind the House that the Minister for National Development could not have made that statement if the South Australian Commissioner had disagreed on an alternative site being investigated. This matter was further aired in the House of Representatives on September 18, when, in reply to a question asked by Mr. Wilson, M.H.R., who sought information, Mr. Fairbairn said:

As the President of the River Murray Commission, I did on behalf of the four Commissioners authorize the publication recently of a pamphlet explaining that we had temporarily suspended work on the Chowilla dam pending further investigations into other sites. The map that was put into the pamphlet to enable people to follow the various sites was overprinted with the two possible dam sites, but it was not upgraded to show the dependence of Adelaide on the Murray River for water. I recognize that Adelaide has a very considerable dependence on the Murray River. For this reason the River Murray Commission realizes the dependence not only of Adelaide but also of all the irrigators in the area on water from the Murray River. The commission is now carrying out investigations into whether the sum that would be needed to complete the Chowilla dam could, if expended elsewhere, produce a greater yield of water than if it were expended at Chowilla.

The Minister is prejudging the situation and his statements will influence the thinking of all the Commissioners. Later, the Minister said:

We are well on the way to completing these studies, and I expect to have a report by the end of the year. In the meantime, it does appear to me from all the reports of the technical committee of the River Murray Commission that if the money were spent on an upriver storage it could produce a greater increase flow in the Murray River and therefore a greater water supply for Adelaide.

Mr. Jennings: That would not be in dry years.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course not. As a South Australian I disagree with the Minister and I dislike his statements made in the House of Representatives, because he does this for the particular purpose of influencing the thinking of the other Commissioners. On Thursday, April 21, 1960, an article in the *Advertiser* under a heading in big black letters, "South Australia Plans Huge Water Dam on Murray", stated:

Plans for a proposed huge £9,000,000 water storage dam on the Murray, about 37 miles upstream from Renmark, were outlined by the Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) in his weekly broadcast over 5AD last night. Preliminary estimates had been prepared for a dam comprising an earth bank $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles long and including a 1,000ft. long concrete section built in a channel excavated across a bend in the river, he said. The dam would be easily the largest in Australia, with a capacity of not less than 4,750,000 acre feet.

That was another statement made by the former Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, and was similar to what he had said prior to the elections concerning the building of a meatworks at Kadina. He made the statement about the works before the matter had been investigated. Not long after, on January 20,

1961, he made the following statement, which also appeared in black lettering, under the heading "Canberra 'cold' on Renmark Plan: Inquiry on New Dam Project":

The Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) last night announced preliminary investigations for a new dam site on the Murray above Mannum, possibly at Teal Flat.

The former Premier had switched within 12 months. Prior to this he had been trying to make people believe that the dam would be constructed. It was typical of the former Liberal Premier to do that, just as it is typical of the present Premier to mislead the people of the State.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the Modbury Hospital?

Mr. HUGHES: I am not dealing with that; I am dealing with water, and referring to the plans outlined to the people of South Australia by Sir Thomas Playford concerning this huge water storage. However, within less than 12 months, the former Premier said that Canberra had "gone cold on the Renmark plan".

The plan had apparently not progressed far by April 21, 1960, bearing in mind that statement, which made headlines on the front page of the *Advertiser*. Apparently the matter had not been investigated to any significant degree, otherwise the then Premier, within a period of less than 12 months, would not have been making another suggestion. However, considerable ill-feeling was evident as the result of the then Premier's statement, because on January 21, 1961, the headline in the paper was, "Dam Plan Angers Growers", the accompanying article stating, in part:

Cadell, a little fruitgrowing settlement near Morgan, was an angry and bewildered town today as residents learned that most of it might disappear under the waters of a new dam.

Mr. Freebairn: What date is that?

Mr. HUGHES: January 21, 1961. The honourable member would not know much about this.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: The honourable member is delving into the past.

Mr. HUGHES: I am so interested in having Chowilla built that I took the time, as was the case with the Minister this afternoon, to prepare a case.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: But I spoke to the motion.

Mr. HUGHES: I am speaking to the motion also, not to the amendment, and I am not speaking about the Modbury Hospital. I am drawing the attention of the House to the wild statements made previously and to the switch that occurred. That is what I am worried about today. Prior to March 2 last, we learned of the wild statements that members opposite are prepared to make ("We'll build Chowilla"), misleading the people into thinking that all they have to do is elect a Liberal and Country League Government and Chowilla will be built. The Minister was trying to justify today in some way what was said at the time. The following appeared in the *News* under the heading, "New Dam Plan Shocks Cadell":

Cadell orchardists said today they were shocked at the news of the proposed new Murray dam. The dam, upstream from Mannum, may inundate Cadell.

From then on we did not hear much about the project, although what statements were made were typical of those that have been made by L.C.L. members over the years. In October, 1961, the then Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) was reported as saying that, if necessary, South Australia would proceed with the dam without the support of New South Wales and Victoria. Why did he not proceed? The present Premier and members opposite said the same thing prior to the last election ("We'll build the dam"), when all the time they knew what Sir Thomas Playford knew in 1960-61.

Mr. Casey: It's a different story now.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course it is. Sir Thomas Playford knew that South Australia alone could not proceed with the dam. The present Premier also knows that, and he knew before the last election that, unless he had the support of the other States concerned and the Commonwealth Government, the dam could not be built.

Mr. Casey: Do you think Sir Thomas told him what to say?

Mr. HUGHES: Perhaps, but the present Premier did not take the trouble to analyse the statement, and thousands who have been misled are disappointed that Chowilla is not being proceeded with as was promised by members opposite.

Mr. Casey: You only have to go to the river today to find out what the people think about it.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: When did work stop?

Mr. HUGHES: The Minister does not need to ask me that. What a question to ask me! The Labor Government never claimed that it would build this dam on its own. Who called tenders for it?

Mr. Lawn: The Minister is strangely silent.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly. I assure the Minister that every member of the Opposition will join with him in an endeavour to have the Chowilla dam built.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I think it is extremely regrettable that the member for Glenelg saw fit to move an amendment to the motion, which, if it had been left as originally moved, might have displayed a sincere desire on the part of the Opposition to see this project recommenced. However, paragraphs (b) and (c) indicate that there is certainly no sincerity on the part of the Opposition concerning the motion. Although I agree that the Opposition wants to see Chowilla built, it is obvious from the speeches that members opposite have made that they do not wish to see the project recommenced under an L.C.L. Government.

Mr. Casey: You should have been here last session.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Hudson: That, in unparliamentary language, is called a lie.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ARNOLD: If the member for Wallaroo were sincere in his desire to see the dam built, surely he would have given more prominence to the statements made by people who were interested in seeing the work proceed, instead of quoting everyone he could think of who was opposed to the project.

Mr. Hughes: I referred to both sides of the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wallaroo is out of order.

Mr. ARNOLD: This project was commenced by the L.C.L.; it came to a standstill under the Labor Government; and what a blow to the Opposition it would be if it were recommenced by the L.C.L. Government.

Mr. McKee: It won't be, though.

Mr. ARNOLD: It will be difficult for members opposite to accept what happens next year when this vital project is recommenced. I refer now to the little pamphlet entitled the

Fourteen Facts of Chowilla. This pamphlet was put out for an express purpose. It can be read in four or five minutes so that the people of this State can readily get a basic understanding of what Chowilla is, where it is and what its purpose is. It is certainly not put out as an engineering masterpiece; it is purely for the purpose of getting a basic understanding across to the public of the need for Chowilla.

An example of this is that, when a person buys a car, he does not get a great thick technical manual on how to drive it; he is interested to know basically what it is. I would go so far as to say that, if the *Fourteen Facts of Chowilla* had been a scientific engineering pamphlet, the member for Glenelg would not have been able to follow it; so what would have been its use? If it had been a scientific engineering document, I doubt whether even the member for Millicent would have followed it either, so why do members opposite deliberately set out to sabotage this pamphlet if there is a genuine desire to see Chowilla built?

Mr. Corcoran: What does the Minister for National Development say about the document?

Mr. ARNOLD: It is well known that South Australia has a problem in trying to convince not only Victoria and New South Wales but also the Minister for National Development, who is under considerable pressure and who, it would appear, is bending under that pressure. So why deliberately set out to sabotage this magazine?

Mr. Hudson: Magazine! It is a very low-standard pamphlet.

Mr. Broomhill: What do you really think about it?

Mr. Hudson: We are trying to get the Government to do this job properly.

Mr. ARNOLD: The member for Wallaroo quoted from newspaper cuttings that grower organizations in the Upper Murray were opposed to Chowilla. By interjection, I asked him to try to name some organizations. I think I have attended all their annual meetings. It is a standard feature of all grower meetings that I have attended that they carry a resolution recording and reaffirming their support for the building of the Chowilla dam. Unless the honourable member can quote the names of these grower organizations, we shall just have to leave his remarks as being non-factual.

We should look at some of the statements made by the member for Glenelg in moving his motion and see how factual some of

them are. He referred to salinity, irrigation and drainage. On salinity, he said, in respect of salt slugs:

Some have come in by accident, and some have come in as a result of a total failure for many years to control adequately the drainage waters when each new irrigation settlement is established. We, to some extent, have been at fault as much as have people in other States.

Mr. Rodda: A preponderance of them has come from other States?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, although I suspect that one of the worst places is Waikerie, in this State. However, incidents there affect the river lower down than Waikerie and do not create problems in the Berri area, for example. I have been told that last summer the average salinity of the Murray River at Waikerie tended to double after each irrigation, because of the low flow at that time.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: One slug got to Waikerie and would not move.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, but after each irrigation at Waikerie the salinity doubled from 250 to 500 parts per million. This was caused by drainage water coming back to the river from irrigation settlements within a few days.

I do not know on what the honourable member based his facts but, from figures supplied to me by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, I can appreciate the salinity at Waikerie, where I can give the figures for November to February. The average salinity in November was 509 parts a million; in December, 500 parts; in January, 545; and in February, 503. The point that the honourable member made that it doubled from 250 to 500 parts after each irrigation has absolutely no basis, as the lowest reading in November was 440 parts, and the highest 555 parts; in December the lowest reading was 485 parts and the highest 530 parts, which is a tolerance of only 45 parts for the month. In January the lowest reading was 495 parts a million and the highest 570 parts, a tolerance of 75 parts. In February the lowest reading was 495 and the highest 535, a tolerance of 40.

The point I want to make is that salinity is caused largely by natural drainage. This is what the honourable member was getting at, but it does not work in the manner in which he said it did. This natural drainage is characteristic of all irrigation areas along the river. It is a process that has built up over many years of irrigation: it is not something where we irrigate one day and it runs back into the river the next day. This cycle builds up over many years and continues for 12 months in the year. It is a steady process of draining back into the river. One of the main needs for Chowilla is the provision of a

bulk supply of water on our border by which we can keep a continuous flow coming into this State to flush this natural drainage out to sea. This natural drainage cannot be stopped; it is something we have and shall always have as long as there are irrigation settlements along the river. Possibly in the early days, if the irrigation settlements had been established 10 to 15 miles away from the river and water had been pumped to them, we would not have had this problem of natural drainage contaminating the river; but this is how it operates and that is the position we are in. For example, at Renmark, honourable members who know the area—

Mr. Lawn: You are satisfied with the progress made, are you?

Mr. ARNOLD: Where the Renmark reservoir is, there is a natural anabranch of the Murray, which flows in above Lock 5 and re-enters the river below Lock 5 and, when we are driving into Renmark along Renmark Avenue, over the bridge on Renmark Avenue across the reservoir—

Mr. Hudson: What has this to do with Chowilla?

Mr. ARNOLD: If the honourable member will wait for 30 seconds I shall tell him.

Mr. Lawn: Are you satisfied with what the Government is at present doing?

Mr. ARNOLD: Getting back to natural drainage, this being a natural anabranch of the river, it is at the same level. In the early days, the flats on either side of the Renmark reservoir were excellent pasture areas on which lucerne and other crops were grown. However, over the years the natural drainage from the settlement flowing to the natural low point has turned the area into a salt flat. This cannot be avoided where irrigation takes place. As far as I can see, natural drainage back into the river can never be avoided. Even diverting the artificial drainage away from the river to evaporation basins miles farther back still would not have any bearing on the problem we face with natural drainage. This is where the bulk of water is needed so that it can keep flushing this salinity out to sea.

Lake Victoria is the living proof of what Chowilla can do for this State. The salinity figures of the Engineering and Water Supply Department for October, November and December last year and January and February this year show that the water in Lake Victoria during last summer was of a far higher quality than water coming down the river from

Mildura to Lock 9. The map included in the statement of the River Murray Commission shows that Lock 9 is above Lake Victoria although it is just below the entrance to Frenchman Creek which feeds Lake Victoria, the outlet being through Rufus Creek and then on down to Lock 5 at Renmark. The salinity figures for Lake Victoria, Lock 9 (which is above Lake Victoria), and Lock 5 at Renmark show that for most of the summer the water in Lake Victoria was of a higher quality than that coming down from Mildura. For example, on October 2 the salinity reading at Lock 9 was 280 parts per million; at Lock 5 at Renmark it was 310 p.p.m.; and at Lake Victoria it was only 180 p.p.m. On October 23, the salinity reading at Lake Victoria was 180 p.p.m.; at Lock 9 it was 150 p.p.m.; and at Lock 5 it was 255 p.p.m. On November 13, the salinity reading at Lake Victoria was 170 p.p.m.; at Lock 9 it was 200 p.p.m.; and at Lock 5 it was 270 p.p.m. Therefore, throughout November the water in Lake Victoria was of a higher standard than that flowing down from Mildura. On December 11, the salinity reading at Lake Victoria was 195 p.p.m.; at Lock 9 it was 240 p.p.m.; and it was 235 p.p.m. at Renmark. This type of reading continued right through to January. On January 8, Lake Victoria had 225 p.p.m. of sodium chloride; and at Lock 9 and Lock 5 the content was 250 p.p.m. Not until February did the salinity content in Lake Victoria, after having a heavy salt slug come into it from Victoria, become higher than the content at Lock 9. The only thing that I can see that is wrong about Lake Victoria is that it is not 10 times bigger.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Doesn't that prove that evaporation is not a real factor in respect to either Lake Victoria or Chowilla?

Mr. ARNOLD: It is self-evident. For the purposes of comparison with Chowilla, I will refer to *The Kimberley Region of Western Australia*, a pamphlet produced by the Western Australian Public Works Committee which has the following to say about water conservation:

The Government has investigated rivers with a view to building storage dams and using the water so stored for irrigation purposes. The main factors to be considered were twofold: (1) sites for dams to be available in reasonably easy construction sites, and (2) the amount of available land suitable for irrigation purposes at an economic distance from the stored water.

The Ord River presented the most logical answers to the requirements, bearing in mind the fact that not one, but two dam sites would

be required. The first dam, to be known as a diversion dam, would be the means by which water would be diverted from the river to the land suitable for agriculture; the second dam to be the main storage reservoir which would release water to the first or diversion dam. The diversion dam would not be essentially a storage dam but rather a diverting structure to raise supplies to levels suitable to supply farmers' requirements. At Bandicoot Bar a rock formation stretched from one side of the Ord River to the other and engineers decided on this site for the diversion dam. At a gap in the Carr Boyd Ranges some 26 miles upstream an ideal site for the main dam was found. This site was unique inasmuch as to hold back nearly as much water as is stored in Lake Eucumbene (3,540,000 acre feet), the retaining wall would need to be only one-third as high. Storage of 4,600,000 acre feet of water in the Ord main dam will form a lake covering over 250 square miles of country.

The Ord River project was commenced in March 1961 when stage one or the start of construction work on the diversion dam and ancillary works to service 30,000 acres of land went under way. Stage two involves the construction of the major dam and the irrigation of a further 148,000 acres of land. Stage three is the incorporation of a hydro-electric station in the main dam site to service the new towns that will arise. To enable stages two and three to be undertaken, the Western Australian State Government approached the Commonwealth Government for finance in the order of \$70,000,000 to be spread over 15 years. In November, 1967, the Federal Government announced that a sum of \$48,000,000 would be made available to the Western Australian State Government to proceed with stage two of the project. With the construction of the major Ord dam greater productivity and closer settlement will result in other activities which will give the Australian nation further impetus in its march towards greater prosperity.

All members will agree that the support and assistance Western Australia is getting is to be commended, because it will make a terrific difference to the productivity of that State. Another advantage is that the headwaters of the Ord River are in Western Australia, and not in Victoria or New South Wales. One of our basic problems is that our headwaters are not in our own backyard.

When it has been built, the Chowilla dam will provide an assured future not for just a handful of people but for over 1,000,000 people. It makes no difference whether one lives on the Murray River, in Adelaide or on Eyre Peninsula: we all depend on this river. I am certain that, when the findings of the Dartmouth investigation are released at the end of this year or early in January next year, Chowilla must proceed because it is impossible logically for South Australia to derive the same benefits from Dartmouth as it would from Chowilla. Further, there is insufficient water

in the catchment of the Hume River to fill even the Hume dam. I do not know how we would benefit from having a dam at Dartmouth, and I have every confidence that next year will see the recommencement of the Chowilla project.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): The member for Chaffey was more eloquent in the things he did not say in reply to the interjections he would not answer than in anything that will appear in *Hansard* as a result of what he said. He was asked four times whether he believed that this Government was doing all that should be done to further the building of Chowilla, but he was not willing to reply. His silence in response to these questions was much more revealing than anything he said and it added force to the arguments advanced by the member for Glenelg when moving the motion. Indeed, it is a basis for grave concern on the part of those of us who believe with the Minister that Chowilla is our very livelihood and that without it we will stagnate. Without it we could give no guarantee of water for additional settlement or for industries that may be considering coming here.

No issue as important as Chowilla has come before this House for many years yet, in spite of all that has been said, including the speeches of the Minister and the confidence repeatedly expressed by the member for Chaffey, we have not yet received anything that would encourage us to believe that the developments taking place on the Chowilla project are coming down on our side. I ask leave to continue by remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

THE ESTIMATES

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from October 1. Page 1568.)

TREASURER AND MINISTER OF HOUSING
Treasury Department, \$112,186.

Mr. HUDSON: When the Treasurer took over his office there were 10 Ministers' offices and 10 Secretaries, and Mr. Vickery was acting as Secretary to the Treasurer. Has there been any re-organization of Government departments since then? Also, has Mr. Vickery vacated his position, or has his appointment been confirmed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): There has been no change, and at present Mr. Vickery is continuing in the office he held when the honourable member left office. Mr.

Vickery has applied for the position, but the matter is still being considered by the Public Service Board, which has not yet made a recommendation.

Mr. HUDSON: Are there still 10 Ministers' offices? Recently there was mention of re-organization in the Minister of Local Government's office, which was being combined with the office of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot answer this question. There has been a change in that office, but I cannot say how it affects the Minister's personal staff. However, I will inquire and let the honourable member know.

Mr. HUDSON: This could re-act on the position of Mr. Vickery?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not see how, but what I have said regarding my own Acting Secretary is the position as I understand it. I cannot say what is the position regarding other Ministers' Secretaries.

Line passed.

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

Prices Branch, \$163,564.

Mr. HUDSON: At the time the Government introduced the Budget and announced tax increases, it also decided to decontrol certain prices and remove price control, at least temporarily, from other commodities. There was no cancellation of the previous proclamation bringing certain classes of commodity under price control. Because of the very extensive nature of the Government's decisions, can the Treasurer say what reduction can be expected in the staff of the Prices Branch?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The staff of the Prices Branch will not be substantially reduced as the result of the gazettal of the decontrol of a number of items. The major work load of officers of the branch is not necessarily involved in administering actual price control as such. The branch, as the honourable member is well aware, does much work for the Government in many ways, and it also renders service to the public that is extensive in both scope and volume. Consequently, I have not asked the Chairman of the Public Service Board to look at the staff situation of the branch. I do not want to discuss policy at present, because there will be an opportunity for such discussion when legislation connected with price control comes before Parliament later this year.

The Prices Branch investigates many matters and it often uses its good offices to cope with inquiries from people who think that some-

injustice has been done to them in respect of prices charged or services rendered. The branch performs this service irrespective of whether a particular item has been gazetted as being under direct price control. It discusses the matter with the parties concerned and endeavours to reach an amicable settlement, to redress a wrong or to have a charge reduced if it appears to be excessive.

The branch does other jobs such as fixing grape prices and investigating alleged improper practices. There does not seem to be any imminent probability of the staff of the branch being materially reduced. But I have not canvassed that matter with either the Chairman of the Public Service Board or the Prices Commissioner at this stage. I think the provision for salaries and wages, and so on, concerning the activities of the Prices Branch, as the honourable member will see from the Estimates, is actually an increase on last year's provision. In addition, the provision for contingencies, although not increased, is virtually the same as it was last year (a reduction of \$90 is involved).

Mr. HUDSON: I disagree with the Treasurer that it is only a small reduction in contingencies; overall, the Prices Branch has a small reduction. The increase proposed in wages and salaries is more than offset by the decline in contingencies, when one looks at the items in detail, because no purchase of a motor car is intended this year and there is a decline in the payments to dependants and officers retiring or resigning. Also, of course, an inter-communication system installed last year is not repeated this year. It seems to me that the effective work of the Prices Branch in relation to investigations it carries out as a result of contacts made with it by members of the public or members of Parliament will be seriously affected by the removal of price control on such a wide range of commodities. For example, plumbing services have been removed from price control. I know of a recent example in which it was a question not so much of the price charged but of shoddy workmanship, and, of course, the Prices Branch's ability up to the present to require repayment of a certain sum or to require certain work to be carried out to bring a job up to standard has been reinforced by the existence of price control.

Where the Prices Branch is dealing with a commodity or service that is not under control its power to intervene is limited, it can attempt only to mediate between parties and,

of course, once people in the community become used to the idea that the branch will play only a minor role in future, the effectiveness of the branch in carrying out these sorts of investigation will be greatly reduced. First, fewer contacts will be made by members of the public with the branch; and, secondly, so many more of the investigations that the Prices Branch will be carrying out will be of a kind that involves mediation between the parties, and the power of the branch to enforce a just solution will be greatly reduced. Will the Treasurer say what prompted the Government in the selection of particular items for decontrol? Why is it that certain services, such as plumbing services, and so on, in connection with the building industry were decontrolled while hairdressing services remained under control?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable member is out of order in raising that particular matter. The items that have been decontrolled have been debated, I think, on the first line. This present discussion is not on the lines at all. I cannot allow a general debate on price control itself at this stage. The Treasurer said that a Bill would be introduced later dealing with an amendment to the Prices Act, and we cannot enter into a debate concerning price control when dealing with the lines of the Estimates.

Mr. HUDSON: Surely, one can deal with questions of administration of the branch?

The CHAIRMAN: That is so, and I have allowed passing references to matters that are not strictly on these lines. I will not object to those references, but honourable members will have to adhere to the lines.

Mr. HUDSON: Do you rule that we are not at liberty to discuss matters of administration that are involved as a result of Parliament's making these appropriations?

The CHAIRMAN: I quote from the 17th edition of Erskine May, page 766:

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

Mr. HUDSON: I was wanting to refer to administrative actions that have been taken by the Government. Presumably, they have been approved by the Prices Commissioner, and they follow on through the department.

The CHAIRMAN: To debate the administration of the department is in order, but to branch out into a debate on price control and certain items that have been decontrolled is going beyond these particular lines.

Mr. HUDSON: But I am not dealing with legislation. Erskine May refers to legislation. What I am dealing with are administrative decisions taken by the Government that have affected the whole role that this particular branch will play. This does not involve any legislation at all.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can raise the matter of the administration of the department; I am not objecting to that but what I am asking him to do is not to embark upon a debate on price control and on the various items that have been decontrolled.

Mr. HUDSON: I then ask the Treasurer this question: what recommendations were made by the Prices Commissioner in relation to the commodities and services that were removed from price control by the Government?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That is not a matter that concerns the wages, salaries and contingencies of the Prices Branch. I have already said that a Prices Bill will be brought before Parliament, and that will be the time and place to debate policy on this matter. I have told the honourable member that the personnel of the Prices Branch are not, as far as I am aware, under review at present. The work of the branch will be sustained close to its former capacity, which is relevant to this discussion; but the items under price control are not relevant to this debate.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Chairman, do you rule my question in order?

The CHAIRMAN: As to whether the honourable member is in order, I refer him to Erskine May. He can discuss the administrative actions of the department.

Mr. HUDSON: Was my question that I have just asked the Treasurer in order?

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to ask it again.

Mr. HUDSON: My question was: what recommendations were made by the Prices Commissioner in the administration of the department that we are currently discussing to the Treasurer in relation to the list of items of goods and services that were recently removed from price control?

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is a relevant administrative matter.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If you so rule, Mr. Chairman, I will accept the ruling, but I am still of the opinion that the recommendations in themselves are matters of policy, not of administration. However, the matter of what should be removed from and what should

be retained on the list was discussed between the Prices Commissioner, one of his senior officers and myself in my office downstairs in this building. We went through the list of items and then I made recommendations to Cabinet on these things, and the basis of the discussion was what items were under such a degree of competition that price control appeared no longer necessary. That was the basis on which the discussion was held.

Mr. McKEE: In view of the great many articles whose prices have been decontrolled, will a retrenchment of staff in the Prices Branch be caused?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have already answered this matter twice. Last year three officers retired and this year two others will retire, but these are not retrenchments—they are normal retirements.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Will they be replaced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot answer that at present because that matter is not entirely under my jurisdiction but involves a recommendation of the Chairman of the Public Service Board. I repeat that as far as I understand the position (and I think I assess it correctly) the reduction in the work load of the department will be negligible.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As the Treasurer has said that these are not retrenchments but retirements, can he say whether this is the first step in reducing the size of the department with a view to eventually abolishing it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: There is no proposal to abolish the department.

Mr. Ryan: Not much!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I was asked a question and I am answering it. In fact, in Victoria the Government has found it necessary, having removed price control over a few years, to set up an office to do the kinds of thing which the Prices Commissioner presently does here, so the branch need not be affected in this way. The honourable member for Whyalla knows that, during the course of a year, officers retire by virtue of reaching the retiring age or for some other reason. It is always a matter for consideration whether or not it is necessary to replace those officers. That matter has not as yet been discussed and I point out to the honourable member that, until these officers do retire, the matter will not be discussed. Last year, under the previous Administration, my information is that three

officers retired. I think members opposite would know better than I whether those officers were replaced at that time.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I refer to "Investigating, Accounting and Clerical Staff" for which an increase of \$3,858 is proposed. Did the Treasurer assess this amount for salaries before or after it was decided to decontrol the items that have recently been decontrolled?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think the Estimates were actually considered before the list of items was published. The provision for salaries would have been considered in the light of the Government's policy. The Government's attitude towards price control is well known and has been known for some considerable time: it is no secret. Therefore, if in the event it is found (and I do not expect this) that the work load on the department is materially reduced, then possibly officers retiring may not be replaced, but that is a matter for discovery after we see how the work of the department progresses.

Mr. McANANEY: I cannot understand the Opposition's attitude on this matter. If there is an excuse for price control at all it exists when things are booming and when there is an excessive demand for goods and a shortage of labour. This was the position three years ago when we left Government, but at present there is not a demand for—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is out of order in debating price control.

Mr. McANANEY: We do not need these extra men that it has been suggested we need.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member should base his remarks on that line.

Mr. McANANEY: It is not necessary under present economic conditions to replace these gentlemen when they retire. However, we need the machinery there for extra men to be employed to implement price control when we get South Australia booming again in the near future.

Mr. HUDSON: A good story has always been told about politicians: when the politician is asked whether he is in favour of something he will often reply, "Yes, I am prepared to consider it", and it is often alleged that this is a way of saying that nothing will be done about it. I was interested in the Treasurer's last reply to me, when he mentioned the discussions that had taken place in his office in the basement between himself and the Prices Commissioner. At one point he said that the discussions led to certain decisions being taken,

but his reply to my question whether the Prices Commissioner made the recommendations that were carried into effect by Cabinet implies that the Commissioner did not make recommendations and that the decisions were taken purely as a result of the Cabinet discussion. That is the only conclusion one can reasonably draw from the equivocating answer I received from the Treasurer. If I am wrong I would appreciate further elucidation from the Treasurer because he did not answer my question and did not say whether the Prices Commissioner recommended these alterations.

I believe also that the honourable member for Stirling has let the cat out of the bag regarding what the Government intended to do in relation to the Prices Branch. The Treasurer said it had not been decided what would be done when two officers retired from the department, and I presume that if an officer resigned from the department to go to another department, the Government would decide whether he would be replaced, but the honourable member for Stirling said that they should not be replaced.

Mr. McAnaney: I said, "According to requirements".

Mr. HUDSON: I question the Estimates given to Parliament in this respect. They are inflated and the Government intends to reduce the staff of the Prices Branch in order to save money in the future, and the service given in relation to complaints received and the investigations following on from those complaints will suffer, quite apart from any effects on the community that will flow from the Government's decision.

We look with much interest to the results that will emanate from this department at the end of this financial year, because from the equivocating answers we have already received it is clear that the Government's proposals regarding the Prices Branch (no doubt egged on by the Attorney-General and one or two others in the Cabinet) will involve a serious reduction in the staff of this department and a considerable amount of underspending by it at the end of this financial year. We on this side regard this matter seriously. We regard the whole way in which the Government handled it as a means of trying to stifle public discussion, an attitude of "strike while the iron is hot" and "combine all your crook announcements in one go."

There is little doubt in our minds that these decisions were the result of pressure on the Government from interests outside and that the more powerful interests were favoured: and,

furthermore, that the decisions were Cabinet decisions and were not a result of recommendations from the Prices Commissioner.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: From what has been said we know that many articles have been decontrolled. Will the Prices Branch still employ its inspectors to watch what is happening in regard to those particular articles? Is it going to keep all the statistical information in regard to all these articles that it has watched in the past? If not, how is it going to arrive at a position where it can recommend to the Government at any given time whether any or all of these articles should be recontrolled in view of what is happening? If this work is not to be done in relation to these particular articles, how does the Treasurer explain that the money that is going to be provided for this branch is as shown in the Estimates?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member knows that prior to any action this Government took many items that were bought by the public were not controlled. He knows also that the Prices Branch, under the previous Government's administration, kept a watchful eye on a great number of items that were not then under control. Therefore, the same system will still apply; there is no general change in policy in that regard, so the honourable member can answer his own question out of his own experience. The Prices Branch will continue to keep such records and make such investigations as it thinks necessary in order to keep an eye on the movement of prices. I have given the Prices Branch no instruction to reduce its activity in this regard.

Line passed.

Superannuation Department, \$196,139—
passed.

Agent-General in England Department,
\$126,600.

Mr. CORCORAN: I refer to the line "Expenses in connection with visit of Agent-General to South Australia". Can the Treasurer say when Mr. Milne is due back in South Australia and how long he will be here? Also I notice that money is set aside for structural improvements to office premises, and I take it that this relates to South Australia House in London, which no doubt the Premier visited when he was in London. I recall that the late Mr. Frank Walsh expressed some disgust at the state of repair of this building, and I believe he intended to upgrade the standard of the accommodation markedly as soon as possible. However, it would appear

from the amount set aside in these Estimates that not very much work is to be done there. Does the Government intend to effect further improvements to South Australia House?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Although I am not sure of this, I think the Agent-General arrives in Adelaide towards the end of this month. His stay in South Australia will extend over the Christmas period. For part of his stay he will be on duty and for part he will be on leave. An announcement will be made when the matter has been firmly decided. I was in London just after the visit of the late Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) and spoke at length to the Agent-General. I heartily concurred in the suggestions he had made to the Hon. Mr. Walsh. They almost entirely involved internal rather than external alterations. The item provides for final payments in connection with internal structural improvements and alterations to the Agent-General's office accommodation.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Treasurer say how may staff members are employed in South Australia House?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Agent-General, his Secretary, and a receptionist. An officer of the South Australian Housing Trust is permanently located in the building, and I think there are two or three additional officers. The staff is very effective, but the building and total accommodation is not large. I understand from the Minister of Education that 10 or 12 people are on the staff: she visited South Australia House after I did.

Line passed.

Valuation Department, \$541,680.

Mr. RICHES: Can the Treasurer say whether the alteration to the set-up of the department will be sufficiently advanced to enable it to undertake valuations for councils during the coming financial year? Councils in many areas are finding great difficulty in arranging their own valuations. This is costly, and discrepancies arise between one council area and another. Councils that adopt the land tax assessment find that it is not always acceptable in another council area. The land tax assessment is often drawn up only to impose land tax, without due regard to its complete adoption by councils. I understand that the Land Tax Office sometimes makes a special effort to arrange its assessment to cover the whole of a municipal area, so that it can be adopted by councils. I commend the person who suggested that a valuation

should be made that is acceptable for all purposes. Can the Treasurer say whether the increase of \$185,764 in the provision is designed to enable the department to perform this service for councils as well as for the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Land Tax Office, as has been suggested?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The arrangement for co-ordination was completed, I think, late in August, and the department is now settling down to its work. The additional sum shown is largely for additional staff required in the initial stages of programming and co-ordinating the work and for making the maximum use of automatic data processing facilities. I should hope that the department's work was sufficiently advanced to offer a service to local government in the next financial year, which I think is the department's aim. I believe the department will produce a common valuation that will apply for Government purposes and be available as desired by local government, but special circumstances obtaining in local government areas or in any part of such areas will have to be referred to the department by the local government authority.

Line passed.

State Taxes Department, \$336,946—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$19,954,660.

Mr. VIRGO: I draw attention to the provision of \$5,200 for the Builders Licensing Board. I have asked the Treasurer two questions concerning the appointment of the advisory committee and the operation of the Act. He said that the Act was not operative, and he did not know when it would be. Is the \$5,200 for remuneration for a board that I understand was appointed last February, is provision made for the advisory committee to be set up, and is provision made for allowances as prescribed to be paid?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This provision, which was previously charged to the Premier's Department, is now transferred to the Treasurer's Department. Concerning the work of the board and the date of operation of the Act, I am making some progress, but I am not yet able to say when the day for the Act to commence operation can be proclaimed. I have received correspondence from interested outside parties and have given them a similar reply. I previously told the honourable member that a subcommittee of the Cabinet was working on this matter and that we believed, from the Cabinet's own views on this matter and from representations made by people outside in the industry, that some major changes in the

Act were required. These I am endeavouring to clear up. Undoubtedly, amendments to the Act will be brought into this Chamber, and they will have some effect on the scope of the board's operations. I cannot take the matter any further now, because I do not propose to try to lead him to believe that more progress is being made than is the case. As soon as I can get the amendments cleared with Cabinet and drafted, we shall be able to make further progress. I am not delaying for the sake of delay; I am delaying because of pressure of business in this Chamber.

Mr. Virgo: What is the \$5,200 for?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The board is functioning.

Mr. HUDSON: The Builders Licensing Act provides for the appointment of a Builders Licensing Advisory Committee. Before going out of office, I made some recommendations to Cabinet for the constitution of that committee and appointments to it where it was possible for an appointment to be made. Where it was not possible for an appointment to be made directly by me or on my recommendation because outside bodies had to be written to, before going out of office I wrote letters to outside organizations requesting them to nominate someone to the committee. I understand from a reply the Treasurer gave to a question from the member for Edwardstown that replies were received from those organizations, and I think the Government would have been able to constitute that committee. Is there any chance that amendments to the Act will be such as not to require a Builders Licensing Advisory Committee? If such a committee is needed, why can it not be constituted now and start to proceed with its work? As the Treasurer must know, there will be a considerable lapse of time between the appointment and constitution of such a committee and the time when the Act can be administered effectively. The Builders Licensing Advisory Committee has to make recommendations to the board on a whole series of matters, particularly restricted licences and the qualifications necessary for restricted licences in particular fields.

If this matter is delayed again and again and again, the day on which the Builders Licensing Act will come into operation will be put off at least until 1970, I would imagine, and perhaps even longer. I do not know whether or not this is the Government's purpose, but it is clear that something like the provisions of the Builders Licensing Act is necessary for the community and for building standards.

The Treasurer is willing to allow people involved in building to charge higher prices and make a bigger profit, so he should be willing (and the Government should be pressing him on this matter) to demand adequate standards. If the Premier thinks that the average standards applying in the building industry today are satisfactory, he needs to examine the matter further. He should remember the friendly exchange between the Treasurer and me yesterday about the damage caused by the storm. There is little doubt that in one or two cases at least the storm caused the damage it caused because of shoddy building of certain houses resulting in the roof being taken off one house and then damaging other houses. The effects of shoddy building show up in many ways and they cause serious consequences for the individual house owner.

Mr. Langley: It is the biggest investment he makes.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and he has every right to expect that standards will be provided within the building industry so that his investment will be protected. There are many ways in which a house buyer is careless in entering into transactions for buying a house. As the law stands at present, the principle of "let the buyer beware" applies, so the house purchaser can very well be taken for a ride. Because of the way in which the building industry has progressed in this State, building transactions concerning people in low income brackets rarely involve the use of architects. Therefore, the Government has a duty to see that the necessary standards are imposed to provide protection for house purchasers on average incomes. The building industry was largely in favour of the legislation passed by this Parliament last year. We know that the Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition last year, did his best to stir up strife and opposition to the Bill, but he was unsuccessful.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member cannot refer to legislation of last year. He is dealing with the line "Builders Licensing Board".

Mr. HUDSON: I accept your admonition, Sir, but extensive representations have been made by building interests to the Treasurer in relation to necessary amendments to this Act. Do these representations involve the complete recasting of the Act? Are the basic principles of the Act to be overturned?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to stick to the line to which he referred.

Mr. HUDSON: The line with which I am dealing is "Builders Licensing Board" for which \$5,200 is provided. The board has been established, but it will not function, because the Treasurer (and I do not know what pressures he is under from his colleagues or from outside interests) is not prepared to go ahead with the administration of this Act.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You have a fertile mind.

Mr. HUDSON: It is not a question of having a fertile mind: it is simply a question of analysing what the Treasurer said, and he said that the appointments to the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee had not and would not be continued with, and that a subcommittee of Cabinet had said that.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I did not say that.

Mr. HUDSON: The Treasurer said they had not been continued with at this stage.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That is different.

Mr. HUDSON: Not much. That is the kind of impression the Treasurer has given and, if he wants to correct it, let him do so because it is important that members should be fully and properly informed on the matter. Opposition members have been given the impression that the kind of amendment the subcommittee of Cabinet has considered could possibly mean that the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee might not be required.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Are you debating it before the amendment is introduced?

Mr. HUDSON: I am dealing with the reply the Premier's colleague gave. If he does not like his reply, he should tell the Minister it was crook. We have been given the impression that the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee cannot be constituted because the subcommittee is considering possible amendments to the Act that may result in the committee not being required. If that impression is wrong I should like to be told that it is wrong. I therefore ask the Treasurer whether the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee will be required to operate under the provisions of this Act, whatever amendments are introduced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The line is for the salaries of the board, and if and when the board is appointed its members will

receive the sitting fees to which they are entitled. That is as far as I am prepared to take the matter. The honourable member will have ample opportunity to discuss this matter when the amendments are introduced. This is not the time and place to discuss it and I am sure the Chairman will support me.

Mr. Hudson: Ask the Chairman!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Let the honourable member ask him. I was asked what the \$5,200 was for.

Mr. Hudson: I didn't ask that.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member's colleague did. The honourable member is adroit at drawing fantasies in his mind and in the minds of members of the Committee in order that he can produce an argument to suit his purposes and thereby cause Ministers and other people to give hypothetical answers to the fantasies that he creates. I have told both the honourable member and the member for Edwardstown the Government's position in this matter. I have nothing further to add.

Mr. VIRGO: I listened with interest and dismay to the Treasurer's reply. We are being asked to vote \$5,200 for a board which has been appointed but which is without a job to do.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It has a job to do and it is doing it.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not know how that can be, because the Act has not been proclaimed. On August 27 and 29, in reply to questions I asked, and again here tonight, the Minister virtually repeated that the Government was still looking at this Act. Whether it will ever be proclaimed, I do not know. However, I got the message (I thought loud and clear) from the Minister's replies to my questions that we would never see a Builders Licensing Act in operation here. We urgently need a Builders Licensing Act. The people who are buying and building houses are entitled to the protection from the many crook builders, and the Government has a responsibility, if it is going to vote \$5,200 to five people. I do not know on what basis they are being paid, but they must be getting an average of \$1,000 a year each, and they should get on with the job. The Government said it was going to get value for the money it spent. Indeed, the Premier said that in his policy speech. Therefore, let us start to get a bit of value for this money.

Mr. Lawn: The Government is protecting the crook builders because they are private enterprise builders.

Mr. VIRGO: That could be so. We certainly want protection, and that is why the Labor Government passed this legislation. From what the Treasurer has told me, it seems that it was the employer representatives on the advisory committee that withheld their recommendations.

Mr. Hudson: I don't know that that is quite correct.

Mr. VIRGO: The Treasurer subsequently got them, but they were not available to the then Labor Government. It is time the Government made up its mind on this matter. It is allocating \$5,200 a year to administer an Act that is not even proclaimed and is not likely to be proclaimed while this Government is in office. The Treasurer should give us the facts and not the run-around on this matter, because there is a real need for this board and for the advisory committee. I hope he will heed these words and indicate whether the Government intends to go on with this Builders Licensing Act.

Mr. LANGLEY: I criticize the Government strongly for not having done anything in this matter. I move around in the building trade and I know there are different types of workmen in the trade. I also know what a great difference the licensing of electricians has made in the electrical industries. Many people hoped that by this time something would have been done about this Builders Licensing Board. I had expected something to be done by June 30 this year.

I know that very good builders who have been in the trade for some years are clamouring for the establishment of this board, for they want to protect themselves and also to ensure that people for whom they build get value for their money. I have heard members opposite talk about shoddy workmanship. People expect some basic principles to apply when they embark on the biggest investment they make during their lives, and they want to ensure that a good job is done. South Australia should be setting the lead in this matter. Young couples who often can ill afford the large capital outlay necessary for housing want to be assured that they will get their money's worth. Why are we not well on the way to having this Act in operation in order to ensure that the people of South Australia are treated properly and fairly?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know whether the Treasurer expects members of the Opposition to be fobbed off by his statement that this is not the time and place to give information in relation to this matter, and by his admonition that "Your question is out of order". I do not see that it is the Treasurer's place to determine what is or what is not in order. If he wants to take a point of order, it ought to be taken. If he can give information to the Committee, that information ought to be given.

The position in relation to this board is fast becoming a scandal. Its members are to be paid salaries for doing nothing, because the Treasurer knows full well, as does every other member, that involved in the operation of the Act is the institution of general builder's licences and restricted licences for those operating in a particular trade.

He also knows that, until the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee is appointed and advises the board on the conditions that should be laid down for the award of a restricted licence in a particular trade or for the award of general builder's licences, the Act is completely and utterly inoperable. The Treasurer knows full well that the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee, when established, will have to set up subcommittees of its own. The regulations dealing with the committee allow for co-opting members on to subcommittees to advise on problems arising in relation to particular trades. He knows that much investigation into particular trades will be necessary by the committee before it can determine standards. If the Treasurer will not go ahead with the appointment of the advisory committee, then he is deliberately (and one must presume that any decision not to go ahead is a Cabinet decision) delaying the operations of the Builders Licensing Board for a considerable period, because the Act cannot be effectively brought into force for at least one year after the establishment of the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee.

This board, therefore, is to be paid \$5,200 until the end of this financial year virtually for doing nothing, except perhaps meeting every so often and having a cup of tea. If the Treasurer is ducking for cover because he does not want to reply, we shall use the fertile imaginations he alleges we have. Is the Treasurer satisfied with this provision of \$5,200? What is the justification for this provision? What has the Cabinet subcommittee been doing? Has it been meeting, or is

this just a nice device for further delaying matters? Is this a way of ensuring that ultimately the whole matter of builders licensing will be dropped? The Treasurer has said that this is not the time and place to tell us, yet we are considering the appropriation by the Government of \$5,200 that will be provided for the board, which will not operate.

The Treasurer will be telling us now that it is nothing to do with administration. Surely the Treasurer should be able to inform members on this matter. If the kind of amendment to be considered will not upset the general scheme of the Builders Licensing Act, why not go ahead with the establishment of the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee, so that it can start to function, because it will be a long time indeed before the advisory committee and all its necessary subcommittees can carry out the work necessary to be done to make this Act effective?

If it were necessary to act so quickly in removing everything connected with the building industry from price control (and I presume that this means that prices will go up, so that the return that any builder will get for his work, whether it is up to standard or not, will be greater), then why cannot the customer have some speedy protection? Does the Treasurer think that we on this side are such a collection of nincompoops that he can get away with telling us, "I can waste \$5,200 for a year, and it is not the time and place to tell you more than that"? I have never heard anything so ridiculous and specious in my life.

Mr. VIRGO: The Treasurer said that the \$5,200 represented the salaries of the five members of the board. I draw his attention to the requirements of the Act, namely, that there "shall be for the purpose of this Act an advisory committee", etc., and that the "Chairman and other members of the advisory committee shall be entitled to receive allowances and such rates as are prescribed". If this \$5,200 is, as he has stated, for the salaries of the board members, where has the Treasurer got the money tucked away for the payment of the advisory committee?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have not checked this matter to see to what salaries board members are entitled. That was not fixed by this Government: it was fixed by the previous Government. Therefore, I do not know whether the \$5,200 is completely absorbed in salaries of board members already appointed and doing the preliminary work which they commenced after the Act

was passed last year. But the members of the advisory committee are entitled to sitting fees, and if the provision proves to be inadequate for the actual expenditure required under the Act, I shall have to ask for an excess on this line. The board members have been appointed for some time and have had much work to do in receiving and processing the many applications that have come in. I recall that when the Leader was Premier this matter was the subject of a conference and it was said there was work for the board to do in anticipation of the proclaimed day being fixed. He said in conference that the suggested compromise reached was acceptable to him because of the work the board had to do. That work has, of course, been going on and is continuing.

That is as far as I can take the matter this evening. I have been honest with the Committee, in spite of the allegations of the member for Glenelg. I have told him that we are trying to make progress in this matter, and have explained to him and the Committee that I am not delaying this matter for the sake of delay—and that is the truth.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I refer to the line "Municipal Tramways Trust—Contribution towards working expenses." The sum of \$20,000 was voted for this line last year, but it does not appear for the current year. Why is that? Is it because the financial activities of the trust have improved? If so, can the Treasurer say what improvements have taken place?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think the trust's report has been tabled. Its finances have improved and, indeed, have been comparatively stable since the big losses sustained during reorganization. The Government hopes the trust will now operate without direct financial assistance from the Budget. This does not mean, of course, that such assistance would not be forthcoming if genuinely required. However, as it has been purely a token item on the Budget for several years, there seemed to be no good purpose in putting a figure for that line this year when it would not be required by the trust.

Mr. HUDSON: I, for one, fail to see how at this stage, after the Builders Licensing Board has been constituted for a considerable time, it can have much work to do. The Treasurer referred to the processing of applications. I suppose it can process them in the sense that it can acknowledge receipt of them and file them, but they cannot be processed any further than that until the advisory committee

is established. We shall obviously get no further information from the Treasurer on this but I hope he contacts the other members of the Cabinet subcommittee and says, "Come on, fellows! Let us meet and work this out. It is about time we had some action and progress in this matter."

I refer now to "Interest on Trust Funds and other moneys". I see that \$430,000 was voted last year, \$510,795 was spent, and \$580,000 is proposed for this year. Can the Treasurer say why there was a large increase last year in the amount voted and why a further increase of \$69,205 is expected for this coming financial year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Interest-bearing balances were above expectations last year. It is anticipated that these balances will be higher again during the current year.

Mr. VIRGO: I had just about given up, in desperation, any hope of getting satisfactory answers on the Builders Licensing Board. I am perturbed that the Treasurer first said that the \$5,200 was for salaries of the board and subsequently said that he did not know whether it was for salaries or whether provision had already been made for the advisory committee or whether it was for some other purpose. Therefore, the only thing I can do at this stage is ask the Treasurer whether he will provide as quickly as possible details of how this \$5,200 is to be spent. In addition, will he provide information about the number of applications received by the board, the number it has processed, and the way in which it has processed them?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the request is proper, I will get the information.

Mr. HUDSON: I refer to "Interest on trust funds and on other moneys". Statement F of the Auditor-General's Report indicates that the Deposit and Suspense Accounts held at the Treasury on June 30, 1968, amounted to \$18,645,314. The Trust Fund Accounts held at that date were \$14,972,051. I understand that the interest paid is paid mainly on the trust funds. In view of the charges levelled at the previous Government and in view of the scare campaign to the effect that trust funds were being used to finance the deficit, I point out that the deficit on both Loan and Revenue Account at the end of June, 1968, was \$2,700,000. It was more than six times covered by the Deposit and Suspense Accounts alone, before there could have been any need at all to use the trust funds. The Deposit and Suspense Accounts were about \$18,645,000 in

relation to a deficit at the end of June of \$2,700,000. In addition to that, in the last financial year trust funds held by the Treasury, on the Treasurer's own admission, have increased substantially.

Line passed.

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

Department of Lands, \$3,291,945.

Mr. CORCORAN: I refer to "Administration of finance—Assistant Director, Secretary, etc." for which an increase of \$25,653 is proposed. This afternoon the Minister of Lands pointed out that all members of the Land Board were highly qualified in their fields. I know that these officers were being over-taxed when I was Minister of Lands and, although efforts were made to obtain the services of the sort of person required to do this work on the board, it was not easy to find such people because of the more attractive conditions offered by outside industry compared with those offered by the Government. Their many duties and the many departments that call on their services cause these men to work not only at nights but at weekends, and this situation cannot continue because eventually their efficiency must drop as a result of their continued strain and effort. Can the Minister therefore say whether there are any positive plans to increase the staff of the Land Board or to increase the number of its members?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): The honourable member has raised a point that has caused me much concern in the last few months. Members of the Land Board work not only as valuers but in other fields. Indeed, they do many things and not just work that is specified under one Act. An additional board member has been appointed within the last couple of weeks but I would have to check whether he is the additional man that the board hoped to get, although I think he is.

The system of Government acquisition for various departments has been altered. The Land Board was doing a multitude of jobs which, it was felt, it should not do. It has now relinquished certain functions, although it will still be the principal authority for purchasing land in large tracts. For instance, the Highways and Local Government Department spends about \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 a year on the purchase of properties, the bulk of those negotiations being for small individual

purposes. By a rearrangement of the duties of the various departments, it is possible for the Highways Department to do most of its own negotiations and to leave the Land Board to do the bigger work. At the same time, the board will still exercise a general supervision over all departments, even over the Woods and Forests Department, which buys its own land. The Engineering and Water Supply Department also comes under this scheme, and its purchasing is to a large extent done by its own officers.

The general effect of this rearrangement has been to make it possible for the Land Board to concentrate on its more important work. Just how far it has gone at the moment is hard to say. The rearrangement took place over the last few months and was approved not many weeks ago, and I am not sure whether the whole system is yet in smooth running order. However, I can say that the Land Board arrangements are much better than they were, and everyone is now looking forward to a more even existence in that respect. I hope it will not now be necessary for these very conscientious men to consider that they have to work at home during the weekends, as some of them have been doing during the last few years.

Mr. CORCORAN: I thank the Minister for his reply in this matter. He would know, of course, that the rearrangement of procedures for the purchase of land by the Land Board was being considered by the previous Government. I thought it necessary to mention this matter because I knew from my personal experience how hard-pressed the board's officers were, and I am pleased that some effort has been made to rectify that situation.

I now refer to the line "Destruction of rabbits on Crown lands" and the one immediately below, "Grants for approved vermin control programmes". I see that no sum has been made available this year on the first of those lines but that \$3,000 has been set aside under the other line. It seems that nothing has been allotted previously (certainly nothing was allotted last year) under the line for approved vermin control programmes. However, I take it that this line will in future replace the line "Destruction of rabbits on Crown lands". Is it intended that some of this money is to be paid to councils, for instance, under the new Vermin Act when they apply to the department to have Crown

land cleared of rabbits or other vermin in their areas after they have cleared the adjacent or surrounding lands of vermin?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The line "Destruction of rabbits on Crown lands" will eventually disappear from the Estimates, and the amounts previously set aside on this line will be included under the line providing grants for approved vermin control programmes. The Government's intention is to do its best, within its somewhat limited means, to see that people adjoining Crown lands meet their obligations in this matter. At the same time, the Government wishes to encourage district councils to carry out their vermin control programmes. I do not know whether the honourable member was present at the recent conference of local government bodies held in Adelaide at which the programme for vermin destruction was explained, but we count that conference as a considerable success. We think it will be a reference point for further vermin control work.

Line passed.

Immigration, Publicity and Tourist Bureau Department, \$811,408.

Mr. CORCORAN: During the debate on the first line I stressed the need for additional expenditure on advertising this State. I again express my disappointment that the sum set aside for this purpose has increased by only \$5,828 this year. I do not consider this increase is sufficient. The item "Subsidies towards swimming pools and sundries" has been increased by \$121,049, but I believe that most of this increase would be for the Government's share of the cost of constructing the swimming pool in the north park lands. What portion of the provision is to be used for this purpose this year?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Immigration and Tourism): The honourable member has criticized the inadequate provision for advertising by the Publicity and Tourist Bureau. Everyone would like more spent on this item. I understand the Treasurer's position, although I explained to him that advertising was necessary. The provision for advertising in this year's Estimates is \$5,828 greater than that for last year, although I readily admit that I would much prefer a greater provision.

The same sort of advertising is effective in respect of both tourists and industrial development. One of the first things Mr. Ramsay did after being appointed Director of Industrial Promotion was to contact me about tourist advertising. Incidentally, arrangements have

now been made for the Director of the Publicity and Tourist Bureau to become a member of the Industries Advisory Council to give tourism its rightful place in association with industrial development. Of the provision for subsidies towards swimming pools and sundries, \$100,000 is for the new pool in the north park lands and \$3,000 is for swimming pools at each of the following places: Coonalpyn, Elizabeth (where two swimming pools are involved), Kingscote, Salisbury, Whyalla, Payneham, Peterborough, Nangwarry, Millicent, Lock, Unley, Strathalbyn, Wudinna, Tea Tree Gully, Waikerie, Lameroo and Minnipa. The swimming pool at Millicent has recently had a good helping in respect of subsidies, and I hope we will be able to continue this assistance in respect of other pools.

Mr. CORCORAN: I am grateful, as are the people of Millicent, for the Government's assistance for constructing a swimming lake at Millicent which I hope will be functioning in January next year. I hope, too, that the Minister will take the opportunity to come to Millicent to see what a fine job the swimming lake committee has done.

I do not doubt the Minister's statement that the increase this year in relation to advertising the State for tourist purposes was greater than the increase last year. However, I said quite clearly and frankly that no Government paid sufficient attention to this industry. I am happy that the Director of the Tourist Bureau will be appointed to the Industries Advisory Council, because I believe tourism is just as much an industry as any other undertaking in the State; in fact, it is one of our most important industries. I hope that as a result of this appointment the tourist industry will develop.

The reduction in subsidies to local government authorities for the development of tourist resorts may well be because few applications for these subsidies have been received for this financial year. However, I believe that this sum should be increased instead of being reduced. The overall allocation to the Tourist Bureau this year represents a small increase of about \$3,000 on what was allocated last year, whereas it has been normal for a greater increase to take place each year. I understand perfectly that the Minister would have put to the Treasurer in the strongest possible terms a case for more money in this field and I should hope that the Treasurer would shift the emphasis from some other provision to this one, because I believe that other projects could do with a little less, whereas this line could certainly do with more. Will the

Minister say why the subsidies to local government authorities for developing tourist facilities in their areas have been reduced?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The provision has had to be cut down, for we have just had to effect economies where we can. We have provided for urgent works. The reduction in the previous year was greater than the present reduction. Over two years, the reduction has been about \$13,000, the greater reduction having taken place during the last year of the previous Government's term of office. Neither Government is to blame, for economies must be made where possible. It is not easy to take money from someone else, and the Treasurer has cogently used this sort of argument with me. However, whence does one get the money? I have told the Treasurer that I could find more if he let me take it from someone else's department. However, he has to present a balanced Budget to help the progress of the State, and he has done a good job. I am wondering how to raise money without taking it away from anybody else. Perhaps a more direct means of levying the tourist industry could be instituted. I have no firm proposals to make, and certainly they will not be made early. These things need studying, and no doubt the member for Millicent thought along similar lines at one stage. Other countries charge tourists for the development of the tourist industry. Some add percentages to their bills. I am thinking of some way in which we can develop this important industry with relatively small amounts of extra money.

Mr. RICHES: I, too, regret that it has been found necessary to reduce the subsidies available to councils. I know that that is not because applications have not been made; I know that where they have been made reductions have been insisted on this year. I am glad to hear from the Minister that some places in the country have been able to avail themselves of subsidies for swimming pools. Is \$4,500 still the limit of subsidy towards the construction of a swimming pool?

Mr. Broomhill: It is \$9,000.

Mr. RICHES: That is much less than the \$100,000 available for the construction of a swimming pool in the metropolitan area. This is further evidence of the fact that it is difficult to provide facilities in the country. It amazes me how easy it is to find money for services in the city and how difficult it is to find it for services in the country. This Budget provides money for some facilities that we do not

know will ever be built; we do not know what their cost will be or their nature. The sky seems to be the limit for development in the city but it is a different story for facilities in the country.

As regards advertising of the State, I pay a tribute to the Tourist Bureau for the posters it has produced and the way it has publicized the Wilpena area of the Flinders Ranges. This year, the State has benefited to a degree difficult to estimate in dollars as a result of such publicity. I have been given figures which show that at Wilpena, for instance, there were over 7,000 caravaners from other States in one week during the September holidays. The following week there were 14,000, but that included many South Australians. In addition, areas farther north are opening up and every motel and hotel that can possibly serve these areas has been booked out for some time. I ask the Minister to consider having produced another pamphlet advertising the southern Flinders Ranges, which are just as interesting, picturesque and scenic as are the northern Flinders Ranges. I believe it could be advertised with the same degree of success. If funds were available, I am sure the Tourist Bureau could carry out this work. I do not expect anything to be done about the matter this financial year, but if planning is put in hand now a reasonable pamphlet can be produced during next financial year, and this would benefit a large area of the State extending from Warren Gorge down as far as Clare.

Mr. HUDSON: I refer to "Grants to Surf Life Saving Association of Australia (South Australia Centre)". I wish to express my concern about the size of the grant and of the increase proposed this year. Also, I want to try to get across to the Government the worthwhile activities that the South Australian Surf Life Saving Association undertakes. The nature of surf life saving in this State is partly affected by the conditions applying along the gulf with the general absence of surf at beaches close to metropolitan Adelaide. This has meant that over the years there has not been the drama attached to surf life saving in South Australia that there has been in other States. There is not the same immediate interest and knowledge among teenagers, for example, as is the case in Sydney, Perth or Melbourne. Nevertheless, an absolutely extraordinary growth in surf life saving has taken place in recent years in this State. For example, the membership of the South Australian Surf Life Saving Association was about 100 in 1952-53, whereas last financial year it was 1,417. There-

has been a similar increase in the active participation of the younger boys and men in the surf life saving movement. There is not sufficient appreciation of the type of growth that has taken place over the years or sufficient appreciation of the role the surf life saving clubs play in the community or of the way in which these clubs provide a real and necessary outlet for younger members of the community who participate in this activity, apart from the tremendously valuable social services that these people provide for the benefit of the community at large.

By and large, the service provided by the Surf Life Saving Association is a silent service, because of the lack of drama associated with many of its activities. Even so, 91 rescues were effected last year. Undoubtedly, without the existence of the surf life saving clubs, some of the people rescued last year would otherwise have drowned. Also, the clubs provide shark warnings and give first-aid assistance and help to find lost children. The effectiveness of the Surf Life Saving Association is very great. It makes a real contribution to the community, and even if of the 91 people rescued last year only five would otherwise have drowned, one would think that each of those lives was worth more than \$1,000 to this State. In its contributions towards the surf life saving movement, South Australia compares unfavourably with the other States.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: What about last year's payment?

Mr. HUDSON: What I am saying is a partial criticism of the previous Government, but I do not mind making it. I am not like the Premier. The Labor Government, when in office, increased grants to the Surf Life Saving Association by 60 per cent.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: What did you give it last year?

Mr. HUDSON: It was \$4,000.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: And what is it this year?

Mr. HUDSON: It is \$5,000.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: That will do.

Mr. HUDSON: It will not do. I hope the Premier is aware that the Surf Life Saving Association has been informed that it is not to ask for any more money for another three years. Is the Premier aware, also, that in the other States the grants that applied—

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: But they have surf there.

Mr. HUDSON: The Minister of Works has not understood the point I was making, and he is deliberately trying to justify an inadequate grant. There is not sufficient public knowledge of the work undertaken by the Surf Life Saving Association, but nevertheless it represents a substantial contribution in community service; the growth in membership from 100 to 1,400 over 15 years should surely indicate that. Furthermore, the membership and the number of affiliated clubs in South Australia is very close to that of Victoria, and is well above Western Australia. The Government grants to the associations in those States are \$26,000 in the case of Victoria and \$12,000 in the case of Western Australia. What do the Minister of Works and the Premier think of that?

I suggest to this Government and to members generally that the Surf Life Saving Association has over the years in South Australia been badly treated just because the work it carries out is more of a silent service and less dramatic than in the case in the other States—less worthy of publicity in the press but nevertheless valuable and important as a community service.

Mr. Corcoran: The press does not give it the publicity it deserves.

Mr. HUDSON: That is so.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: You are in a bad mood tonight.

Mr. HUDSON: I think anyone would be entitled to be in a bad mood after receiving a letter indicating that the association was to get an increase of 25 per cent in its grant but that this was to be the only increase for three years. The people concerned with this association are aware of the tremendous activity and liveliness within the association, the tremendous need for expansion, and the real contribution the association makes to the community. I hope that at least we can get some sympathy in this matter. I know that we will receive some sympathy from the Minister of Lands, even if we cannot get it from the Premier. I am sure the Minister knows the work of the association, as he at least is intimately associated with it because of the nature of the district he represents. He knows what clubs have been established in his area in recent years, and I am sure that he thinks the grant is inadequate. I suspect that the Minister would have liked to make the annual grant to the association much more than it is. I hope that he will press the Treasurer and an unsympathetic Premier and, presumably, an unsympathetic Minister of

Works very hard in subsequent years to try to have reversed the decision that this grant should stay steady for three years.

I hope that within a short time, partly as a result of the action of this Government and partly as a result of the actions of the next Labor Government that will be elected not later than 1971, we will see a very substantial increase in the assistance given towards surf life saving in South Australia, because it plays an important role in the community and a very active role for our youth. It is attracting more and more young people every year and new clubs every year, in recent years at the rate of one or more a year, and these new clubs in each new area bring in more young people, quite apart from the tremendous service in the way of first-aid and rescues that apply to the community in general. This service largely goes unrewarded and unthanked, as far as general publicity is concerned. It is an extremely valuable and worthwhile service, and it should be getting much more support from this Government.

Mr. McANANEY: Although I do not think much of the member for Glenelg's childish little tantrum, I support his general remarks regarding the work these clubs do. I know that some clubs in my district have been helped by tourist grants. For instance, the Playford Government made a grant of \$3,000 or \$4,000 to the Chiton Surf Club. This year a club is being started at Goolwa. Surf clubs do a terrific amount of voluntary service, and I am sure that they will appreciate the extra \$1,000 allotted. When we get South Australia going again and the liability inflicted by the Labor Party is no longer evident, we will see that these clubs that are working for the benefit of the community as a whole will obtain more assistance through the Tourist Bureau than they are getting now. I cannot remember any surf club in my area receiving direct assistance from the Labor Government. I support this statement of the member for Glenelg that these clubs perform a wonderful community service. I am sure, because of the type of Government now in office, that the surf clubs will not be neglected as they have been in the past.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): The Government does appreciate the work of surf life-saving clubs and, of course, finds no complaint at all with the praise lavished on them by the member for Glenelg. Anyone who has dealt with these clubs is full of praise for the way they manage their affairs,

and for the community services they perform, and for the help they give to young people who are members. However, the way in which the member for Glenelg raised this matter is completely hypocritical. Where was he when this provision was discussed last year? At that time the matter apparently did not warrant a comment, but now it has been raised by 25 per cent of last year's provision and this is a terrible thing! This is utter nonsense and is the typical type of twisting political trick the honourable member tries to play in this place.

As the economy grows over the years and as this Government's financial measures prove to be effective, I hope we shall be able to provide additional assistance to surf life-saving clubs and to other equally worthy organizations. For the honourable member to criticize a 25 per cent increase, in the light of the previous Government's policy, is ridiculous. His criticism at this time will not help his case or the case of anyone else in this place.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I support the remarks of the member for Glenelg and the member for Stirling, but I regret that the Premier has involved himself in this debate, because I believe that the attitude adopted by the member for Glenelg (and recognized by the member for Stirling) was reasonable. He was not attempting to play politics, and I regret that the Premier has made this appear to be a political question. I, too, am very interested in the activities of the Surf Life Saving Association of Australia (South Australian Centre). There is a large area of beach in my electoral district.

Mr. Jennings: Are you a life saver?

Mr. BROOMHILL: I am not an active member of a club but I do frequent the beaches in my district. The member for Glenelg was not suggesting that the previous Government had provided all the moneys it wished to provide. Bearing in mind the Premier's interjection to the effect that the \$5,000 allocation this year "would do", I realize the difficulty the Minister of Lands would have in approaching the Premier for a grant in this respect. As the Premier has indicated his support of the activities of the Surf Life Saving Association and has indicated that he would make more money available if it were possible, I should like to know when he intends to withdraw the provision placed on the grant this year to the effect that this particular sum shall apply for three years without change. This seems to me to be quite wrong.

Although the member for Glenelg said that life savers in this State did not have to contend with the same surf problems that apply in other States, I think this fact is offset by South Australia's greater area of beaches that are used by the public, as a result of which life savers must spread their resources and patrol more beaches. We must consider not the sum made available to the association last year, the year before that or this year but the sum the association requires to fulfil the demands made on it by the public. When we consider the growth of population in this State, together with the growth of activities that take place during leisure hours and the requirements thus placed on the Surf Life Saving Association, and compare the sums provided in this State with those provided in other States, it seems fairly clear that insufficient money is allocated in South Australia in this regard. I should like the Minister to say whether or not an additional line cannot be inserted in the Estimates next year. Many South Australian business organizations and local councils involve themselves in the affairs of the association and make donations to it, and, if they are of the opinion that the Government is not particularly interested in those affairs, it could have an adverse effect on these donations. Will the Minister examine this matter next year with an open mind, and will he comment now on what has been suggested?

Mr. HUDSON: The Premier did not bother to listen to what I said: I specifically criticized the previous Government for the grant that was made. Let me say it again so that we all know who is the hypocrite around this place.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Steady up!

Mr. HUDSON: The charge was made by the Minister's colleague, and the Minister should tell him to steady up. I specifically said that Government after Government had not sufficiently recognized the Surf Life Saving Association. Let us get an assurance from the Premier to show that he is not a hypocrite, that he really believes that the association does a good job, and that he is not just paying lip service to it. Let us remove the three-year stipulation here and now. The Premier is the "boss cocky" in his show. Let him do this, for I am sure he will have the support of the Minister of Lands. He would be delighted, as would the member for Stirling, the member for West Torrens and many other members in this Chamber. Let us hear the Premier. Will this Government here and now make it clear that, so far as the Surf Life Saving Association is

concerned, the condition that the grant of \$5,000 per annum shall remain stationary for three years will be withdrawn? If he will not say that here and now, will he give us an assurance that the matter will be taken up with Cabinet and thoroughly investigated and, if it is possible to withdraw that condition, will it be withdrawn? Will he give us these assurances?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is unnecessary to get excited about this. Whilst the member for Glenelg criticizes the Premier and says he started the row, I remind him that he started it by kindly flattering me a little and saying I would like to help and then sympathizing with me critically about the Premier. Having done that, he can hardly expect me to go along with him without hearing some reply. It is wrong of the honourable member to try to claim that this heat started on this side. If he is honest with himself, he will admit that it originated in his flattering one person and criticizing another. A little flattery is nice but it is not so nice when one is flattered so that a colleague may be compared unfavourably with one. This is a sound Budget and the Treasurer has done a good job. It is no good the honourable member saying what he did and egging me on to have a go at the Treasurer.

Mr. Broomhill: Why do you not recommend the \$5,000?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will tell the honourable member something I thought he would know. I think I am right in saying that the member for Glenelg is a patron of the Surf Life Saving Association.

Mr. Hudson: Vice-Patron.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am not sure about the member for West Torrens, but I am Patron of the association and have been for some years. I have had much to do with it. This \$5,000, which is said to be inadequate, relates to the State centre, and nothing else.

Mr. Hudson: I am aware of that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member did not say so. He spoke of this as the total amount. He should remember that the Glenelg club has in past years received \$4,000 as a grant; it currently has in an application for a grant and it will get some of it, but the honourable member does not mention that. He talks as though \$5,000 is all that the Government is providing for the Surf Life Saving Association; but that is not correct. That is for the State centre, which

is a central organization with its headquarters at Henley Beach, in either the old police station or the old police residence, or a combination of the two. I well remember when that property was acquired from the Government. It was purchased on very generous terms by the association from the then Government (I know this because I had something to do with it), and the State centre was established.

The association has received \$4,000 a year for the last few years (in fact I believe it has received the same sum all along) and this has now been increased by 25 per cent. Of course, I acknowledge what the association does and if the circumstances permitted I should like to provide more than that. However, it is only sensible and realistic to tell the association that it can expect \$5,000 this year and for the next three years, which is far better than leaving the position up in the air with the possibility of an increase or decrease. The President and officers of the association discussed this matter with me and, knowing they could spend much more money than the sum provided, I would like to help them. Nevertheless, they have appreciated what they have received and, without solicitation, they wrote to me thanking me for the allocation.

Having been associated with various surf life-saving clubs, I agree with what the honourable member said about them. They do a good job in saving lives and in keeping our beaches safe, as well as providing recreational activity for many young people. The Glenelg club, for instance, has junior members who are taught life saving, swimming and so on, and obtain a healthy sporting outlook through their association with this movement. I do not criticize the previous Government for what it did for the association, but I point out that this Government has increased the sum provided.

Mr. HUDSON: I am always delighted to hear one of the holier-than-thou homilies that I receive from the Minister two or three times a year. I am well aware of the assistance provided for the establishment of individual clubhouses. The Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club had been told it would receive \$750 for its extensions but, now that the Minister has said this club's allocation is still being considered, I hope (and the club hopes) it will receive more. I point out to the Minister that the comparison I made was on the basis of the administration of State centres and the grants made in the various States to the respective State centres. The Queensland

Government provided \$69,000 for its State centre; Victoria provided \$26,000 for its centre; New South Wales provided \$20,000; Western Australia provided \$12,000; and South Australia has provided only \$5,000. On a comparable basis, the South Australian figure should be at least \$10,000.

I urge that further consideration be given next year and in the following year to the grant to be made to the Surf Life Saving Association. I do not want the condition that this grant is pegged for three years and that the association cannot make a further approach to the Government for another three years to be firmly established now, because it is an inappropriate condition. I am glad the Minister recognizes fully the fine work the association does, and I am glad that he recognizes, too, its need for additional finance. I hope that both he and the Premier will live up to the words they have spoken this evening and will permit further consideration next year and in the following year of the position of the Surf Life Saving Association of South Australia. I am sure if they do this that every member will be well and truly satisfied.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$531,931.

Mr. CORCORAN: What is the purpose of the \$1 grant to the Field Naturalists Society of South Australia towards field reserves?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Government spent \$1 last year and in this respect this Government thought that the previous Government had done a good job and agreed to match the previous grant. This grant is to enable the society's field reserves to be exempt from land tax under section 10 (1) (e) of the Land Tax Act, pursuant to Cabinet approval of November 27, 1967.

Mr. CORCORAN: Will the Minister comment on the statement by the Chairman of the Pastoral Board and of the Dog Fence Board (Mr. J. L. Johnson) reported in this morning's press that it seems inevitable that rates in connection with the dog fence will have to rise? This, particularly in the north-west, has no doubt been caused by wombats.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I doubt whether wombats have made such a vast difference. There is no difficulty about permits being granted where damage is occurring, and the destruction of wombats will be carried out where necessary along the fence line and within a short distance thereof, but it will not be

extended further than that. Beyond that, the main cause for the Chairman's warning is that maintenance and many other costs have risen.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF WORKS

Minister of Works Department, \$22,091—passed.

Engineering and Water Supply Department, \$12,716,900.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I refer to the lines "Engineering Operations" and "Wages for construction, reimbursement and other works". The Minister of Works has told the Committee that in fact salaries will be paid this year in the training of people for fluoridation of the water supply. In consequence, I rise to indicate my support for that expenditure. I think it necessary to do this because it is often charged to members on this side that they are bound to particular attitudes by outside organizations and cannot move a hand or a foot if it is not in consort.

That is not true. On our side of politics in South Australia we undertake to support those things to which we pledge ourselves in the programme before an election, and apart from this we are completely free agents. In consequence, some of the members on my side have previously, in the course of this debate, expressed themselves as opposed to fluoridation or opposed to the action of the Government in proposing to fluoridate the water supply. I leave aside the question as to whether Parliament should or should not have been consulted about this matter beforehand: I simply address myself to the question of whether the water supply should be fluoridated.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I am aware of the Leader's view on this subject.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate the point of view that has been advanced by some of my colleagues. I respect their views, but I disagree with some of them on this matter. I believe it is a vital public health measure to South Australia that fluoridation should be undertaken, and I want to make it clear that that is so.

I do not intend to weary the Committee, but I want to express my reasons for my attitude on this matter to make it quite clear why I take the stand that I do. It is generally alleged that the fluoridation of water supply is an uncertain business, that there is too much

uncertainty attached to it and therefore it is not safe to proceed with it. I was privileged to be a member of the Select Committee of this House that investigated the matter, and I was one of the majority on that committee which came out in support of fluoridation of water supply in consequence of the evidence that was given to us.

I went to that inquiry endeavouring in my own mind to establish from the evidence what the correct course was, and I believe that all members of the committee did that. There are times when I have my signal disagreements with the Attorney-General, but he was the chairman of the committee and I believe that he approached his work on that committee in a proper manner and with an open mind, though not, on this occasion, with an empty one. In my view, there could be no doubt from the evidence given to that committee that fluoridation of water supply was a proper and desirable public health measure, that it was safe, and that it was proper, therefore, to proceed with it. There is clear and completely undeniable evidence that fluoridation of water supply will lead to a very significant reduction in the incidence of dental caries and that there is no other way of procuring that particular reduction in the same measure. There is no other way of providing fluoride to the community in any form that will produce the same degree of reduction of dental caries as the fluoridation of the water supply will do.

It is suggested that tablets be administered but it has been proved that, where this has been tried, it does not work effectively, simply because of the human failing of people regularly to administer the tablets. What is more, the suggestion made by one of the qualified witnesses before the committee that the tablets should be administered through the school system was quite as open to objection as the objection he made to fluoridation of the water supply generally. It was open to the further objection that pre-school children would not be able to benefit from fluoride administered in this way. There has been a long period of proof of fluoridation of the water supply—a far longer period than was suggested originally by the major opponents of fluoridation as the necessary testing period. Originally, they continually used the figure of 20 years, but this period has now been far exceeded by tested and controlled experiments, and many of the original critics have been completely confounded.

There is overwhelming support by medical and dental organizations in the world for fluoridation of the water supply. The overwhelming body of technical evidence by people properly qualified in this area is in favour of fluoridation, and it is simply not open to argument that these people have been influenced in some improper manner by personal motives, nor is it open to argument that they have been influenced by those who would make some profit from fluoridation. For the most part, the objections made to fluoridation of the water supply seem to me to fall into two categories: one says, "There are experts on both sides. Therefore, we cannot make up our minds about the matter. Since we are unsure, it is better not to have the thing introduced."

True, some qualified people oppose the fluoridation of the water supply, but such people are very few indeed and, what is more, they have not done so as a result of an independent inquiry that evaluated their evidence in opposition to fluoridation. Evaluation of their evidence has taken place in a number of expert inquiries, whose results have been published and should be readily available to members. The most recent inquiry was the Royal Commission in Tasmania. It was a comprehensive inquiry, and its report is very well written and very much more detailed than is the report of our own Select Committee.

The conclusions of the Tasmanian inquiry are very clear and the Commissioner there, as had our Select Committee, had the advantage of commissions of inquiry established elsewhere in the world. These commissions have constantly come to the same conclusion. Probably the most qualified commission of inquiry was the South African Commission, which reported on May 12, 1967. It was an inquiry by a highly expert commission and, of its six members, five were qualified academically and professionally in medicine, dentistry, or some other branch of science. The report was extremely comprehensive and went into the whole medical and physiological aspects of the matter. It came out very clearly in favour of the fluoridation of the water supply.

The expert committee of the World Health Organization has come out in support of fluoridation. The evaluation of the evidence of those opposed to fluoridation has taken place in a number of inquiries, including the Tasmanian inquiry. Our Select Committee had before it the judgment of the High Court of Ireland, which had had an opportunity to

evaluate the scientific evidence of the witnesses claiming qualification in the area of fluoridation, and it was quite clear from that judgment that the value of this particular scientific evidence was heavily discounted after the gentlemen concerned had been subjected to expert cross-examination.

I commend to honourable members interested in this subject the report of the Tasmanian Commission because it is the most recent Australian report, and it is clear from this that numbers of the things that are said in current periodicals and publications opposed to fluoridation do not bear any adequate examination. I have seen a list, which has been produced to this Chamber, of those purporting to be opposed to fluoridation in some measure or another. The nature of the opposition and the basis of it is not, however, examined in that document. It has been for the most part examined by this Commission, and it has come clearly out against the conclusions to which the opponents have come, and in favour of the overwhelming body of scientific and medical opinion, which is to the contrary.

The other suggestion is that it is unsafe to fluoridate. That question is again considered in this Commission report and, while it is made quite clear that it is impossible to say that anything done in the public health area including, for instance, chlorination of the water supply or compulsory X-rays, is 100 per cent safe in all the circumstances and not subject to human error, the conclusion reached in report after report is that the possibility of this process being unsafe (taking the fluoride content in the water supply to one part in a million) is so remote that the community need not be disturbed. The possibility of allergy or toxic response is dealt with thoroughly in this report, and there is no sort of clear evidence of allergy resulting from fluoride. Indeed, the writings of Dr. Waldbott, to which the opponents of fluoride so often refer, are dealt with at some length in this report, and his pretensions to come to scientific conclusions are largely discounted, as they have been discounted in previous investigations. In fact, in the Irish High Court case, the value of his scientific evidence received severe criticism.

Altogether, then, I think that it is proper to proceed, although I think it would have been wise to put the question specifically to Parliament so that a vote could have been taken before fluoride was introduced to the water supply. I believe a vote should have been taken, but at the same time I make it quite

clear that had such a vote been taken I would have voted for the introduction of fluoride to the South Australian water supply. I believe there is no public health measure in South Australia that can at this stage do as much good for the community as fluoridation can do.

Line passed.

Public Buildings Department, \$7,410,583; Public Stores Department, \$335,690; Miscellaneous, \$195,050—passed.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION

Minister of Education Department, \$18,028—passed.

Education Department, \$53,267,146.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Under "Administration and Finance—\$648,300" I notice that in the items for which this money is provided "research officer" is in the singular. From my experience as a previous Minister of Education, I am sure this department needs more research officers. It is now spending one-quarter of the State's revenue and it is obvious that, in a department of this kind, research officers are necessary, particularly at this stage, to examine many of the procedures that have been adopted and in some cases have remained unaltered for many years. I am not criticizing the Minister for not providing more money on this line, but I should like her to comment on what she considers should be Government policy in this matter. It is particularly important that several research officers be appointed with a view to having enough competent people to examine the organizational procedures of the department, particularly in view of its size and the amount of money involved. This, of course, depends on getting competent people able to carry out the necessary research and paying them good salaries. This is an important matter, bearing in mind what I have just said.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE (Minister of Education): "Research officer" appears in the singular, but I think the honourable member knows there are what are known as release-time scholars who teach in department schools in the mornings and come into the department in the afternoons. They have been engaged in various matters associated with research in the various divisions within the department. These people are picked as probable future executive officers on the administration side of the department. I will check for the honourable member whether there is only one research officer, but I stress that

these teachers who are brought in on a part-time basis to work in the department will certainly be relieving the research officer of some of his work.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I draw the Minister's attention to the following statement made by the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards) last evening regarding free books:

One headmaster told me it cost him more for books now than before this free book system was announced, mainly because only some of these books are free and consequently this makes whatever books which have to be bought dearer. When books are all bought from the one firm, they can be bought more cheaply.

I am sure the Minister will be aware that when the free books scheme was introduced the Supply and Tender Board called for tenders for books and, by adopting this method, on the initial outlay \$240,000 was saved in the first year of operation and over \$500,000 in the second year. I notice that in the provision this year the cost of free books has increased from about \$254,000 to \$550,000, which is undoubtedly because we are now in the third year of full operation, which means that many books need replacement and this additional sum is required. I find it incredible that one of our headmasters, after nearly three years of operation of this system, should believe the sort of thing which the member for Eyre tells us was told to him. As this is utterly incredible, will the Minister explain to the honourable member the details of the free books scheme and find out who this headmaster is because, if such a headmaster exists, surely he should be informed, after three years, how the free books scheme works?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I was not in the Chamber last evening when the member for Eyre made the statement, nor have I read it today. The provision for the supply of free text books to primary students in the Education Department and private schools has increased from \$254,469 to \$550,000. The increase is due to the cost of replacing books after two years' operation of the free book scheme.

Mr. JENNINGS: I refer to "Wages—cleaners, playground supervisors, labour as required", for which a modest increase is proposed. Does this provide for window cleaners?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will put the honourable member out of his misery at once: it does not provide for the cleaning of school windows. In keeping with what the former

Minister did, I point out that my windows still have not been cleaned. The increase comes about because more cleaning staff is needed for the new schools that have been built.

Mr. HUDSON: I refer to the teachers award that has just been granted. Does this award apply to the staff of teachers colleges and to any administrative staff within the department such as inspectors, superintendents, etc.?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I cannot specifically name the teachers to whom this applies, but I believe that it has general application. However, I will obtain this information. This decision is made by an independent tribunal (the Teachers Salaries Board) which is presided over by Judge Williams and which has two representatives of the Education Department and two teacher representatives as members. The Government has indicated as, I believe, previous Governments have done that it will pay the awards granted by properly constituted tribunals, and I think the Treasurer intimated recently that this would probably necessitate a supplementary budget to meet the cost, because this was announced after the Budget had been prepared.

Mr. HUDSON: I believe many teachers consider that the award is by no means adequate. Many teachers consider also that the tribunal is not entirely independent of Government influence and that the Government of the day, whatever Government it is, exerts some influence on the kind of award made. Certainly, the increase in teachers' salaries (a maximum of 3 per cent, and in some cases there is no increase or only a very small increase) is a little alarming in a world in which we need to do all we can to raise the status of the teaching profession. South Australia is losing teachers to Canada, where teachers can earn significantly more than they can here.

There is a mobility in the teaching profession, and this has shown itself to an increasing extent in recent years: once a teacher is free from the obligations of his bond he can and does move either from Government service to a private or independent school or from Government service to other States or overseas. Increasing numbers of teachers have gone from Australia to Canada, particularly over the last few years. This is disturbing in circumstances where we do not have sufficient qualified teachers and where our classes are too big. It has been demonstrated that the only

way in which universities can attract staff and retain it is by paying salaries competitive with those applying overseas. Our salaries are competitive when compared with those of the United Kingdom, and there is a definite financial incentive for someone employed in an English university to move to Australia should the opportunity arise.

This has been the main way in which we have partially solved our problems with regard to the shortage of doctors. If it were not for the intake of doctors from the United Kingdom each year South Australia would be in grave difficulties. One of the reasons for the shortage of dentists here is that there is a regular out-flow of dentists to England, because dentists there are relatively highly paid through the national health scheme compared with what dentists receive in Australia.

Because of the problem of attracting teachers and keeping the qualified teachers we already have, I consider that this award will prove to be inadequate. It will not meet adequately the needs of teachers or do anything of a substantial nature to raise the status of the teaching profession within the community. It has always been a problem within the Australian community to ensure that teachers are sufficiently highly regarded by the community as a whole. This is important in that teaching becomes a profession that attracts the best qualified people, and it is important in the long run for the overall morale of the profession.

If our salary rates are favourable compared with those in other States and overseas, the morale and enthusiasm surrounding the work that goes on within the Education Department can be extremely valuable protection against the departure of staff. I believe that with the large administrative machine such as we have in the Education Department it is difficult to maintain the morale of teachers, and it seems to me that the morale amongst the teaching profession will be adversely affected by this award. I believe some loss of staff will result. I register my disappointment at the award, and I also register, on their behalf, the disappointment of many people in the community who consider that this sort of tribunal is not really entirely independent of influence from either the Government or, in particular, the Treasury.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I now have the information on what teachers are covered by this award. Teachers College staff are covered by the award but the administrative

staff of the Education Department are not. It is rather interesting that the member for Glenelg should have mentioned losses to countries such as Canada. Only within the last couple of weeks I had a letter from the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science asking, for purposes of an exercise being done by his office, whether I could advise him on the number, if any, of teachers who had left here to go to Canada. It is hard, sometimes, to find where people are going, but I think that the number here was perhaps one or two: it was very small.

Mr. HUDSON: I can tell the Minister of two such people straight away, namely, two whose votes were in question before the Court of Disputed Returns regarding the Millicent by-election. It would be a great coincidence if those two teachers happened to be the only two who had gone to Canada. The votes of these two people had been admitted, and it was ruled by the Court that they had been invalidly admitted. If the Minister has written to the Commonwealth Minister saying that only one or two teachers have gone to Canada, I can assure her that both the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) and I can give her the names and addresses of two such people. In fact, we could write to those people to find out whether they know of any more South Australian teachers in Canada, because I am certain that more than one or two teachers are involved.

Mr. JENNINGS: I refer to the line "Primary Education". Recently, at the invitation of the Enfield Primary School Committee, I attended an inspection of the school with members of the committee. I was shown a letter from Mr. Kearney (Acting Assistant Superintendent of Primary Education). I admit that, in telephoning Mr. Kearney, I departed from my normal procedure: I usually get in touch with the Minister on matters of this nature because, if she makes a mistake, she can be attacked here, whereas a public servant cannot be attacked here. Since I had Mr. Kearney's letter I got in touch with him and he said, "This has gone to the drafting department and plans are being made. If the committee inferred from the letter that it is likely to get what it wants very quickly, I am afraid it will be disappointed." I got in touch with the secretary of the committee and said, "It is obvious that you are not going to get what you want for some time. Take it up with me in October." It is now October, and the committee has been in touch with me

today. Will the Minister investigate the problems at the Enfield Primary School and will she tell me the result of her investigation?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I notice that \$721,800 was provided for teacher education last year, but the actual payments were \$756,192. It is proposed this year to spend \$603,300, which involves a reduction of \$152,892. Since teacher education generally has been regarded of the very highest priority for at least the last three years, I cannot understand how a decrease can be made in this item unless some very special circumstances have arisen. The tendency has been to devote more funds to teacher education because of the need for ensuring an adequate supply of teachers of quality. Also, more funds should be required for inservice training. Much additional expenditure has been incurred in acquainting teachers with changes in courses. Consequently, I find it hard to understand how such a big reduction can be made satisfactorily from the viewpoint of education and of the department's needs. Can the Minister of Education say why such a big reduction has been made?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: This involves a decrease of \$152,892. The item relates to the provision for general expansion of the teacher-training programme, including tertiary teaching scholarships. The decrease in expenditure is the result of the reduction in the provision for textbooks and student travelling expenses, these items to be provided by students as from January 1, 1969, out of an increased allowance of \$105 a year.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I move:

That the vote of the Education Department be reduced by \$200.

I draw the attention of members to the fact that this is the traditional way of expressing a lack of confidence in the Government, in particular on the matter of travelling allowances and textbooks relating to student teachers. The Minister has just said that the large reduction in the provision for teacher education is made up, in part, of savings that will be effected as a result of the intended change in the arrangement concerning travelling expenses and textbooks for student teachers. I will show later how much that statement differs from statements that have already been made on the subject in this Chamber. Members on this side regard the change of arrangement that has occurred as a most intolerable one from the point of view of education generally and, in particular, the students

involved. When one reviews the Minister's statements and replies to questions put to her on this subject, one is struck by their ambiguity and unsatisfactory nature, and I think we could ask ourselves what is the real reason for this change of policy.

There can be little doubt that the intended change arose out of the pressure placed on the Education Department by the Government in making its decisions on finance. The annual increase necessary to finance general expansion of the department's services has been cut from an increase of more than 7 per cent last year to one of 5.6 per cent this year. Having given details earlier, I think it is unnecessary to go over the figures again, but it is clear that this cut has been made, and it has been made at a time when there should be an increase, and not a decrease, in the finance provided for this department. The Education Department has been under tremendous pressure for several years, and I think this is borne out by the fact that the previous Government even went to the extent of saving money by not cleaning school windows, a move that no Minister would undertake unless he was under the greatest of pressure concerning the supply of finance to his department.

I refer to the Minister's statement that the new scheme will be just as costly, that the students will actually get the same amount overall, and that no extra money is involved concerning the department, so this is not a question of more money or less money. We heard little about the cost of administering the present arrangement. Judging from the Minister's previous remarks, one would imagine that this is not a question of saving: it is not a question of extra money, because it is said that the scheme will be just as costly and the students will get the same amount overall; yet we are told this evening that a proportion of this decrease in expenditure on teacher education comes as a result of the saving from the proposed change in travelling expenses and the cost of supplying textbooks to student teachers.

Although the Minister has said that the whole purpose of introducing this new idea is to equalize allowances, we know it will produce great inequality in the circumstances in which individual students will find themselves under the new arrangement, and considerable financial hardship will fall on those many students whose allowances will in future be inadequate to meet the cost of travelling and textbooks. I am satisfied that the real reason

for this change is the cutting out of administrative costs associated with the checking of students' travel claims. I firmly believe that, and that it has been forced upon the department by the pressure of insufficient money being provided by the Government for it. This was the main reason advanced to me when I was Minister, the other reason being that the allowance for textbooks would allow students to accumulate a personal library—in my opinion, a minor reason to add weight to the argument.

I propose to examine separately these reasons regarding textbooks and travel. There is no doubt that the present administrative procedure of checking students' travel claims is uneconomic. College lecturers and departmental officers have been engaged in checking these claims every term, but the problem is not capable of solution on a just and equitable basis by fixing an average allowance for travel expenses. If a change is required, the aim should be to reduce the administrative costs to a reasonable level and retain the equity of the present arrangement, which accepts what are the undeniable facts—that the individual students' travel costs vary tremendously. I gave many figures taken at random when previously speaking on this matter. We know they vary in as wide a range as \$80 to \$200, and some even more, each year.

It has been said that, because employees do not get paid to travel from their homes to their places of employment and back, there is no justification for the payment of travel allowances to the students for travelling from home to college and college to home. It has also been said that the cases are not analogous, because the students are not employees; but it should be remembered that, when wage-fixation inquiries are held, the cost of travelling to work is often regarded as a part of or an element in wage fixation. I recall a case in point when the district allowance for Whyalla was being fixed, and the point arose that the people who worked in Whyalla did not have to travel so far to their work as other people did: in other words, the cost of transport to work was an element in the wage fixation.

When the living wage is fixed, the cost of travel is an element in it, so it is not entirely correct to say that employees do not get paid for travelling to and from work. This is done indirectly through wage fixation and in some cases I believe special provisions are made—for example, for bricklayers in regard to the

places where they have to work. These costs for students travelling between home and college and college and home vary widely. The distances vary widely indeed and, regarding the costs between colleges and colleges and the annexe or the university, the Western Teachers College students have by far the heaviest costs.

To reduce administrative costs and retain equity, alternatives should be considered and introduced. For example, a zoning system could be adopted with payment for travel costs based on public transport fares for travel from home to college and return, with an additional annual allowance for college to annexe or university travel based on the particular needs of the students at each college. This would not be difficult to work out and, once an amount was fixed, the student would have that amount paid and that would be the end of it. The only thing that would be necessary apart from that would be for the students to notify change of address. Alternatively or in combination with this arrangement, student travel concessions on public transport could be introduced, again eliminating much administrative cost. This should be examined to see if it is necessary to introduce it as part of a scheme which would, as I said before, retain the equity in the present arrangement, because the present arrangement certainly is equitable since it recognizes the difference in the circumstances of the individual students.

I turn now to the second reason advanced for the proposed change: that, instead of free textbooks being provided on loan, an allowance would enable students to accumulate a personal library. In my opinion the advantages claimed in respect of this matter are doubtful since some textbooks, particularly science textbooks, rapidly get out of date. I believe probably many students dispose of their textbooks for a variety of reasons. For a student who has little money the temptation is strong, after a textbook has been used, to dispose of it on two grounds: first, that the textbook may get out of date; and secondly, that the student says to himself that in a few years he will be earning much better money and will be able to get that textbook or its successor, which is more up to date, much more easily. At that time he will want the money. I believe a great many students will dispose of their textbooks as soon as they believe they are moving on to other textbooks and no longer require the ones they have at that time.

Obviously the Education Department can buy textbooks in quantity and much more cheaply than students can buy them individually. Seeing that many textbooks have to be bought, surely the proper thing to do is to buy them on the most economical basis, and the department can do that. What has been said earlier this evening about free textbooks in our schools indicates the enormous savings that can be made by calling tenders for textbooks. It has been said that, under this new scheme, the textbooks in stock will be sold at half price to students. Of course, this can only help students who happen to buy these textbooks. Once they are sold that is the end of it: it is merely a temporary advantage to those who happen to buy them at the moment.

If the proposal for building up individual libraries for students is a good one, if the students and the principals place a high value on it, and if the consensus of opinion is that it is very desirable, then obviously the allowance made in respect of these textbooks must be adequate, otherwise it does not fulfil the function of building up a library. Again, the cost of textbooks varies greatly with students, depending on the courses being pursued. I drew attention earlier to the fact that the minimum cost of textbooks for at least four categories of student was about \$90 or \$100 a year, and that is inescapable. Yet, after the Opposition protested about the matter, the allowance has been increased from \$85 to only \$105.

I point out, too, that access to suitable reference libraries under the proposals referred to by the Minister is an important matter. It has been said that multiple copies of textbooks will be provided for the use of students who cannot afford to buy them, but it has not been explained how the use of these textbooks is to be restricted to the students who cannot afford them. Obviously, if they are there the tendency will be for as many people as possible to use them, unless the Minister has in mind a means test to determine which students cannot afford to buy textbooks out of this new allowance. In any case, the Barr Smith Library cannot sustain any further student pressure, and the Western and Wattle Park Teachers College Libraries have not sufficient facilities to carry large quantities of multiple copies of textbooks to meet this new suggestion and set of arrangements. In the course of the debate comparisons have been made with allowances paid to student teachers in

other States and overseas. Some of these comparisons have been made by averaging out combinations of allowances, but I suggest that this sort of thing has little relevance indeed to this situation. What is done in Great Britain or America or in the other States has little relevance to this, because we are dealing with circumstances applying in South Australia at the moment. We are dealing with conditions which students and parents accepted as part of an agreement that would be continued with provisions at least as good as those in their present form. The parents and students would not have objected if there had been an alteration to the scheme, provided it was equitable and as good as the present one. That is the whole crux of the situation.

It has been said that the students are being treated more as adults, but I ask members whether this is true. If the student teachers were all adults, would they not have been consulted on this matter before this arrangement was proposed? Would any body of adults in this situation have a cut-and-dried proposal concerning them announced, a proposal which would put many of them in a position of considerable hardship and in a position much worse than they had hitherto experienced? Of course it would not. When an organization is faced with a proposition that means a change, in these days they expect a change to result in at least as good a state of affairs, materially, as the one that existed before. Indeed, most people expect something better. They certainly do not expect something worse.

Mr. Clark: And they expect to be consulted.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That is true, and there is not the slightest doubt that this new arrangement will cause considerable upset in many families that have budgeted for a period during which their son or daughter will be at the college for anything from two to five years. Coming as it does just before the students examinations and at a time when everything should be done to carry on the policy of the previous Government of securing an adequate supply of teachers of quality, this proposal is an outstanding blunder. The adverse effects in education in this State will be far reaching and of considerable duration. The relations between students and the Education Department have already been sadly undermined by this move. I emphasize that I consider that the relations between the student teachers and the department were very good

prior to this suggestion being made. There is not the slightest doubt that the effects of this matter will be very difficult to overcome. This could have been avoided by a less parsimonious and deflationary attitude in the Government's approach to finance and these Education Department estimates in particular, and no Government responsible for such a blunder in these circumstances can have the confidence of the people.

Mr. CLARK: I rise with some regret that the move we are discussing tonight on such a subject is so vitally necessary. Honourable members will know that I speak with complete sincerity on this matter. I have a very strong personal feeling for education, for the teachers in our schools and for the people who are training to be teachers, because I was for 25 years a teacher myself and many of the highest ranking officers in the Education Department today were colleagues of mine. In fact, the Director-General himself was at the teachers college at the same time as I was. Since I have left the department I have had the opportunity to continue my interest in schools. I suppose that when a person has been a teacher for 25 years teaching becomes a part of that person.

I am most concerned at the unhappy situation that exists at present. I want harmony as much as anyone else in matters affecting the Education Department, and I want to see the Minister of Education respected (as has always been the case) by everyone in the employment of the department. I regret to say that at the moment this is not so.

I remind members that there was a time when almost any person, if he was prepared to enter the teachers college for a short period, could become a teacher. Happily that time has gone, and the Education Department, fortunately, has been able to become more and more selective in the type of students it accepts into the teachers colleges. This, of course, is good, and it means that in this case we are not dealing with those of, shall we say, lesser ability: we are dealing with some of the cream of the young people of that particular age in South Australia. Indeed, many of these people will become the best teachers in the department.

The reason I say the situation at the moment is a most unhappy one is that there has been disagreement amongst teachers over one particular issue that has been mentioned here tonight but which I will not discuss. In

addition, the students are feeling frustrated and hurt over what they consider is a rank injustice, and I must say that I agree with them.

I admire and congratulate the students of the teachers colleges on their moderation over this issue. There must have been a very great temptation to take action of a different sort, for in any large body of people there are always a few at least who advocate wild and woolly measures to combat these things. The students generally have not succumbed to the temptations of having a revolution, shall we say. For a long time we have wanted smaller classes and more teachers, but is this the way to find more teachers? Or is it the way to get rid of them?

We must not entirely blame the Minister of Education, as we tend to do, for this decision. Surely an important issue such as this must have been a Cabinet decision. If the Minister calmly went along and agreed with the decision, much of the odium must fall on her. As the member for Whyalla said, the only reason anyone can possibly imagine for this alteration is that it was made to save money. However, such a saving will be to the eventual disadvantage of the department. Dissatisfaction breeds loss, and I believe many young students will leave the service as soon as they have the opportunity. It leads to a personal loss for many students and, indeed, for their parents. It is not only a financial loss. The worst feature of the decision is that the regulation was brought in only a few weeks before the students were due to sit for examinations. Obviously, this upsetting experience will not be very helpful on the eve of examinations.

I have tried to work out why this was done. Apparently the reason was to save money—and what a petty saving. I believe student teachers need more money, not less. There had been no alteration in their allowances since 1965, and the cost of living has increased considerably since then. At whose instigation was this done? We believe that the department, or, at least, someone was worrying about the time taken over the administrative work associated with travelling allowances, and that it was thought that money could be saved in this connection. That is a petty way of saving money.

The member for Whyalla covered very well the question of textbooks on loan. The students will now have the opportunity to build an educational library for themselves!

I was a student teacher, and in my time we might have received a greater amount, when the cost of living is taken into consideration, than student teachers receive today. If we could sell a book and we needed the money, we sold the book. I know how a student teacher thinks: "In a few years' time I will have more money." We must remember that many changes in set textbooks are frequently made. I can think of two bulky textbooks on my shelves today. I have them for two reasons. The chief reason was that these textbooks were so poor that they were used for a particular course for only one year, and there was no future sale for them. The second reason was that, being a book lover, I did not like to throw books away. One is a 700-page volume on money and, in my opinion, the driest book I have ever seen or tried to study, so that is probably why my knowledge of money matters is not as extensive today as it might be.

Who will pay for this saving? We are told that the students will be dignified. But they will also be poorer, and they will be more dissatisfied and disturbed now than they have been previously. Indeed, they will be dissatisfied and disturbed at the wrong time. I honestly believe that we will lose many student teachers. We shall find that some of them will be so dissatisfied that they will leave the service as soon as they have an opportunity to do so, and I know that students who may have hoped to apply to spend additional years in college will not be doing so, because they will realize that they will be better off teaching than at college. This will be a bad thing. When I was a student, we managed to get one year in the teachers college, and one may imagine how much university training one received in that period. It has always been a great thrill to me that students attending a teachers college nowadays have an opportunity to complete degrees before actually teaching; they do not sit night after night studying degree subjects after a day's teaching.

I am afraid that the new arrangement will cause many students to leave the college one or two years before they should. Although this point may not be strictly and legally correct, these students are under a bond and subject to certain contractual liabilities, and I believe that, just as they are under such a bond, there is a moral bond on the department or on the Government at least to allow students to continue to enjoy the conditions that existed at the commencement of the bond. However, students are being denied that privilege here.

As has been evidenced by motions moved and statements made at student meetings, the Minister has lost the confidence of the students. This confidence is not lost easily: I have served in Parliament at the same time as a number of particularly fine Ministers, and I cannot remember an occasion when a Minister of Education has completely lost the confidence of students at teachers colleges. However, that has unfortunately occurred on this occasion. Surely, Cabinet must have made this decision; I cannot believe that the Minister, meek and mild, made the decision herself and that everyone quietly agreed without discussing it at all. I therefore support the motion, for I believe that the Government has lost the confidence of this Chamber as well as of the students concerning this issue.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Prior to moving this motion, the member for Whyalla asked me a question about teacher education services. I told him the position with regard to this. I had not anticipated that he would move the motion now; I had expected him to ask me further questions on this matter, in which case I would then have proceeded to tell him the way in which this was offset in the lines for education. The salaries and wages paid for the year ending June 30, 1968, amounted to \$39,876,106, and the current rate of payment as at July 1, 1968, was \$41,284,426. Additional provision was made for certain things, amongst which was the cost of the payment of the increased allowance (at that time \$85 per annum) to commence as from January 1, 1969, for which provision had been made in this Budget. This was to cover the cost of textbooks and travelling expenses. That line is set down as \$170,000.

Since that time, we have increased the amount of the allowance by \$20, raising it from \$85 to \$105. This meant that we had to find within the department extra money to cover this increase. So the provision for the increased allowances now to be paid to student teachers will be \$170,000 plus \$39,000, which extra expense must be contained within the department's estimates. I reiterate what I said in the debate on the first line, that this is an increase added to the amount of the living allowance that previously applied. The allowances paid to student teachers were never intended by any Government to cover entirely every expense involved in their training. This current step was taken for obvious reasons: first, that it was hard to control the amount of travelling expenses paid, and, secondly

(though it is only a minor reason but it has been referred to by the member for Whyalla) it was felt that the students could build up their own library. I still believe this is desirable, and anybody who has been a teacher will probably believe this.

In fact, only today I had a letter from a teacher who had been a student teacher some 11 years ago telling me that he had a professional library that was standing him in good stead now that he was a mature teacher, and that he built up this library at a time when the allowances were nothing like what they are today. He said, "If only I could have been in the position of student teachers today, what a difference it would have made to me!" The extra money involved in the increased allowance just announced by the Government is being contained within the department, which means that various divisions of the department have to meet this extra cost. It was interesting to hear the member for Whyalla say that there was a decrease in the amount of money spent on education this year. I refer the honourable member to the Treasurer's statement in which he said:

The biggest individual increase in the expenditures from the Budget will again be for the Education Department, for which the proposals totalling \$53,267,000 are an increase of \$4,140,000. Excluding \$200,000 for expenditures on equipment for science and technical training purposes to be covered by Commonwealth funds, purposes which in the past four years have been charged directly to a trust account, the increase is \$3,940,000, or 8 per cent above payments in 1967-68.

How there can be a decrease in the amount of money being voted to the Education Department I do not follow. It is an 8 per cent increase on the amount voted for education last year.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Last year it was 10 per cent—it was a decrease percentage-wise.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The member for Whyalla said that the only reason for this change was to cut out administrative costs. That is not entirely so. I wish to refer to figures I have mentioned in this place previously to show just what happened in the last three years of the Labor Administration. In 1965-66, the sum voted for expenditure on textbooks, library books and travelling expenses for teacher students was \$210,000. The actual cost to the department in that year was \$248,100 and a transfer excess warrant had to be obtained, meaning that the expenditure had to be contained within the

department to cover the excess of \$38,100. In 1966-67, the amount voted for this purpose was \$255,000 and the actual cost was \$327,300, an excess warrant having to be obtained for \$72,300. In 1967-68, the amount voted was \$336,700, the actual cost was \$400,000, and an excess of \$63,300 was incurred. This means that in the three years these schemes cost \$174,700 over and above the amounts voted. Obviously, this kind of thing cannot be allowed to continue. Departments must balance their budget in just the same way as Governments must balance their Budgets.

Mr. Hudson: What is that figure of \$400,000 for 1967-68?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: That is the actual sum spent.

Mr. Hudson: On travel allowances and textbooks?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes.

Mr. Corcoran: I thought you said this wouldn't save the department anything.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: This money has to be found in the department. Every division in the department has to sacrifice something to make sure that this sum is met.

Mr. Corcoran: You said previously that the department would save nothing as a result of the change.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I did not say that. The member for Whyalla said that cutting our administrative costs was the real reason for our making the changes. I have already said the allowance was not meant to cover, and has never been expected to cover, every expense. It was meant as an aid to students to meet expenses and as an aid to parents, who are responsible to a certain extent, to help their student sons and daughters through the teachers college. At this stage we should consider the many hundreds of parents who put their sons and daughters who are not eligible for a Commonwealth scholarship through the university. These parents have to meet the entire cost of textbooks, fees, and travelling expenses, as well as having to keep their young people. It seems that this is lost sight of.

Mr. Langley: They could not do it if they didn't have the money.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Hundreds and hundreds of private students attend the universities and teachers colleges. Many of them do not go through the teachers colleges just for the sake of the monetary help they receive; they do so because they want to make teaching their career.

Mr. Langley: Some have cadetships to help them through.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I do not suggest that is not so, but hundreds of students go through universities and colleges and receive no help whatever and have to meet all the costs themselves.

Mr. Langley: I would like to know the percentage; it would be low.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Many private students attend teachers colleges and universities. Travelling allowances were introduced in 1959 when everything was being done to attract young people into the teaching profession, and, as I said before, I believe it was a bad principle to introduce this. It has been said that these factors are considered when certain awards are being made, but this sort of thing happens only in isolated instances. I believe this happens in the bricklaying section of the building trade, where people can be moved from one job to another to suit the convenience of particular contractors and I believe, too, that it is done in instances in the Engineering and Water Supply Department where employees have to be taken to different jobs. However, as I understand it, the employees have to report first to their place of employment and their travelling expenses between their home and the depot and between the depot and home later in the day are not covered. It was established when members of the students representative councils of the five teachers colleges came to see me last week that the students of the Western Teachers College were perhaps worse off than were the students at the other colleges, because that college is divided into three parts: one part is at Taylors Road, Thebarton, another is in Currie Street, and the third is in Walter Street, Thebarton.

The Director-General of Education, who was with me when I received this deputation, suggested to the presidents that if they could make any suggestions on this matter, first discussing the matter with the principal of the college, we would consider their suggestions sympathetically because we felt that they had established a case. Again, a special case was made out for the "M" students attending Wattle Park who come in half way through the year. These students find it difficult to meet the cost of books because of this. We also offered to do this in the case of the students who would be coming into the teachers colleges at the commencement of the college

year. We suggested that this could be looked at sympathetically so that students could be given an advance payment instead of increments to enable them to buy their initial textbooks.

I believe that the various sums mentioned in the letters to the newspaper regarding the cost of textbooks have been based on the price of new books. Of course, as everyone knows, the supply of textbooks to students consists, in the main, of secondhand books which are used and issued to students year after year, the cost to the department of replacing textbooks varying from year to year, depending on the number that have to be replaced. I believe, too, that in many instances these are paper-back books. Of course, the syllabuses are changed from year to year. However, I believe that the students' estimates, which vary from about \$100 to \$500, of the cost to students to buy their books, are based on new book prices.

I think it is accepted by everyone that students the world over buy and sell books amongst themselves with the idea of keeping book costs down to the very lowest price, and I am sure that that applies here at the teachers colleges and at the universities.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: If they do that, they don't keep them for their own professional library.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: There are quite a number of students who do want to buy their books for their own library.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You can't have it both ways.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Not every student wants to build up a professional library, although some do, and I believe that those who want to do it will do it, despite the cost of the books. Some reference was made to the question of multiple copies of textbooks. I thought it might interest members if I told them the position at the Wattle Park Teachers College regarding the provision of multiple textbooks. The library books in the college library at Wattle Park total about 31,000, consisting of more than 21,000 general reference books and 10,000 of multiple copies of various textbooks associated with university and teachers college courses. That is the position at present, and I have given an undertaking that there will be multiple sets of textbooks used by the students in both the teachers colleges and in the universities libraries.

Another point that was made when I spoke earlier was that in cases of hardship, where it can be proved that students are in need (for various reasons), they can apply for a boarding allowance. Even those students who are living at home can do that. As always with these kinds of allowance, provided people can prove extreme hardship to the satisfaction of the department, they are eligible for boarding allowances.

I was chided because I did not seek the opinion of the student teachers before this new method of applying allowances was suggested. I question whether in every instance employers ask the people who work for them whether or not they will be satisfied with certain things, and I also question whether employers tell those people that they intend to do this or to do that.

Mr. Corcoran: They are students, not employees.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am using this in a general sense because it is a little difficult to make an analogy unless I do this. I am not suggesting that student teachers are employees of the Education Department. They are, however, potential employees because they are getting the advantage of a first-class education at the department's expense and the assurance of a job on completion of the course. They can go into the teaching profession, and their qualifications will enable them to get a job anywhere in the world.

The point I am making is that I do not know—perhaps some member may enlighten me—of any instances where employees are asked in advance whether they will be prepared to accept something. I know the previous Minister of Education did ask the principals of teachers colleges to get some indication from the students whether they would approve of this kind of thing. The reply was that those who would benefit from it were in favour of it and those who would not benefit from it were not in favour of it, so I saw no point in doing it two years later. I believe that the relationships between me and the student teachers are most amicable: members would have found it very interesting to be present in my office during the two interviews I had with representatives of the student teachers.

The member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) compared allowances in South Australia with those in other States. I want to quote from a schedule of allowances that was obtained for me by the Director who controls teacher

training and education. He spent the morning telephoning the Education Departments of all other States so that I could have their up-to-the-minute figures. The member for Whyalla said that we should be concerned only with South Australian students and the conditions here, but I still believe that the allowances paid in other States are valuable for purposes of comparison and are relevant. If it suited any member's book, he would quote the figures of other States, and they are usually accepted as providing a valid comparison.

Mr. Corcoran: Comparisons are odious.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: They are not odious. The honourable member will find that student teachers' allowances in South Australia compare very favourably with those in other States. Only two States provide better allowances than does this State. At the risk of taking a little time, I should like to read the figures rather than to ask that they be incorporated in *Hansard*. In South Australia the new allowances for first-year student teachers are \$805; in New South Wales, \$590; Victoria, \$1,183; Queensland, \$676; Western Australia, \$785; and Tasmania, \$850. So, South Australian first-year student teachers receive the third highest allowances in the Commonwealth, and I draw attention to the very small margin between this State's allowances and those of the two States whose allowances for first-year students are higher.

Second-year student teachers in South Australia receive \$845; in New South Wales, \$590; Victoria, \$1,183 (as the member for Whyalla will know, Victoria is way out ahead of the other States with regard to allowances); Queensland, \$728; Western Australia, \$785; and Tasmania, \$900. So, here again South Australian allowances are the third highest in the Commonwealth. South Australian allowances for third-year students are also the third highest in the Commonwealth: in South Australia they are \$905; in New South Wales, \$810; Victoria, \$1,397; Queensland, \$780; Western Australia, \$865; and Tasmania, \$1,000. In their fourth and fifth years of training student teachers in this State receive \$1,005; in New South Wales, \$890; Victoria, \$1,506; there are no fourth-year or fifth-year students in Queensland. In Western Australia, where training extends only to the fourth year, students receive \$943 in that year, and in Tasmania, where the training extends also only to the fourth year, the allowance is \$1,100 in that year. If we add to these

allowances the boarding allowances paid to country student teachers or to those who live at home but who can prove extreme hardship, South Australia is first with \$1,235; and then follow Western Australia with \$1,075; South Australia, \$1,055 (there is a difference of \$20 between Western Australia and South Australia); Tasmania, \$1,000; and Queensland, \$988. Having, I think, quoted sufficient figures to make my point, I ask that the table containing the rest of the figures be incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

| Year of training | Allowances | | | | | |
|------------------|------------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|
| | S.A. | N.S.W. | Vic. | Qld. | W.A. | Tas. |
| | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| 1 | 805 | 590 | 1,183 | 676 | 785 | 850 |
| 2 | 845 | 590 | 1,183 | 728 | 785 | 900 |
| 3 | 905 | 810 | 1,397 | 780 | 865 | 1,000 |
| 4 | 1,005 | 890 | 1,506 | ? | 943 | 1,100 |
| 5 | 1,005 | 890 | 1,506 | ? | — | — |

| Year of training | Allowances | | | | | |
|------------------|------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | S.A. | N.S.W. | Vic. | Qld. | W.A. | Tas. |
| | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| 1 | 1,055 | 1,010 | 1,235 | 988 | 1,075 | 1,000 |
| 2 | 1,095 | 1,010 | 1,235 | 1,040 | 1,075 | 1,050 |
| 3 | 1,155 | 1,230 | 1,449 | 1,092 | 1,155 | 1,150 |
| 4 | 1,255 | 1,340 | 1,558 | ? | 1,233 | 1,250 |
| 5 | 1,255 | 1,340 | 1,558 | ? | — | — |

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I think this clearly shows that only two States in the Commonwealth pay a higher rate of allowance to student teachers than is paid in South Australia.

Mr. Clark: Would you have the figures before 1965 for comparison?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I thought the present figures were much more relevant.

Mr. Clark: I was wondering how they compared with the figures before the last big increase.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I cannot tell the honourable member that. The member for Gawler said that the arrangement was made as a result of a Cabinet decision; he was apparently being chivalrous and trying to let me down gently.

Mr. Clark: No I wasn't; I wanted to know.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As happens in all matters such as this, recommendations are made to the Minister in charge of a particular department; I thoroughly considered the submissions made and took the matter to Cabinet, because I thought it was one on which my Cabinet colleagues should be fully informed and which should be discussed freely.

My approval of the recommendations submitted to me was upheld by my Cabinet colleagues, and I wish to make that perfectly clear. Finally, I do not share with members of the Opposition the belief that because of this change many young student teachers will leave the profession. I believe that there are senior students in our schools throughout Australia who, for most of their lives, have been dedicated to the teaching profession, and I believe that they will continue to dedicate themselves to this profession, which means so much not only to the community generally but to the young people whom these teachers will in due course have as students.

Mr. Broomhill: Despite what you have done?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes, despite what I have done.

Mr. Riches: Do you think it is fair to take advantage of that dedication?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As I have said previously, I believe that what the honourable member suggests is not the case.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I have listened with great attention to what the Minister of Education has had to say tonight. I can only say that she seems to have missed in the whole of this business the basic point that should occur to any Minister concerning student teachers, namely, that it is our job to provide such conditions as will ensure a proper recruitment to the department of student teachers and will maintain recruitment in the happy position in which it was when the Minister took office. This State, as has been pointed out by previous Governments and not only ours, is a State where we have had consistently a greater percentage increase in school enrolments than any other State has had. We have had to increase our Education Department expenditure at a greater rate than the rate of increase in total population. We have had to see to it that there were means of attracting student teachers into the fold.

At the time when the Labor Government took office, the recruitment to the department was not good. Indeed, we did not have enough student teachers in training. We would have been in difficulties, had the then rate of recruitment been maintained, in servicing the department because the rate of recruitment would not have coped with the projected retirements from the department. We increased student allowances. It was one of the first things we did

when we took office. It was the first increase for 10 years. It was because of that increase that the comparisons now arise that the Minister has cited. That increase was one of the measures that improved recruitment to the Education Department. Other measures were then taken to improve conditions for teachers in South Australia so that the whole of the teaching profession would be more materially rewarding than it had been previously. It is all very well to put a premium on the sense of vocation of teachers coming into the department, but the plain fact is that they have to live in a competitive and materialistic society. They have obligations to meet and they want to be able to live under conditions where they will be able to keep themselves and their families at any rate at something approaching the level available to other competitive vocations requiring the same amount of work and training.

What the Minister has done here by reducing the amount available to the many students in training in South Australia is to strike a real blow at recruitment to the department. She says she is convinced that not many people will leave the department, but I think she is forced to admit there will be some; and there is no doubt there will be some who will be unable to continue as a result of this new proposal. However, in addition to this, it is now known to the parents of students in South Australia, that the things that are said to them when they are considering going into the department may not last long. In fact, they may bind themselves to the department and then find the emoluments that they were told they would get (only a few days before this original regulation was gazetted, it was advertised that they would get the allowance as previously provided for them) they may get on certain assurances, but with no guarantee that they will not be in a less advantageous position after a while, because of some unilateral decision taken by the Government, after not consulting them.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: The agreement is the same.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but the Government did not consider that any parent would think that an alteration would be made to the disadvantage of the students.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: **You did not make any change under your Government?**

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We made a change for the better, but this is a change for the worse, and it is about time the Minister

freely admitted it. At first she did not admit it. Tonight, she has pointed out the increased cost of running the original scheme and said that for a period of three years excess warrants had to be signed constantly in relation to this matter.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: They had to be contained within the department.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Quite so, but nevertheless more was spent on the scheme than originally budgeted for in the detailed budget presented to the Treasury. This then was why, in her view, the procedure had to be altered: the total money available to the Education Department had to be contained. When the Minister was chided with what she had said previously (that, in fact, this would not be less costly to the Government than the existing scheme), she denied that she had said that and said the member for Whyalla had said it. Let me point out to the Minister what she did say as reported at page 975 of *Hansard*. In reply to a question from the member for Whyalla, she said:

Overall, the new scheme, by which students will be responsible for providing textbooks and for budgeting for travel, will be just as costly to the Government as the old scheme has been.

Mr. Corcoran: She denied she said that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know: she denied it this evening. Again, on September 3, in reply to the member for Glenelg, she said:

As I told the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday), there is no actual saving for the Government in connection with this matter.

It is apparent this evening that she intended that there should be a saving, that the thing would be controlled by the new system, and that money would be saved by it in order to contain the moneys spent in the Education Department. I wonder, in all of this, what background study the Minister did in this matter before the new measure was undertaken. It was apparent that no detailed study was made by her of the regulation originally gazetted before she took it to Executive Council, because the regulation gazetted had to be altered because it was not the one originally intended. However, as Minister, she put it through Executive Council. Now, this evening, she has said that she did not say things she clearly said and reiterated in this place when questioned on this matter. The Minister has said that the old system was hard to control. No doubt it was and no doubt, occasionally, students have taken advantage of the difficulty of control.

Mr. Langley: Very few.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think there have been many. The average student has been most careful and completely honest about this. However, if it was desirable to have some additional measure of control, then the way in which this matter has been introduced was not the way to do it. What should have been done was something such as the member for Whyalla has suggested this evening: there could be a zone allowance and that, at any rate, would make some allowance for the inequalities between expenditures of students.

Mr. Hudson: There could be student travel concessions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. One cannot average out successfully, between students, amounts of their expenditure. In fact most students will be signally disadvantaged by this scheme. It is not difficult to devise a scheme of zone allowances that would be able to cope with the situation. The Minister then talked about the increases in education expenditure and said that the Treasurer had said that this was a significant increase this year. She quoted the following passage from the Treasurer's Financial Statement:

The biggest individual increase in the expenditures from the Budget will again be for the Education Department, for which the proposals totalling \$53,267,000 are an increase of \$4,140,000.

The Treasurer then said that if other items were taken into account that was 8 per cent above payments in 1967-68. However, the member for Whyalla pointed out the situation very clearly, when he said:

The Treasurer informs us that the total for the Education Department will be \$53,267,000. Excluding \$200,000 for expenditures on equipment for science and technical training services covered by Commonwealth funds, this provides an increase of \$3,940,000, or 8 per cent above payments in 1967-68. If we follow the same procedure as was listed in the Treasurer's statement last year and deduct the third instalment (\$400,000) of the five-year programme of equal pay for female teachers and the cost of free textbooks for primary schools of \$550,000, making a total of \$950,000, we find that the increase to finance general expansion of the department's services is only 5.6 per cent, compared with more than 7 per cent last year.

That means an overall reduction in the normal rate of expansion of the department, a department which has to expand at a greater rate than the average of the departments of

State. When the member for Whyalla was Minister of Education he was kept to a tight budget. Indeed, it was not possible for us at any time to provide him with the sum we would have wished to provide for education or the sum that he thought the department needed.

Mr. Corcoran: But he used to put up a very good case.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, a very forceful case, but it was necessary in budgeting to provide a general rate of increase for various departments, and we financed a rate of increase for the Education Department which was not as much as we would like to have financed but which we could not go below without reducing services. We were keeping up with the general expansion of the Education Department and with a reasonable improvement in the standard of service given, but that is not what is being done here. The sum available for general expansion of the department has not increased this year at the rate at which it has previously increased, and this is happening in a State which normally has the biggest increase of school enrolments of any State. This is a disastrous situation facing the Education Department, and it is completely contrary to the things reiterated by members opposite when in Opposition. One could imagine the sort of things that would have been said by the Attorney-General had he been sitting in Opposition and been faced with that kind of thing.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: He would have been in a perfect frenzy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, he would have been in orbit.

Mr. Hudson: It is a pity he does not stay in orbit.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Perhaps he will shoot off and do a little cleaning of school windows himself. He was not here when the Minister of Education said she was not going on with cleaning school windows, but perhaps he will help the Education Department in that respect. The Minister gave other reasons for making this change in allowances, but these are specious reasons for doing something which, in effect, reduces the money available to be spent and, as a consequence, makes the job less attractive both to those in it and to those who are to be recruited to it in the future.

Mr. Clark: And they still love it!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but I do not think the Minister could have listened carefully to the tape recordings of certain student meetings that were played to her, because if she had listened to what was said by certain students at those meetings and to the reactions that occurred at the mention of her name, she could not have thought that they loved her. She says it is wrong in principle to pay travelling allowance because it is not done in other jobs.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: I said "from home to work."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All right, but paying a travelling allowance to students was one of the means of making this job attractive. In fact, it was an overall payment to students, and it was an increase in their emoluments because if that was covered they did not have to take it out of their allowance. It was an incentive, and by cutting it out the Government is cutting out the incentive to students, making it difficult for many of them to carry on.

I have had, as I am sure every member has had, letters from parents complaining that their children will not be able to go on if the Minister continues with her proposals. It was suggested that the Minister should have consulted the students. She has said, "Well, what employer asks his employees about something before he does it?" Has the Minister never heard of joint consultation? Does she think that changes in the provision of allowances to employees are not discussed with employees before the change takes place? If the employer simply goes out and cuts out some benefit that employees already have, without saying a word to the employees about it but simply putting something on the notice board about it, he is asking for industrial trouble.

Regarding the comparison with the other States, here again the Minister must remember that we have to keep our recruitment in this State high. She says she is convinced that sufficient people will come forward even with the reduced amount available to so many students now, but I cannot think that she realizes just how far feelings on this subject have gone. Obviously, she cannot have realized that or she would have done something about it, and we are trying to persuade her to do something about it tonight. We are doing that not for any political advantage but to get something done about this matter, because when we take office we do not want to be in the position of having to begin the recruiting campaign all over again.

The students in South Australia, as a result of what the Minister has done (if she sticks to it), will let potential students know just what the position is. This is perfectly clear. They have said that they consider it to be as much their duty as anything else to let people who are coming into the department know what they are facing, not that they are going to come into the department on the basis of the advertisement the *Advertiser* published in August of this year which completely misleads them as to what is to happen in the immediate future, but the facts as to what they will be faced with in actual costs in being able to continue in the service as students in training.

If that happens (and it will happen if the Minister persists), then we shall not be able to recruit to the department the number of people who were coming in previously to the department or to maintain the position of having the highest proportion of students in training to teachers in service of any State in the Commonwealth, the very happy position that existed in the department when the Minister took over.

Lastly, I deplore the attitude which says, "Oh well, students are really getting a very good go because they are being trained and they are going to an assured job and in consequence they have to take what is handed out to them in what we think is a reasonable way of disposing of their allowances." Students who come in to the department are subject to real disabilities compared with students training for other avocations. People who go in for training for clerical or executive positions or who undertake similar training are either much more free than the students of the Education Department or are better paid. In either case they are better off in many ways. I reiterate that we found it necessary to provide benefits of the kind which are in operation here and which, although they are not the best in Australia, at any rate were reasonably comparable in 1965 with what was being paid in other States.

[Midnight]

Mr. Clark: The figures we provided were quoted back to us tonight.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, we provided for those allowances to ensure that we could compete in the market for students of the quality we wanted. Because we were able to provide them, we got students who came to the department at a very high level—

much higher than had ever before been the case in respect of background and academic ability.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Quality is as important as numbers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it is. At the time we took office it was very easy to get into the teaching service as a student teacher, but at the time we left office it was not easy because it was so competitive.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I have heard other reasons.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, the teaching profession had been made decidedly more attractive. If the Attorney-General is suggesting that there was some other specious reason he should say what he thinks it is.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It is true, not specious.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If he is talking about unemployment, I must point out that there has never been any unemployment amongst this group of people.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I did not say anything about unemployment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are many opportunities in the community for people of this level of training and ability. This State has not lacked for them at any stage.

Mr. McAnaney: That is not correct. I know a number of people who could not get jobs when they left school.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For people seeking to enter teachers colleges, there were numbers of alternative opportunities. The reason for the competition was that conditions in the teaching service had markedly improved.

Mr. Clark: And the prospects.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly. What the Minister has done—and she has given only a series of specious reasons for the introduction of the new system—is to take away benefits from the students. This is having a serious effect, because this immediately means that some of the very good students we get will not go on and apply for extra training. Instead, they will go out into the field because they cannot continue to live on the allowances. Consequently, we will not have the number of diplomates and graduates coming into the profession that we would have had if the Minister had not taken this action. This will immediately affect the numbers who enter the service and the degree of training of the people entering it. On all these scores, the action taken by

the Minister is disastrous, and we beg that she think again about what she is doing. This is not a matter on which she should be cheese-paring. We must be able to pay these things so that the Education Department can keep going at a satisfactory level.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday (teller), McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele (teller), Messrs. Stott, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Line passed.

Libraries Department, \$991,051; Museum Department, \$193,012; Art Gallery Department, \$99,315; Miscellaneous, \$13,267,854—passed.

MINISTER OF LABOUR AND INDUSTRY

Department of Labour and Industry, \$507,165.

Mr. VIRGO: Under the heading "Inspectorial Branch", I note a reduction of \$5,705 on last year's allocation for inspectors. What is the reason for that?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Labour and Industry): On this line, 15 industrial inspectors have been transferred to and are now included in the Administration Branch. This line now provides for a full year's salary for all other inspectors. It is merely a matter of arrangement.

Mr. VIRGO: Do we have the Minister's assurance that there is no reduction, either by wastage or by non-replacement, as occurred in the Inspectorial Branch of the Prices Branch?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I assure the honourable member there are several classifications of inspector, as he realizes. Recently, Cabinet approved my recommendation for additional inspectors to be appointed. Some of these are necessary as a result of the passing last year of the new Industrial Code. More inspectors have been appointed.

Mr. HURST: Does the Government intend to proceed this year with the Industrial Safety Convention, for which \$3,000 is provided?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I am happy to say that this year it is planned to have a large Industrial Safety Convention, which will be held at the Flinders University next month. I have been honoured by being asked to chair the convention, which will be opened officially by the Premier. It will receive much publicity. All the leading industrial concerns in this State have been approached by, in some cases, personal letters from me as the Minister and, in other cases, appropriate correspondence and literature. The press will give this convention much publicity. Some speakers from other States, including a senior representative of the trade union movement in Sydney, and representatives of appropriate trade unions and industrial leaders in this State will be present. The convention will take two days. A programme has been specially arranged for the evening of the first day, and publicity given to it, so that industrial officers and men working in factories interested in this subject can attend, hear a lecture and see what goes on. I appreciate the great amount of work undertaken by an executive committee, which met twice in Parliament House earlier this year. Representatives of various branches of industry, commerce and the trade union movement were present. I appreciate the honorary work they have done to get this thing going and to ensure it is the great success it deserves to be. In due course I shall be able to inform the honourable member further about details of the programme.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$15,050.

Mr. HURST: Last year \$10,000 was provided for the Industrial Accident Prevention Society of South Australia but nothing is proposed this year. On the other hand, \$10,000 is proposed for the National Safety Council of Australia (South Australian Division). It appears as though this sum has been switched from one body to the other. I recall that the grant to the Industrial Accident Prevention Society was greatly appreciated. Can the Minister indicate the present position?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member is correct in assuming that this sum has been switched from one organization to the other. What was previously known as the Industrial Accident Prevention Society of South Australia has become the South Australian Division of the National Safety Council of Australia. In common with other States, we now have a branch of the National Safety Council of Australia. Some years ago another

organization that had the same name came into some disfavour. It operated at a drill hall in the Prospect area. At that time it was necessary for the other organization bearing this name to change its name, and that is how the Industrial Accident Prevention Society of South Australia came into being. Subsequently the organization that fell into disfavour disappeared, and the Registrar of Companies agreed to the National Safety Council of Australia (South Australian Division) being formed again under that name. It is run under the national auspices. I must say how much the Government has appreciated the work Mr. W. B. Moore (the Chairman of this organization), his officers and a great many voluntary workers have done in the cause of safety. I have had the privilege of presenting, I think, three safety pennants to various factories in the past few months.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF FORESTS

Minister of Agriculture Department, \$21,510—passed.

Agriculture Department, \$2,551,175.

Mr. CASEY: I am pleased to see increases for most items under this heading. I believe the department has an important role to play in the future economy of this State. It will probably soon have to establish an advisory branch to inform producers of the potential of the marketing system in this State. The department's basic object is to provide an overall advisory service to rural producers. One of the basic problems confronting rural producers is getting to the market the right type of product that the consumer wants. There is a demand for a certain type of commodity, and this information must be collated by a branch that will inevitably have to be set up so that the information can be conveyed to the State's rural producers.

This information could be of great assistance to such organizations as the Citrus Organization Committee. One of the industry's basic problems is to market its products in such a way that the return to the grower increases as the committee gets on its feet. Unfortunately, one of the greatest difficulties confronting the industry is the small return the grower receives compared with the price the consumer has to pay for the fruit. In America, where these marketing systems have been implemented and the economics have been investigated

thoroughly, it has been proved beyond doubt that the most important source of economy, particularly by the chain stores that operate in such a big way over there, is from direct purchases from the producers, thereby eliminating the middle man. These are some of the things that will confront rural industries not only in this State but in the whole of Australia in the years to come. This applies particularly to the citrus industry. Will the Minister explain why there is a big reduction of \$28,138 for fruit fly control?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): The allocations for the control of fruit fly necessarily involve much guesswork, as they have always done, because one cannot foresee what will happen. There has been a reduction this year because most of the money was spent on the outbreak at Port Augusta last year and it is expected that not much more need be spent. A precautionary spray will be made towards the end of the month over the whole of that area for what we hope will prove to be the complete eradication of last year's outbreak. Beyond that not many expenses will be incurred unless an emergency arises, in which case other money will have to be found, but it will not be on this line.

Mr. CASEY: For "Meat Inspection, reimbursement of costs of Commonwealth Inspections" there is an increase of \$14,915. I understand that this reimbursement has occurred because there are many Commonwealth inspectors in the abattoirs in this State. We were told recently that the export of our beef and mutton products to the United States of America would cease, and although we export to other countries the U.S.A. is the main channel for our export of meats. Will this reduction in exports greatly affect the amount of reimbursement for meat inspections? This is for a period of three months, and we are not likely to export until after Christmas.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot answer this question offhand. As the honourable member will know, we are coming to the end of a three-year period. Some years ago the Commonwealth Government took over the inspection of meat and at the same time it took over the employees of the State engaged on those inspections. I am told that we actually show a profit on meat inspections. The only information I have on the recent alteration in beef exports to the U.S.A. is that the alteration is not expected to be permanent.

Line passed.

Agricultural College Department, \$415,964.

Mr. CASEY: The amount allocated to the line "Purchase of farm implements, laboratory equipment, and other plant" has been greatly increased this year, by \$47,518. Earlier this year, when I made an inspection at Roseworthy, it was pointed out to me that more land could be purchased for the college. With the amount of equipment there, most of the fallow could be sown in a very short time, and it seems to me that it would be more practical from all points of view for the college to have more land. This will be required when the college expands in the future, as undoubtedly it will. Can the Minister say whether the Government intends to purchase more land there?

The CHAIRMAN: This line deals with the purchase of implements.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman; can the Minister tell me whether the amount allocated for that purpose is related in any way to the purchase of additional land?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is not directly related to the purchase of land. Over the years the college has expanded its acreage considerably, but there has always been a strong imbalance between the amount of land available and the ability to farm it. In years gone by the students used teams of horses, but in these days the tractors there can cover the ground much more quickly and there is much less physical work for the students. At the same time the syllabus is of a more highly technical nature. I am unsure whether the area of the college's land has been extended this year, but I think not. The big increase in the item results from a new arrangement in connection with the Commonwealth Government grants for technical education, which cover capital equipment and buildings. In the revenues of the State will be shown a large sum received from the Commonwealth Government, and this is, in turn, shown as an expense by the State, but it is largely caused by these Commonwealth grants.

Line passed.

Produce Department, \$646,960; Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation, \$214,684; Chemistry Department, \$212,681—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$1,471,107.

Mr. CASEY: I recently received a letter from one of my constituents in the Far North who is concerned about the bush fire prob-

lem we will experience later this year following the excellent season. He suggested that, in the light of existing conditions, it would be wise to impose a complete ban on the lighting of fires in the open from November to March throughout the whole State. I shudder to think what will happen in the Mid North if motorists flick cigarette butts from car windows. I hope the Minister will carefully consider my constituent's suggestion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This relates to policy, and the matter would undoubtedly be referred to the Bushfire Advisory Committee. I am not sure that the matter would not necessitate an amendment to the Act, but I think that exceptions apply which may be difficult to proclaim without reference to the Act. In any case, I will obtain a report on the matter for the honourable member.

Mr. GILES: I commend the Minister for making available an additional \$15,000 for fire-fighting equipment. The Emergency Fire Service is an entirely voluntary organization that extends throughout the State, and much of the equipment required is purchased by local residents. As such equipment is often extremely expensive and beyond the means of certain districts, I commend the Minister for the increase, which will help ensure that our country fire-fighting services are adequately equipped and able to cope with any emergencies.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF MINES

Mines Department, \$2,230,000—passed.

MINISTER OF MARINE

Department of Marine and Harbors, \$3,785,292.

Mr. HUDSON: I am concerned at the way in which the accounts of the department are set out. It is difficult to determine just what is happening in terms of the amounts charged to other accounts. The figures given show that a considerable part of the increase in the overall grant arises from an increase of \$284,118 in the sums "charged to other accounts". Will the Minister say what are these other accounts and how they tolerate the increase that has been provided?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Marine): As far as I can see, this is a normal recurring account each year, the explanation that I have being that it relates to salaries and wages to be charged to Loan works and sundry deposit accounts. The honourable

member would be aware of the Loan works that are undertaken by the department throughout the State in providing facilities. The wages are set out under "General" and relate to maintenance of wharves, etc., construction, reimbursement and other works" and to the "maintenance of Meyer recreation ground", from which is deducted the sum charged to other accounts which, as the honourable member has said, has increased by \$284,118 over last year's sum. The procedure is similar each year.

Mr. HUDSON: Obviously, from the nature of the items covered here, some of the work carried out by the Marine and Harbors Department and some of the wages paid are legitimate charges against the Loan Fund, but it is a little difficult to determine whether or not the break-up is legitimate. Probably the department has some latitude in the way in which it allocates its costs between Revenue and Loan, and some yearly adjustment is made. Will the Minister obtain some information about the procedures adopted in allocating these wages items as between Loan and Revenue? Is a definite procedure followed each year, and not varied, or is it subject to variation from time to time? Can the Minister also indicate whether or not some of the wages costs of "Administration", "Engineering" and "Traffic" are charged to Loan Account?

The line "Less charged to other accounts" applies to the total salaries and wages paid by the department; it does not apply to wages under the heading "General". If he looks into it, the Minister will find that the total amount chargeable to Loan Account is attributable partly to "General", partly to "Engineering", and perhaps in some part to "Administration".

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I can get that information readily for the honourable member. There was an increase of about \$1,000,000 (a 45 per cent increase) through more money being involved in salaries because of extra expenditure in this department. The line "Wages—Maintenance of wharves, etc." under the heading "General", showing an increase of \$343,331, is the provision for an increased labour force to carry out increased maintenance and a new works programme, increased operating expenditure on grain bulk loading plants, together with a full year of marginal increases granted during 1967-68.

This explains some of the increase.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$6,700—passed.

MINISTER OF ROADS AND TRANSPORT AND
MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local Government Department, \$259,502.

Mr. VIRGO: Under the first heading of "South Australian State Planning Office" there is an increase in the line "Deputy Director of Planning, Drafting and Clerical Staff" and under the second heading of "South Australian State Planning Office" there is an increase of \$19,280. Can the Minister explain that?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): The honourable member will appreciate that I do not have intimate knowledge of this as I would have if I were dealing with one of my departments. Regarding "Deputy Director of Planning, drafting and clerical staff", where the increase is \$37,779, I have a note to the effect that, in regard to the drafting and clerical staff, Cabinet approval, dated December 19, 1967, was given for an additional \$40,000 for staff for 1968-69. The honourable member would be aware of that because this decision was taken in December under the former Government. I can give the honourable member details about the increase of \$7,570 for "Office expenses, etc." under the South Australian State Planning Office. The increases are as follows:

| | |
|---|---------|
| | \$ |
| Printing and stationery (mainly printing of planning area reports for State Planning Authority) | 5,000 |
| Library services | 900 |
| Stores and materials | 670 |
| Travelling expenses | 500 |
| Costs in connection with appeals before Planning Appeal Board . . | 500 |
| | \$7,570 |

Regarding other expenditure to be approved for the State Planning Office, the provision for "Contribution to planning and development fund for interest and sundries" is to cover the difference between the interest credited by the Treasury on the monthly balance in the fund and the interest charged on the debentures. "Purchase of motor vehicles" relates to the purchase of a motor car for the department. "Redevelopment surveys" relates to the provision for a Hindmarsh survey in 1967-68, which is deleted, and a similar provision is made for general redevelopment surveys, for example, at Hackney. That is about the only information I can give the honourable member.

Mr. HUDSON: In his reply, the Minister indicated, in regard to "Contribution to planning and development fund for interest and sundries" that this sum of \$5,000 was to cover the difference between the interest earned at the Treasury and the interest charged on debentures. Why was this sum not actually paid in 1967-68?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The vote for that year was covered by the previous Government, and I have no explanation as to why it was not spent. I point out to the honourable member that the same sum is provided again this year, but why I do not know.

Mr. HUDSON: Will the Attorney-General get the information for me?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

Line passed.

Highways and Local Government Department, \$4,147,509.

Mr. ALLEN: This year there is an increase of \$139,417 for the line "Design—Design engineer, etc." In reply to my recent questions regarding surveyors of highways and roads, the Minister said there was a shortage of surveyors. Will the Attorney-General ascertain whether it is expected that additional engineers and surveyors will be employed this coming year?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is expected to fill certain new approved positions under this line.

Mr. HUDSON: There has been an increase of 16 or 17 per cent in the appropriation this year for the Highways and Local Government Department compared with an increase of 8 per cent for education which, as the honourable member for Whyalla pointed out, when certain adjustments were made, represents an increase of only 5.6 per cent. The Highways Fund is relatively healthy compared with the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and the Highways Department has in general been afforded a great degree of independence both from the Minister and from Parliament. I am concerned that we have been informed in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study recommendations that administrative costs can be cut to a minimum, because it seems that certain of the basic assumptions underlying that report are called into question by the appropriation for this department. Can the Minister therefore explain the extraordinarily

high percentage increase in the appropriation granted to the Highways and Local Government Department?

Mr. VIRGO: I notice that the line "Expenses in connection with official openings" has been increased from \$1,954 to \$3,000. Presumably the Government is expecting some fairly lavish openings. Can the Minister say what these are, how lavish they are to be, and whether I will be invited?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will use my good offices with my colleague to see whether I can secure, in spite of every other consideration, an invitation for the honourable member. The Government is doing many good things and therefore expects to have a number of official openings, not just one big function. This line covers the estimated cost of official opening ceremonies for the Broken Hill road, section of the Hills Freeway, Jervis bridge and additions to the Walkerville building.

Mr. HUDSON: The line under "Administration" for wages of administrative employees shows an increase of 14 per cent; under "Design" in the Engineering Section of the department the increase is of the order of 25 per cent, from \$582,194 to \$721,611; and under "Contingencies" the line for office expenses, legal expenses, accident claims, Road Traffic Act and traffic census expenses, rates, maintenance of buildings, motor vehicle expenses, reimbursement of travelling expenses, data processing services, library services, minor equipment and sundries shows an increase of almost 30 per cent. We are here being asked to approve substantial increases, yet we are not being given any detailed breakdown or any information as to why these are all necessary, nor has the Government shown any willingness to tell us how a 25 per cent increase can be justified in relation to design work and how a 30 per cent increase is justified in that conglomerate item I referred to under the heading of "Contingencies" while so many other things in the Budget, including the Surf Life Saving Association of South Australia, are being starved for the kind of increased funds that they need.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: That body is getting an increase of 25 per cent.

Mr. HUDSON: If the Premier will assure me that these increases, which are of the order of 25 per cent to 30 per cent, are pegged for three years, I think we shall be satisfied. The Premier knows that we will get similar kinds of increase in the years to come. One

of our great troubles is to get adequate information from certain Ministers, and one of the worst offenders is the Premier. I have asked why substantial increases are required under three separate headings for this department. I ask the Attorney-General, because if I ask the Premier he will not tell me.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Obviously, the question should come to me, because I am the Minister in charge, and it is unreasonable to expect the Premier to carry these details in his head. The amount he carries in his head is prodigious. With regard to the wages of administrative employees, the increased number of weekly-paid employees engaged on traffic studies, the operation of the Walkerville building, and wage increases account for the increase. With regard to the design section, I gave the member for Burra (Mr. Allen) the reply, but apparently the member for Glenelg was not listening. Provision has been made for filling certain approved new positions, and for the payment of salary and marginal increases. With regard to the first item under the heading "Contingencies", the estimate is based upon past trends in relation to total funds available, and upon known and anticipated cost increases, including the servicing of the new wing of the administrative building at Walkerville. The major part of the \$243,493 increase is made up as follows: (a) increase in maintenance and cost of operations of the administrative building (most of which increase is attributed to the new wing) \$86,000; (b) minor items of office equipment, \$45,000; (c) increase in hire of computer time, \$23,000; (d) increase in motor vehicle registration fees, \$14,000; (e) increase in travelling expenses, \$10,000; and (f) increase in traffic census expenses, \$11,000.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not think we can let this opportunity pass without again bringing home to the Ministers of this Government the way in which this department is treated as a sacred cow and the way in which its administrative expenses are rising very rapidly. The increase is about 16 per cent or 17 per cent. I do not know what attitude the Premier takes to this matter, but it is obviously inconsistent with the kind of picture presented in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. Members do not receive sufficient information to be able to assess properly what is going on within the department. I think that what is being appropriated here is completely unfair in relation to the kind of increases that

the Education and Social Welfare Departments or a number of other equally important departments are receiving, and that it is contrary to the kind of recommendations being broadcast in the M.A.T.S. Report. In addition, it shows an overall lack of control on the part of the Treasurer over this activity.

Mr. CASEY: Could the Attorney-General obtain from the Minister of Roads and Transport information concerning receipts from the ton-mile tax? The Minister of Agriculture at a meeting on the West Coast only a couple of months ago said that he would refer the whole matter of road tax to the Commonwealth Government. Has anything been done about this matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will inquire about the matter.

Line passed.

Railways Department, \$32,863,094.

Mr. VIRGO: I am concerned that an increase of over \$1,000,000 is proposed in expenditure although, judging from the various items shown, it seems that little, if anything, will be done to try to bridge the gap between receipts and payments of this department. I ask the Attorney-General to direct the attention of the Minister of Roads and Transport to what I think is an unsatisfactory state of affairs within the department. We see that the earnings of the department to June 30 last fell by \$2,000,000-odd, but that is not the complete picture. Although a substantial part of the drop in earnings occurred in the freight section, no doubt as a result of the drought, there was a substantial decrease also in both the country passenger service and parcel service earnings. It is about time the Government looked at the railways and started providing some service. I asked the Minister a question yesterday about the "window dressing" statement that was made two months ago. A great effort should be made to provide decent and proper travelling facilities for people who want to use the railways; they should be induced to use them. The best the South Australian Railways can offer on the Overland is a plain roll and a cup of tea. There is a wonderful opportunity for somebody to make the railways more attractive.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: What do you suggest?

Mr. VIRGO: The airways provide a bar service and a meal service. The railways should employ attractive girls to supply

meals. Also, let the Minister go to the railway station at 5 p.m. on any day and see whether he can send off a parcel. He would not get away within three-quarters of an hour. There is room for great improvement, and the Minister should be concerned about it. I ask the Attorney-General to direct the Minister's attention to these things.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I will do that.
Line passed.

Transport Control Board, \$22,623; Motor Vehicles Department, \$891,348—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$41,970.

Mr. LANGLEY: What does the line "Building Act Advisory Committee" mean? Has it strayed from another section? What part does the committee play?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This is a miscellaneous line common to the several departments administered by the Minister of Local Government. I have always understood the Building Act was administered by him. That is why the line is here. I can give the honourable member no further details.

Mr. HUDSON: I see that under the line "Local Government Act Revision Committee—Fees and expenses" the amount voted in 1967-68 was \$19,200 and actual payments amounted to \$12,486. Only \$10,000 is proposed for 1968-69. I have heard rumours that the Minister intends to wind up the work of the committee. Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to continue fully the work of this committee until it is at a stage where it can report on the necessary revisions to the Local Government Act?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I had dinner only last week with Mr. Gifford, Q.C., Chairman of the committee. The Minister of Local Government has asked the committee to complete its report by March 31, 1969, and there is no suggestion of winding up the committee before its work is finished. Although Mr. Gifford has told me that it will not be easy to have the report ready by that date, he hopes that the deadline will be met.

Mr. VIRGO: I again direct to the Attorney-General the question raised by the member for Unley about the Building Act Advisory Committee. The Attorney skated right around the question without giving the information requested. If he does not have it, the member for Unley and I will be happy to receive a reply later.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You tell me what you want and I will get it.

Mr. VIRGO: Can the Attorney say what this committee does? Is it established under the Builders Licensing Act, which is under the control of the Minister of Housing who earlier said that it would not function?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As I have always understood, the committee is there to advise on any changes that should be made to the Building Act to keep abreast of advances in technology and that sort of thing. However, in case that is not its purpose, I will certainly make inquiries and, if I am wrong, I will give the honourable member the correct information.

Mr. JENNINGS: I refer to "Purchase of land for public parks, etc." The Sunday before last I met many of my constituents who were meeting to embark on a campaign to ensure that Mr. Chris Hurford would be returned at the next election as the Commonwealth member for Adelaide. Many of these people were employed at Islington and they asked me when members of this place were to inspect the workshops there. I said that I had no knowledge of a visit. One of them said that there had been painting and cleaning up going on, and that this meant that either the Commissioner was coming out on one of his rare visits or that a gang of members of Parliament would be visiting the workshops.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! What line is the honourable member speaking to?

Mr. JENNINGS: I thought I made it clear what line I was speaking to.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member made it clear what line he was supposed to be speaking to, but he has not been doing so. I ask him to confine his remarks to that line.

Mr. JENNINGS: There are areas in Islington suitable for parks, and no doubt they are being tidied up for the proposed visit. While I had to deny truthfully on that Sunday that I knew nothing about the proposed visit, the following Tuesday I received an invitation from the Minister of Railways—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF SOCIAL WELFARE AND MINISTER OF ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Department of Social Welfare, \$3,250,116.

Mr. HUDSON: The sum of \$263,000 is allocated under the line, "Magill Home, etc." This is a small increase, and for some time

there has been much concern among the people at Magill and among the representatives of the Australian Government Workers Association about the staffing position and the ration of staff to patients, particularly in regard to the amount of work that certain of the nursing staff have to do.

In recent years the nature of the work at the Magill Home has altered because the percentage of bed-ridden patients or patients who require heavy nursing has risen considerably. Secondly, the staff ratios that apply now mean much more strenuous work for the employees than previously, and representations were made on two occasions to the previous Government on this matter. However, the financial position was tight and it was not possible to make the necessary provision to relieve the position. I presume that the Minister is in much the same position again this financial year. Indeed, it seems that there is to be a reduction of staff at Magill, because the increase is surely not enough to cope with the automatic increment of wages that occur each year, and possibly any award increases that may occur. Has the Minister considered the position there, and has he reached any conclusions about it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Minister of Social Welfare): When I went out to Magill I was, I must say quite frankly, distressed at the condition of the place. It is of itself a most depressing place. This is relieved only by the willingness of the staff, for whom I have the greatest admiration, and the cheerfulness of many of those who live there. I thought the physical condition of Magill Home was poor, and I would like to be able to do something about it during my term in office.

I know that staffing is not adequate. I know, for example, that during some periods of the night some of the wards are uncovered; I think that is the word that was used to me. There is one reason apart from the lack of money that has led us not to increase staff, and that is that the numbers at the home are dropping. The daily average last year was 157, and I was told today by Mr. Bruff, the Acting Director, that there are now 150 people in the home. Some of the wards, as my predecessor in office in the Ministry would know, are not being used at present. I think the reason for the lesser numbers at Magill is that there is now greater and more attractive provision generally in the community for old persons. Be that as it may, this is one reason why we have not provided additional staff at

Magill, but nevertheless I would have liked to have been able to increase the staff if we had had the money.

Mr. HUDSON: The line "Promotion of Social Welfare within the community" is broken down into two items, namely, After-school activities and Youth activities (pilot project). Can the Minister explain what is proposed to be done in relation to this matter during the coming financial year? Does he expect that his department will be able to expand its activities in this direction in the future? It seems to me that this is a general area in which the Government, via the Social Welfare Department, ought to be developing, and it is an area that needs a great deal of consideration

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Both these lines, with an amount of \$2,000 each, refer to the Norwood Activities Centre, which was started during the life of the previous Government. It is intended to continue this. I have been out there and had a look at it myself, and it seems to be a desirable project. It is described here as a pilot project, and that is what it is. I agree with the member for Glenelg that this in an area in which a good deal of work can be done, not only of the nature being done at Norwood but generally. Youth work is, I think, a very important aspect of community activity, and I hope that we will be able to do more. Indeed, this was mentioned specifically, as the honourable member would know, in the L.C.L. policy speech.

We have not, unfortunately, in this financial year anyway, been able to do significantly more than was done by the previous Government. I had discussions with Mr. Cook, the Director, as to the best approach when funds are available, and I hope that we will be able to expand this work as time goes on.

Mr. HUDSON: I refer to the section of the Auditor-General's Report dealing with children's welfare and with an old favourite of the former member for Gumeracha, namely, the average cost for a child in the various institutions run by the department. The Auditor-General reports:

The average cost per child to Consolidated Revenue in 1967-68 for children in institutions was \$2,763 compared with \$2,683 in 1966-67, \$2,270 in 1965-66, \$1,962 in 1964-65 and \$1,666 in 1963-64.

The increase over the four-year period from 1963-64 to 1967-68 is about 60 per cent, a very substantial increase, which must cause

much concern. I draw the Minister's attention to the table provided by the Auditor-General dealing with departmental institutions. It clearly shows that the cost a child in children's cottage homes is substantially less than the cost a child in institutions. For example, the cost a child in cottage homes at Glenelg is \$1,874; in St. Peters, \$1,512; and in Port Pirie, \$1,080. These figures are to be compared with the departmental average of \$2,763.

I know that for certain purposes institution-ization is unavoidable. Nevertheless, it is clear from these figures and from the relative cost of placing children with foster parents that the more the department can shift towards moving children from institutions, the greater will be the economies achieved, and the children's interests will be just as well served. I think an overall investigation should be conducted into the department's homes with a view to determining a long-term development programme that will enable a reorientation of the department's attitude toward these matters.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Apparently the honourable member, while Minister, did not become aware of the great difficulties involved in doing what he suggests. I agree with him overall that this is a most desirable approach but it is not appropriate for some children. The biggest difficulty we have is in getting appropriate people who can be appointed as house mothers and house fathers. Those we have are excellent. When one goes into one of these cottage homes one can almost think he is going into a normal home.

Naturally, as soon as I saw the Auditor-General's Report I asked the Director what his explanation was of the comments that had been made. In previous years I have asked other Governments about the same thing. This trend has existed ever since I have been in the Chamber, I think, and the strictures of the Auditor-General have been appearing in his report for the last four or five years, to my recollection. There are some good reasons in justification for the position. I think I would do best to answer the points the honourable member has made if I read from the minute which the Acting Director gave me yesterday on this matter and which states:

As instructed, I submit my comments on the criticism contained in the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1968, about what he considers is the high cost to the department of maintaining each child at certain institutions.

1. At most of our institutions specially mentioned by the Auditor-General more than one-half of this department's expenditure in 1967-

68 was for salaries and wages for institution staff. It is pointed out that the children have to be cared for on a seven-day-week 24-hour-a-day basis. Most staffs are rostered for duty for 40 hours a week over seven days. There must be sufficient staff available to fill the rosters for day, afternoon and night shifts every day of the year.

2. For our institutions to function effectively as training institutions and not merely as places of custody, there must be sufficient trained staff available during waking hours to deal with the children in small groups and as individuals in the vocational training, living, recreational and other group activities.

3. The department has very little control over the numbers of children committed to its institutions. During 1967-68 there were considerable fluctuations. At the McNally Training Centre, where the highest cost a child was incurred, as few as 56 boys were accommodated at the one time in the first half of the year. By June, 1968, the number had increased to 119. Since then the maximum number of boys held at the centre on any day has increased to 141.

The honourable member may be aware that there are committals to McNally from the juvenile courts of the State and we have noticed, as I am sure my predecessor noticed, that the policy of successive magistrates of the juvenile court often differs. For instance, Mr. Elliott was rather inclined not to commit, whereas Mr. Wright, the present magistrate, is far more inclined to commit boys than his predecessor was. This naturally affects the numbers and is reflected in the numbers I have just given. That is beyond the control of the Social Welfare Department, but the department must be equipped to cope with numbers, whatever they are, all the time. The minute continues:

4. The number and type of staff required at each institution is assessed on the basis of the training programme, the degree of supervision and care needed, and anticipated numbers of children. It is neither desirable nor practicable to adjust the number of staff with each temporary decrease or increase in the number of children. If the number of children is low the cost for a child for salaries and wages and for other fixed charges must necessarily be high.

5. Especially at some of the newer institutions Public Buildings Department charges for interest and sinking fund and for building maintenance costs form a considerable proportion of the total cost (about 25 per cent for McNally Training Centre, Brookway Park and Vaughan House, and 17 per cent for Windana).

6. The Auditor-General acknowledges in his report that Davenport House was closed for renovations from April 14, 1967, to October 30, 1967. During that time the department was involved in expenditure for salaries and wages and other charges.

I understand (and my honourable friend on the left, the Minister of Works, cannot be blamed for this; he was not Minister then) that the department was not able to get on with the necessary renovations at Davenport House for a long time (I think a matter of years), and workmen suddenly came and quite unexpectedly they had the roof off before those who were living there knew what was happening. They had to be accommodated elsewhere and were not back for six months. The minute continues:

When the home was reopened on October 31, 1967, only five girls could be accommodated—

because the place was not completely finished—pending completion of renovations by the Public Buildings Department.

The Acting Director makes this final comment:

In the circumstances, it is difficult to understand why the Auditor-General has included this home in his remarks.

Mr. HUDSON: I am pleased the Minister obtained that report. It is helpful when a Minister shows the foresight to anticipate matters likely to arise in Parliament: it facilitates our functioning. The Minister's comments about the different practices of the magistrates in the Juvenile Court in respect of committals interest me. We should be able to have more influence on the policy followed in the Juvenile Court. We are left with the end product of the decision whether children should or should not be committed. We have to provide for them should they be committed. Also, as representatives of the people, we should be concerned with the general social consequences of a particular policy pursued by Juvenile Court magistrates.

We do not have to accept what the magistrate does and leave it at that. We should introduce amendments to the legislation so that the decisions of the Juvenile Court magistrates will be influenced in the right way. The kind of variation in the figures of committals to McNally is extraordinary, a significant part of it arising from changes of magistrates in the Juvenile Court. The current trend is a little disturbing. Does the Minister believe that appropriate amendments can be made to the Juvenile Courts Act to provide a firmer guide for the carrying out of a more rational policy in the court than exists at present?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This matter was before the last Parliament, when new legislation was piloted through Parliament by my predecessor, and all these questions were then debated at some length. At the moment I have no specific proposals to put to Cabinet or to bring into this Chamber. Cabinet was perturbed at the figures in the report of the Juvenile Court magistrates. We are doing our best to evaluate them and decide what more, if anything, should be done about juvenile crime in South Australia. With regard to the policies pursued by the magistrates, I have made it a rule not to comment publicly on their decisions, for I feel such public comments would be most undesirable. I have refused to do it when asked by newspapers and I do not think I should do it in this place.

Line passed.

Department of Aboriginal Affairs, \$1,727,551; Miscellaneous, \$176,385—passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

The Estimates were adopted by the House and an Appropriation Bill for \$150,962,355 was founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. G. G. Pearson, and read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is for the appropriation of \$220,962,355, details of which are set out in the Estimates which have just been dealt with by the House. Clause 2 provides for the further issue of \$150,962,355, being the difference between the amount authorized by the two Supply Acts (\$70,000,000) and the total of the appropriations required in this Bill. Clause 3 sets out the amount to be appropriated and the allocation of the appropriation to the various departments and functions. The clause also provides that, if increases of salaries or wages become payable pursuant to any determination made by a properly constituted authority, the Governor may appropriate the necessary funds by warrant and the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased accordingly. The clause further provides that, if the cost of electricity for pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide main, from bores in the Adelaide Water District, and through the Morgan-Whyalla main should be greater than the amounts set down in the Estimates, the Governor may appropriate the

funds for the additional expenditure, and the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased by the amount of such additional expenditure.

Clause 4 authorizes the Treasurer to pay moneys from time to time up to the amounts set down in monthly orders issued by the Governor, and provides that the receipts obtained from the payees shall be the discharge to the Treasurer for the moneys paid. Clause 5 authorizes the use of Loan funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Commonwealth and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by Clause 3 of the Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1968. Clause 7 authorizes the expenditure of \$2,765,000 from the Hospitals Fund during 1968-69 and of \$1,000,000 in the early months of 1969-70 pending the passing of the Appropriation Bill for that year. Clause 8 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated.

With one minor exception the clauses of the Bill are in the same form as those of the

Appropriation Bill passed by the House 12 months ago. The small variation follows as a consequence of the new Industrial Code coming into force. The previous Industrial Code included provisions restricting the payment of certain wage awards prior to the necessary moneys being specifically appropriated by Parliament, and for many years it had been customary for clause 3 of the annual Appropriation Bill to contain a subclause designed to overcome those restrictive provisions. The rewritten Industrial Code, assented to in November last, does not include such restrictive provisions and therefore the special subclause in the Appropriation Bill is no longer required, and accordingly is omitted this year. I commend the Bill for consideration by members.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.55 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 3, at 2 p.m.