

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, February 6, 1969

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

QUESTIONS

CHOWILLA DAM

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Today, an article by Sir Thomas Playford concerning the Chowilla dam was published. This article was apparently written after Sir Thomas had the benefit of discussions with the Engineer-in-Chief and Commissioner for South Australia on the River Murray Commission (Mr. Beaney). In the article, Sir Thomas states:

Therefore, the main differences between the present studies and the recommendations upon which Chowilla was approved are that the technical committee has brought in a number of matters completely outside the control of the River Murray Commission, that it has approached the problem rather from the view point of the upper States than the benefit to South Australia, and that it has taken into account in its conclusions a number of political factors with which it is incapable of giving advised opinion.

In view of that statement by the former Premier and political architect of Chowilla, do the Premier and his Government intend to persist in the attitude they have put to this House and the public in favouring the Dartmouth dam over the construction of Chowilla?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I ask the Leader what he means by "persist in the attitude". What attitude? The Government has clearly stated (and I say it again for the Leader's benefit) that it believes in Chowilla unless there is something better available. The article written by Sir Thomas Playford in no way discredits the findings of the technical committee: honourable members should ponder that. Obviously, the needs of South Australia are the last thing in the mind of the Leader, who is seeking political advantage at the expense of South Australia. The difficulty developed for South Australia when the Leader, then Premier, and his Government agreed to the deferment of Chowilla and then wrote to the Prime Minister saying, "Guarantee us our 1,250,000 acre feet in some way." That was when he first implied that he would accept an alternative.

Mr. Hudson: Utter lies!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The member for Glenelg can place misconstructions on the

situation if he wishes, but what I have referred to is the political basis of this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I can allow only one question at a time. This is not a conversation.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I intend to ask the management of the *Advertiser* to put the facts before the public of South Australia and not merely the misconstructions of the Opposition. I will ask the *Advertiser* to be big enough to face the issue and allow the public to have the proper information from experts, not political matter such as that from the Leader of the Opposition. I want the *Advertiser* to publish something other than statements made by people who are willing to sell the future of the State for their own political advantage.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Sir Thomas Playford in no way said that the findings of the technical committee were improper or wrong, although he said that the committee made some assumptions. The commission has numerous reports before it for its own use and the technical report, which was one of many reports, was not written for public perusal: it was written for the commission's own use and study. However, because of political pressure and, indeed, because of support from this Government, the report was released to the public in order to try to clarify the position. But the report does not attempt to set out the facts regarding a comparison between Dartmouth and Chowilla. I reiterate that neither Sir Thomas Playford nor any member opposite has had an opportunity, as the Government has had over recent weeks, to study the matters which are uppermost in the minds of the River Murray Commission and which were considered by the representatives of this State and other States on the technical committee.

I say again that the reputation of the people who formulated this report is beyond reproach, and, again, the technical committee's report is without politics. The Leader has said that he will rampage through the river districts, but what will he tell the people there? Will he tell them that the technical committee has been dishonest?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. S. HALL: On the other hand, will he be truthful and say that he himself waited for the technical committee's report? The technical committee's report having come to hand, the Leader is willing to accept those

parts of it that favour his argument but rejects other parts because they do not favour his argument. The Leader referred to a difference of 100 parts per million in favour of Chowilla as compared with Dartmouth, but this argument falls to the ground when we study the technical committee's report. This sort of fabrication is not good enough for the people of South Australia. I am quite willing to place before the public every fact at our disposal. If the Leader is referring to the *Advertiser*, I will request that newspaper to give me the opportunity to clarify the position.

Mr. CORCORAN: I cannot understand what the Premier means when he says that he will approach the management of the *Advertiser* about the accuracy of the report of what Sir Thomas Playford had to say. I do not know whether the Premier thinks the *Advertiser* has reported Sir Thomas inaccurately or whether he thinks Sir Thomas was inaccurate in writing the report. In the last part of the article, Sir Thomas states:

The last question I am asked to express an opinion on is can South Australia still hope to achieve the Chowilla proposal? This depends upon the South Australian people themselves. If they are prepared to require the Federal Government effectively to support Chowilla they can, in my opinion, obtain it.

Can the Premier say how he expects the people of South Australia to gain effective support from the Commonwealth Government if his and the Government's attitude continues to be, as it has been recently, clearly in favour of Dartmouth?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Perhaps the honourable member has not read the report or perhaps he has not listened to what I have said.

Mr. Corcoran: I heard the debate the other day.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have not said that, on any condition, the Government favours Dartmouth. I have simply said that, if Dartmouth is built, it must provide additional advantages to South Australia that Chowilla will not provide. That is the condition the South Australian Government has laid down.

Mr. Corcoran: That's saying that Dartmouth is better.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No, it is not. We have said that we will not accept Dartmouth unless it does these things. Can't the honourable member understand that simple statement?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Unless Dartmouth provides more than Chowilla can provide for South Australia, this Government is not interested in it. Do I have to repeat that again and again? It is a simple statement.

Mr. Hudson: You say it does these things: you've accepted the report.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Opposition members, including the member for Millicent, have implied that the report of the technical committee is incorrect. Is the honourable member saying that the committee studied the wrong things?

Mr. Corcoran: We question the assumptions.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: He should look at the preamble to the technical committee's report which states that the technical committee has reported after 18 months' investigation.

Mr. Corcoran: We have been questioning the assumptions.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Which Party was in government in South Australia 18 months ago? Is the honourable member saying that the technical committee has investigated the wrong things? If he is, what responsibility did he bear, through his Government's Commissioner, 18 months ago?

Mr. Corcoran: You say what responsibility. I have asked you a question.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member and his Leader are trying to get out of the responsibility of their Government for agreeing to the deferment and for being able to guide the deliberations of the technical committee under their Government, and, now that the committee has reported, members opposite will not accept the report.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Premier is getting into a debate. As honourable members know, questions and replies to questions must not be debated. Does the Premier wish to continue?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to refresh the honourable member's memory. The first words in the technical committee's report are as follows:

This report summarizes the results of studies which have been made by the technical committee over the past 18 months.

Mr. HUDSON: I address my question to the Parliamentary Under Secretary to the Premier. First, may I, personally and on

behalf of other members present, congratulate the member for Victoria on his appointment.

Mr. Clark: Whatever it is.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. I commiserate with the member for Victoria concerning the fact that he is not getting any remuneration, although I presume he is now going to do much of the work. My question was intended for the Premier, and now that he has returned I will direct it to him, with your permission, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. HUDSON: Then I will continue with the question.

The SPEAKER: No, you cannot. You must take your seat. You directed your question to a certain member and you cannot change it.

Mr. HUDSON: I am not going to change it.

The SPEAKER: You changed your question.

Mr. HUDSON: I never changed it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will take his seat.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I said that, as the Premier had come back I would like to address the question to him. You said I could not, and I therefore wish to continue to address my question to the Parliamentary Under Secretary. I do not see why I should be out of order in doing that.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has to make up his mind.

Mr. HUDSON: I have made up my mind.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must take his seat. First, you addressed a question to the Parliamentary Under Secretary. You cannot change the question half-way through and ask it of another person. The honourable member can do that subsequently. If he wishes to direct his question now to the Premier he may do so, but he cannot direct one question to two persons.

Mr. HUDSON: I wish to explain my question, with your permission and with the concurrence of the House. In dealing with the technical committee's report, some criticisms have been made which have all been criticisms directed at the assumptions that govern the nature of that report. At no stage have any members on this side questioned the accuracy of the calculations or the integrity of the officers who did this work. The particular assumptions which are mentioned in the report and which led to the conclusion that has been quoted a number of times by the Premier

(that Dartmouth would provide 860,000 acre feet of water more than Chowilla would provide for New South Wales and Victoria) are as follows: a minimum flow of 900 cusecs at all times at Mildura, South Australia's entitlement to be 1,254,000 acre feet a year, and the optimum capacity being achieved when the yield to New South Wales and Victoria is maximized; and the Menindee Lakes storage to be under River Murray Commission control. Stated today in Sir Thomas Playford's article, but not stated in the technical committee's report (I presume Sir Thomas obtained this information from Mr. Beaney) is an average flow of the Mitta Mitta River of 750,000 acre feet a year, and there is a further assumption (again, I presume Sir Thomas obtained this information from Mr. Beaney, although it is not stated in the report) that the Mitta Mitta needs to be used to store water until very dry years. In other words, in normal years it will not be run down at all.

Further assumptions relate to a 5:5:5 sharing ratio, not less than 70 per cent of normal requirements to be provided in a year of restriction. Some of these assumptions have been questioned by Sir Thomas Playford, and some of them have been questioned strongly and continually by members in this House. Is it a fact, from the acceptance by the Premier of the conclusions of the technical committee, that he accepts the validity of these various assumptions that I have outlined? Will the Premier explain whether or not he accepts these assumptions, and will he explain in detail how he justifies them? I point out that unless one justifies these assumptions one cannot arrive at the conclusions achieved by the technical committee.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am pleased to hear the member for Glenelg say that neither he nor his Party questions the technical excellence of the report.

Mr. Hudson: The calculations!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The member for Glenelg does not question the calculations in the technical report and I am pleased to hear that, because that means his thinking is developing; indeed, it needs to develop.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Casey: You're trying to be smart.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the honourable member accepts the technical excellence of the report, of course he must accept some other things which naturally follow from the findings.

What the technical report has said, in effect, is that if these things occur together the yield will be 860,000 acre feet in an average year additional to that of Chowilla. The honourable member cannot deny that.

Mr. HUDSON: That is based on all those assumptions, including maximizing the use—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! Only one question may be asked at a time.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member is rapidly coming around to the Government's thinking on this point, and he will inevitably have to, as he further studies the report. He cannot go as far as saying he accepts the technical excellence of the report and deny the conclusions that flow from it. That would be the greatest contradiction of the many contradictions in which the honourable member has been involved. The result of the Dartmouth study will undoubtedly depend on political negotiations. South Australia has asked for much more from any alternative than it could obtain from Chowilla. This has presented a new factor in the thinking that is taking place in other States. Will those States agree to a greatly increased quota for South Australia which is above that demanded by the previous Government? Will they agree to much more water for South Australia than the previous Labor Premiers demanded? This is a new factor to be considered, and we will go to the conference table with all the factors in mind which the member for Glenelg raises. This will include the various factors that have gone into the technical committee's report to produce the additional advantage of 860,000 acre feet, of which this Government is demanding an appropriate share on behalf of the South Australian people. Cannot the honourable member understand that the final outcome depends on negotiation? Here we have presented for study, which apparently the honourable member is unable to understand, all of the technical details that must be the basis of future negotiation.

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

Leave granted.

Mr. HUDSON: In answer to a question asked by me, the Premier said that I was accepting the technical excellence of the technical committee's report and implied that I was coming around to the conclusions expressed in that report. This is completely misleading and quite an inaccurate commentary on my attitude or, indeed, on the attitude of any other members of the Opposition. If

I may be able to clarify the position particularly for the Premier, I should like to do it in this way:—

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Is this a personal explanation?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is making a personal explanation and must be heard without interruption.

Mr. HUDSON: The conclusions that any committee of investigation reaches can be accurate if the assumptions are accurate and if the detailed working out of the calculations involved is accurate. No-one on this side has questioned the detailed working out of the calculations made by the technical committee: we have been assured that these have been checked, and we are satisfied with that assurance. What we have questioned are the assumptions on which those calculations are based. Even the most remorseless computer, if it starts off with false premises, can still end up in bedlam. I have attempted to question the Premier this afternoon on the consequences of variations in the assumptions made by the technical committee, and I was concerned to discover whether or not the Premier's acceptance of the committee's conclusions meant that he accepted fully the assumptions on which they were based, because we on this side do not. That is the position that I was seeking to have clarified but, instead of getting it clarified, I found myself accused of accepting the conclusions in the technical committee's report, and that, of course, is the complete reverse of the position I have taken.

I hope that the Premier will now see the difference between the detailed calculations on which conclusions are reached from a set of assumptions and the assumptions themselves. I hope, too, that he will appreciate, for example, that if we assume a different flow of the Mitta Mitta River, and a different minimum flow at Mildura, that the aim of any proposal is to maximize the yield to South Australia and not just to maximize the yield to New South Wales and Victoria, or that the Menindee Lakes are not under the control of the River Murray Commission, we could reach different conclusions. Because we take this attitude and question the basic assumptions on which the technical committee's procedure is based, we cannot be accused of accepting its report. That is something that neither Sir Thomas Playford nor we have done.

Mr. LAWN: I understand that, following the resolution unanimously passed by this House regarding Chowilla, you, Mr. Speaker, and other persons organized a committee that subsequently became known as the Chowilla Promotion Committee and that after a meeting of that committee you were appointed its chairman. Can you say whether you, as chairman, intend to call a meeting of that committee and whether the committee will be disbanded or will continue to fulfil the function for which it was originally set up?

The SPEAKER: I must correct the honourable member on one point. As convenor, I helped get the committee formed. I am not the chairman of the committee: the chairman is Mr. Julius Dridan, formerly Engineer-in-Chief, who has called a meeting of the full committee for Friday, February 14, to consider what further action is contemplated.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: Although my question is addressed to the Premier, he will be pleased that it does not refer to Chowilla dam, because he got himself confused on that. Today's *Advertiser* contains a report, which I have subsequently compared with the *Hansard* proofs, of an extremely severe conflict between the Minister of Local Government and two of his political colleagues about the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill asked the Minister a question about a statement in the press of the previous day emanating from the Chief Executive Engineer of the Highways Department (Mr. Flint). I regret that the *Hansard* proof reveals what was stated by innuendo in the press this morning, namely, that in fact the Minister was critical of Mr. Flint. I point out to the Premier that, had the Minister been at the meeting, the situation whereby the Chief Executive Engineer had to suffer the apparent barrage obviously would not have occurred. Can the Premier say (and, if not, will he find out) whether the Minister of Local Government or any other Cabinet Minister has attended any public meetings to defend the Government against public criticism levelled at it in relation to the M.A.T.S. plan, or has this all been left to the executive of the Highways Department?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The officers of the Highways Department are not instructed to defend this Government: the Government is able to defend itself quite well without the assistance of public servants. We do not bring people who serve the Government dili-

gently in their various fields of operation into the realm of politics, and I consider that the report of Mr. Flint's remarks refers to an occasion on which he was provoked to a great degree and that the incident does not involve politics at all. I do not think it profits the honourable member to know how many meetings Ministers have attended. Obviously, he will say that Ministers should have attended all the protest meetings that have been held regarding the plan. The Government has welcomed the holding of these meetings: it has desired that they occur and that citizens should make representations about their complaints on the plan. The honourable member complained bitterly that the people should not have had this opportunity. I remember his decrying, in this House, the Government's move to give a six months' stay on the M.A.T.S. plan so that members of the public could complain if they wished to do so. The Government steadfastly maintained, despite the honourable member's criticism, that it would give this stay of six months. We are pleased we gave it, despite the honourable member's opposition to it. During this time all the complaints from individuals, organizations and local government have been noted and are being studied. When these matters and the final matters submitted to the Government have been studied, after the six months' period an announcement will be made about M.A.T.S. This is the context in which Highways Department officers have been involved: to explain the plan to members of the public and to get the facts over to them, but not to defend it (that is not their aim in life, nor would it be a service to the public). Their service to members of the public is to get the facts over to them so that they can have informed discussions. I compliment the department's officers on the strenuous work they have carried out in trying to get over to the public at all times the details of this vast plan. Nothing can be served by coming to an assumption that Ministers should have attended all these meetings. Frankly, they could not have done so, because the meetings have been numerous and, as the honourable member knows, Ministers have been very busy serving the best interests of the State.

STURT HIGHWAY

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: On December 3 last I asked the Attorney-General to ascertain from the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the Government would consider giving immediate attention to improving the Sturt

Highway, particularly the scenic portion that runs from Gawler into the Barossa Valley, and I referred to the condition of the road. On January 16 the Attorney wrote to me as follows:

Consideration is currently being given to the practicability of asphaltic concrete sheeting the Gawler-Tanunda section of the Sturt Highway Main Road No. 4. Although this treatment would do nothing to improve the geometric alignment of the road, it would nevertheless greatly improve the riding qualities of the existing pavement. It appears likely that at least some of the work can be put in hand during the current summer months.

Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague whether by now it has been decided to re-sheet, in the way suggested in the letter, that part of the Sturt Highway to which I have referred and, if that has been decided, whether the work can be put in hand immediately, particularly as in April this year the Barossa Valley Vintage Festival will take place and this road will be used by tens of thousands of people who attend the festival?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to do that and to let the honourable member know as soon as possible.

NEGLECTED ORCHARDS

Mr. GILES: A constituent of mine complained to me last weekend about two neglected orchards which are adjacent to his property and from which diseases and insect pests are spreading to his property, making it difficult to keep it clean. As an Act has been passed to protect careful growers from careless growers, will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, ask his colleague to take the necessary action to ensure that the neglected orchards are either properly looked after or removed? The constituent has already complained to the Agriculture Department, and I will supply the Minister with the necessary information later.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I take it that this matter has been reported to the department and that no action has been taken. In the circumstances, as soon as I have the relevant details I will take up this matter with my colleague.

SCIENTOLOGY

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yesterday, the Government secured the passage of the Scientology (Prohibition) Bill, under which it will be empowered to seize documents and records of scientology and to break into their buildings, if necessary, and seize whatever is

there. On January 31, the Government permitted the registration of the Church of the New Faith to teach scientology. Will the Attorney-General say how he intends, in the event of breaking into the Church of the New Faith, to make his actions consistent with one of the four freedoms, namely, the freedom of worship? Does he think that, if he has to break into the church, he will be committing blasphemy?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I point out that the honourable member asks his question on a false premise, as the Bill has not yet gone through: there was an amendment made in this House which must now go back to the Legislative Council and, if it is agreed to there, it is necessary for His Excellency the Governor to give the Vice-Regal Assent before it becomes law. Regarding the substance of the question, the honourable member knows perfectly well that there are adequate powers in the Bill to allow all that is necessary to be done and to protect those who do it.

WATER LICENCES

Mr. McANANEY: My question concerns the Murray River and the issuing of licences by the Government to the full extent of the water which is now possibly available in a dry year and which would be guaranteed by Chowilla. I understand that, although applications for licences have been made, they have had to be refused and that until an alternative dam that will give a greater guarantee in a dry year can be established no licences can be issued. In most normal years, whether Chowilla or Dartmouth was established, there would be a flow of water in the river that would get into the lakes and would be available on a temporary basis. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether it is possible to issue temporary monthly or yearly licences so that this water can be used for crops such as onions and potatoes and even lucerne on a seasonal basis which can be left without irrigation for a year?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Last December I made a statement to the House about the new policy concerning water licences for irrigation on the Murray River, but as the member has now questioned another aspect I shall be happy to obtain a report for him.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: When the Minister considers the request of the member for Stirling for a variation of the sound policy regarding water licences on the Murray River, will he also consider the case of the

people who were granted water licences on a temporary basis and who would be embarrassed during a dry season? In view of their circumstances, will he consider how much financial assistance these people may claim from the Government as relief?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will consider this matter at the same time as I consider the other matter and inform the honourable member accordingly.

GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENT

Mr. BROOMHILL: I have been informed that an announcement on the radio a short time ago stated that the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) had been appointed Parliamentary Under Secretary to the Premier. Can the Premier say whether this report is correct and, if it is, can he say under what constitutional provision this appointment has been made, whether the honourable member will continue in his position as Government Whip, and whether in the absence of the Premier from this House the new appointee will be responsible for legislation under the control of the Premier?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before the Premier replies to the question it would be fair to point out that there may be a misunderstanding. The Premier spoke to me a few moments ago about a statement he wished to make.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am pleased to inform the House that in Executive Council this morning, His Excellency the Governor appointed the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) to be Parliamentary Under Secretary to assist the Premier. This appointment, I believe, is new in South Australian Parliamentary history, although such appointments exist in other Parliaments in Australia and overseas. In selecting Mr. Rodda to undertake the duties of this new office, I had in mind his proven capabilities and experience. The appointment will enable me as Premier to devote more time to major aspects of policy, State administration, and industrial promotion. No remuneration is involved.

Mr. LAWN: I understand from the Premier's announcement today that the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) has been appointed Parliamentary Under Secretary to the Premier. Can he say what are his duties? As the Chief Secretary has already stated in Parliament that he is not on speaking terms with the Premier, do the honourable

member's duties involve his being a message boy between the two Ministers? Also, as it is strongly rumoured throughout this building that during this year the Chief Secretary will become the Premier of the State, has the honourable member been appointed as an organizer for the present Premier among Liberal and Country League members?

Mr. RODDA: Before replying, may I thank the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) for the congratulations he extended to me earlier, in his nice way, on my appointment. The statements made by the member for Adelaide about relations between the Premier and the Chief Secretary are completely erroneous and unfounded. However, it may suit the honourable member to propagate such rumours.

Mr. Lawn: DeGaris said it in the Legislative Council.

Mr. RODDA: The honourable member should read some of his own statements and see how much authenticity they have. I assure the member for Adelaide and the House that there is no friction between the Premier and the Chief Secretary: they are a harmonious team. My duties will be to assist these honourable gentlemen in their very honourable undertakings.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was interested in the Premier's announcement that a Parliamentary Under Secretary to his department had been appointed. The office of Premier, as a Ministerial office, was created only recently, during the term of the Labor Government, in order to control the Premier's Department which, apart from a few minor branches such as the Government Motor Garage, had control of the Industrial Development Branch. This was the basis of the department. All previous Premiers also had a series of other portfolios; indeed, all previous Premiers were also Treasurer. When the Premier took office he took the portfolio of Premier, which included oversight of the Industrial Development Branch. He certainly then created another portfolio, that of Minister of Industrial Development, to do the same work as the Premier's Department was already doing, but he has the smallest administrative burden of any leader of the Government in the State's history. In these circumstances, I should be grateful if the Premier would say what precisely are the duties of his Parliamentary Under Secretary; what administrative duties of any kind he will undertake; and what other duties he will undertake. As he cannot be a member of Cabinet or Executive Council,

precisely how does he fit into the scheme of things?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I said earlier, my Parliamentary Under Secretary will help me perform my general duties so as to enable me to spend additional time on major issues. The Leader of the Opposition, when Premier, was not involved in the amount of industrial promotion in which I and my department are involved. There has been a great increase in industrial activity. Last year, during my overseas visit, I made a tremendous number of visits to individual industrialists, some of which I am happy to say have borne fruit. At present, there is accumulating in the department, and under the daily direction and inquiry that is growing, many more industrial contacts to be attended to, and this could well mean another overseas trip this year to present South Australia's case to industrialists in the United States and Europe. All of this adds up to a very much larger increase in the work load than applied in that department when the Leader was running it. This alone is a specialization that takes a tremendous amount of my time, apart from involvement in general policy matters and conferring with my Ministers. This has led me to believe that I can perform my duties more efficiently and give better service to members opposite and to the public if I have the assistance of this very capable, newly-appointed officer.

Mr. LAWN: As indicated by the Leader of the Opposition, former Premiers of the State, in addition to being Premier, have been in charge of the Industrial Development Department and have held other portfolios such as those of Treasurer and Minister of Social Welfare. Bearing in mind the appointment of a Parliamentary Under Secretary to the Premier, I point out that the Minister of Works is also Minister of Labour and Industry, Minister in charge of the Public Buildings Department, Minister of Marine, and Minister in charge of electrical undertakings, plus one or two other functions that I may have missed. Will the Premier say whether we can expect therefore an announcement by Cabinet shortly that the Minister of Works, too, will have the assistance of a Parliamentary Under Secretary?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not believe that such an announcement is imminent. However, when electoral reform is instituted in South Australia (that is, if the Opposition supports the relevant measure) and when more members are in this House after the next election, I will appoint at least one more Minister.

ABALONE FISHING

Mr. EDWARDS: Much concern has been expressed by abalone divers and others about a provision in the abalone regulations made under the Fisheries Act last year by the previous Government, requiring abalone fishermen to bring ashore all abalone before removing it from its shell. They claim that this requirement restricts the quantity of fish they are able to handle in one load, and makes it impossible for them to operate economically within the law. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether this problem has been brought to his notice, and if it has, what action is being taken to remedy the situation?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I know that my colleague is well aware of this matter, and that he has received representations from the industry concerning this provision in the regulations. I am informed that it was inserted to comply with proposals by the Department of Primary Industry for export standards for abalone, which, of course, is a Commonwealth matter. Following a recent meeting of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Fishing Industry Council held in Adelaide, the Minister of Agriculture decided to convene a conference of interested parties to discuss this matter on February 26, to which will be invited representatives of the abalone fishermen and processors, appropriate officers of the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry and Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, and heads of the departments of fisheries in New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and South Australia. The results of this conference will be carefully examined with a view to amending the present South Australian regulations—in particular the provision which prohibits the shelling at sea of abalone—to solve some of the problems complained of by people engaged in the industry.

BEACH FACILITIES

Mr. HURST: In mid-December the Minister of Immigration and Tourism, accompanied by the Director of the Tourist Bureau, inspected the foreshore facilities and amenities that have been erected at Largs Bay and Semaphore for the convenience of the public. In the *News* of January 30 there appears an article written by a correspondent of the *News* (Dale Harrison), strongly criticizing the toilet facilities at metropolitan beaches, including Semaphore. Indeed, it seems from the arrangement of the article that

his main complaint concerns those at Semaphore, because he has gone to the trouble of photographing a shed and making certain comments. Has the Minister of Immigration and Tourism read that article and, if he has, can he say whether he considers that it is a reasonable summary of the facilities that have been provided in that district?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Being away when the article was published, I have not read it and I therefore prefer not to comment at present. With the honourable member and the Director of the Tourist Bureau, I visited Semaphore some weeks ago, inspected the facilities being constructed, and discussed the hopes and ambitions of the corporation. I realize that the corporation has an earnest desire to improve the foreshore in its area, and much work has already been done. I was impressed with what I saw, particularly when one realizes the limits of local government finances. Beyond that I shall not comment: I will read the article first and then comment on it.

Mr. EDWARDS: During a recent visit to Tasmania I was amazed at what had been done by the Tasmanian Government Tourist Bureau to make everything attractive for tourists. At every small beach resort there was a first-class toilet for both men and women, a well equipped store or shop at which one could buy almost anything, and a petrol pump. Generally, the beaches are no better than ours, but everyone seems to do everything possible for the tourist. As many beaches in this State are as good as those on the Queensland Gold Coast, can the Minister of Immigration and Tourism say why more cannot be done, including the provision of better toilet facilities at more beaches throughout South Australia, to make our country beaches better and more attractive to tourists?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Government, through the Tourist Bureau, subsidizes councils so that they can provide these facilities, and the Parliamentary vote has steadily increased during the past few years, although this increase has been interrupted occasionally. I believe that the industry in this State is in a sound position, although if more money were available for promotion more could be done. The honourable member may have created the impression that facilities at our beaches are bad: they are not bad at all beaches, although in isolated cases improvements are necessary. However, if any com-

plaints are to be made I should like them to be made to me. Last year the honourable member asked a question about facilities at roadhouses and, although I am sure he did not think that this would happen, this was reported throughout Australia, and it created the wrong impression. Instances were quoted by the honourable member where an improvement was needed, but I am sure that if I had had the chance to discuss the matter with him we could have found the answer. I would not like the House to gain the impression that our beaches were badly catered for while those in other places were good. About two years ago I visited Costa del Sol, a resort on the southern shores of Spain which caters for tourists who chase the sun and which is popular with northern Europeans. It has many fine installations and many multi-storey buildings, and private enterprise had spent much more money on facilities than has been spent around our coastline. However, the cleanliness of the beaches and the general civic administration did not compare with ours in their effectiveness, although I did not know all the problems involved. Certainly our beaches would have given a much better impression than the beaches I saw there gave. Generally, although there is vast room for improvement in the further promotion of tourism, our tourist industry is on a sound basis. The Government would be pleased if it were informed through the Tourist Bureau of any instances of unsavoury conditions so that they can be remedied. I believe that these are isolated instances, however, rather than the normal conditions.

COOLTONG IRRIGATION

Mr. ARNOLD: My question relates to the irrigation settlement of Cooltong, which is one of the settlements in the 1,000-acre bracket. One of the main bones of contention of people in the area at present is that considerable delay occasionally occurs in the roster in the peak period of water use. The pumping capacity at Cooltong is about 280,000 gallons an hour, whereas in the average 1,000-acre settlement the capacity is about 350,000 gallons an hour. Will the Minister of Irrigation consider having one of the smaller pumps in the pumping station at Cooltong replaced by a larger one in order to lift the average pumping capacity to 350,000 gallons an hour?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will examine the question thoroughly and give the honourable member a reply next week.

ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM

Mr. JENNINGS: I address my question to the Minister of Lands. Apparently I cannot address it to his Parliamentary Under Secretary as yet, although undoubtedly at some future time I shall be able to do so. I realize that the subject of my question is not as important at Chowilla dam or some of the other matters about which there have been questions, but it has been almost as protracted as the Chowilla dam. I refer to the future use of the former sewage farm at Islington. As the Minister of Lands will recall, I took a deputation from the Enfield City Council to see him a long time ago. I know that this is a vexed question and that the Minister has had tremendous problems with it. However, although I have asked several questions, he has given me only interim reports. The position now is that many of the people in the district are beginning to believe that we did not have such a deputation at all, for they cannot obtain any answer on the matter. As I have done my best to dissuade those people from holding this belief as I know it is not correct, will the Minister give as much information about the matter as he can and give some idea of when it will be finalized?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member can be assured that the deputation and the words spoken at it have made an impression on me, and have been fully considered: there is no suggestion that the deputation has been ignored. In fact, I appreciate the call that was made on me, having found that the discussion was of some value in determining the future of the sewage farm. Although I am not yet able to make a further statement on it, I believe it will not be long before I can give some information to the honourable member. This matter has been in front of me fairly frequently since before the deputation came to see me. One of the matters involved in the future of the sewage farm land is the consideration of the possible boundaries of the freeway as incorporated in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan. This matter will be decided, along with the remainder of the M.A.T.S. plan, within a few days, so that that aspect will be disposed of. After that, fairly rapid progress will be made in deciding how the other land will be used. I will inform the honourable member as soon as possible after the decision has been made.

Mr. Jennings: What about the question of Crown lands?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I might have explained earlier that this land was held in various ways and it was necessary for the whole of it to be gathered under the ownership of one Government department (in this case, it was gathered under the Minister of Lands). This was done last year and the land now comes under the Lands Department for disposal, so there is no barrier in that regard.

RAILWAY LAND

Mr. McKEE: The Port Pirie Branch of the National Trust has for some time now been negotiating with the Railways Department about acquiring the old railway station in Ellen Street, Port Pirie. Will the Attorney-General obtain from the Minister of Roads and Transport a report on what the Government intends to do with this building?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will do my best to get it.

WHEAT

Mr. CASEY: Many wheat farmers throughout the State are most disgruntled, to say the least, at being unable to get all of their wheat crop into the silos. Not only are some unable to get all of their wheat into the silos but others are unable to get in any wheat at all. The latter position is caused mainly by the fact that, in view of the long delays at the silos, wheat carters will not cart the wheat. I realize only too well that the present harvest is much greater than our previous best. Nevertheless, in the interests of the growers in this State, will the Premier discuss, in Cabinet, the advisability of making available to South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited \$1,000,000 so that more storages can be provided to enable farmers to get the whole of their grain into the silos? I also point out to the Premier that, unless farmers are assisted in this way, there could be serious repercussions on the acreage of wheat sown this year, thus detrimentally affecting the economy of this State. I think that, in the circumstances, the co-operative has done a good job, but more money is required because of the urgency of the present position of farmers.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am concerned about the position to which the honourable member refers and have discussed it with the Minister of Agriculture several times. I know of my colleague's concern about the position and his sympathy with the people involved. However, I point out that the co-operative is controlled by the South Australian growers,

almost all of whom are members. I do not know of any recent request to the Government for assistance in this way, but I will ask the Minister of Agriculture whether any such request has been made to him. I should expect that the co-operative would be carefully considering both the present and future positions, especially what stocks may be held at the end of this year and at the beginning of the next delivery season. That would be a much more worrying problem than the difficulty that farmers in the various localities have had this year. I will discuss the matter with my colleague and take up the points the honourable member has raised.

INDUSTRIAL PROMOTION

Mr. RYAN: I asked several questions last year, including questions on notice, about what percentage of Mr. Ramsay's duties were involved in his work as Director of Industrial Promotion, and I also asked what salary Mr. Ramsay was to receive. As Mr. Ramsay has held this position for many months, can the Premier now give this information?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Mr. Ramsay is Director of Industrial Promotion in South Australia and in this capacity he is extremely busy, especially because of the increased industrial activity in the State in the last few months. I think he is in Sydney today, following up several recent approaches from firms interested in starting operations here. In fact, Executive Council today approved the building by the Housing Trust under its rental-purchase plan of a new factory at Elizabeth for Texas Instruments, and I can tell the honourable member that much more activity is taking place within the department. An announcement to be made later today will show how business activity is picking up. Mr. Ramsay's duties are to spearhead this promotional drive, and we cannot measure in hours or by percentage how much time he puts into those duties. He does what is required and, on the morning on which he has not specific appointments, he discusses with me and other staff members the current industrial activity in the State by way both of initiating new ventures and of maintaining existing ones. Mr. Ramsay's job is to give constant attention to this matter and have discussions with me. I have not asked him how many hours a week he works but I know he does much after-hours work and spends many evenings with visiting industrialists, persuading them about South Australia's industrial opportunity. His salary for

this is \$1,500 a year in addition to his salary as General Manager of the Housing Trust, and this salary has been fixed by the Public Service Board.

SWIMMING POOLS

Mrs. BYRNE: On November 5 the Minister of Housing, in reply to my question of October 3 about the provision of safety walls or fences around swimming pools or around properties on which pools were built, said:

The Minister of Local Government states that the Building Act Advisory Committee has considered the question and advises that it considers that an amendment to the Building Act, 1923-1965, to provide for fencing around privately-owned swimming pools and private properties containing swimming pools is not advisable. However, the committee points out that, under sections 28 and 101 of the Building Act, councils have the power to control the construction of pools with any conditions they see fit.

I notified the Tea Tree Gully council of this reply and the council referred the matter to the Local Government Association for an opinion from the association's solicitors. This opinion is contrary to that of the Building Act Advisory Committee, the last paragraph stating:

It would have been helpful to know whether the views of the Building Act Advisory Committee were supported by the opinion of the Crown Solicitor.

If I give the Minister a copy of the opinion obtained by the Local Government Association, will he seek an opinion from the Crown Solicitor on the matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It surprises me somewhat to hear that there is a doubt about the law on this matter. However, I thank the honourable member for offering to give me the document, and I certainly will seek the Crown Solicitor's advice and let the honourable member know.

TOMATOES

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Lands received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question about marketing of tomatoes?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My colleague states:

Regulation 10 under the Fruit and Vegetables (Grading) Act requires the outside of the package (containing fruit or vegetables) itself, or a label or ticket affixed in a conspicuous position on the outside of the package itself, to be legibly and durably marked with: (a) the initials of the Christian name and full surname of the owner of the fruit or vegetables; or in the case of a grower, his recognized packing shed number; or in the case of a firm or corporation with the firm or corporate name;

and (b) in the case of tomatoes, the grade and size of the vegetables.

However, regulation 27 exempts fruit (except citrus) and vegetables sold in open packages from compliance with the requirements of regulation 10. An "open package" as defined by the regulations means any package which has been left unclosed from the time in which the fruit or vegetables have been packed therein until such fruit or vegetables have been sold for retail distribution. I am informed that in this particular case the produce was in open packages and, therefore, exempt from the provisions of regulation 10. It is not customary to make radical changes in marketing practices unless the support of the industry is obtained beforehand, and tomato growers in South Australia have resisted proposals to amend this regulation. The Agriculture Department engages in extension campaigns from time to time to assist growers to pack to reasonable standards and acquaints them of their obligations under the Act. Greengrocers in Mount Gambier should refer to the local fruit inspector any complaints concerning the standard of fruit sold to them by growers, to enable corrective action to be taken when possible.

WALLAROO HARBOUR

Mr. HUGHES: On August 6, 1968, in reply to my question about the Wallaroo Harbour, the Minister of Marine said:

I have requested the Fishing Haven Advisory Committee to visit Wallaroo to inspect requirements needed there, and to report promptly.

Last month, the Minister visited Wallaroo and was met by the Mayor and the Town Clerk. Later, the following report appeared in the press:

Mr. Coumbe expressed concern at the condition of the old jetty and undertook to examine the possibility of the providing of a new jetty for fishermen east of the harbour-master's office.

Will the Minister make available to the House the advisory committee's report which, according to the report of his statement in the local press, must be a favourable one?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Subsequent to the advisory committee's visit to Wallaroo, my attention was drawn to the condition of the existing jetty, which is used mainly by fishermen. The honourable member as a resident of Wallaroo knows what is the condition of the jetty. The cost of rehabilitating the jetty and making it safe for fishermen to use would be prohibitive because this tremendous pile structure has deteriorated rapidly. In view of this, I announced that investigations would be made to see whether there was a more suitable site where a new jetty could be erected instead of money being spent on an old structure which, even when rehabilitated,

would have only a limited life. I assure the honourable member that the Government desires to help the large fishing trade that is developing at Wallaroo and, as soon as I have further information, including the soundings that must be taken of that coast, I shall be happy to give it to him.

VEHICLE REGISTRATION

Mr. ARNOLD: My question relates to the registration of vehicles in country areas, particularly the registration of new and second-hand vehicles for the first time. There appears to be a continuing build-up in delay in respect of registration for the first time of new and secondhand vehicles, so much so that it exceeds the 14 days' limit on the existing permits issued by the local police. The situation is creating much work, not only for motor firms but also for local police officers and the insurance companies which have to issue another insurance cover note with the additional 14-day permit from the police. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to see whether this delay cannot be shortened, if not eliminated? If it cannot, could the 14-day permit be extended to a 21-day permit in order to reduce the duplication of work occurring at present?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will discuss the matter with my colleague.

BEACHPORT WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CORCORAN: I have asked several questions of the Minister of Works about what progress is being made by the Mines Department to locate a satisfactory water supply that will eventually lead to a reticulated water supply for Beachport. I believe that recent efforts of the department have resulted in a satisfactory supply being located about two miles from the town. Can the Minister of Works say what further action is contemplated by the department as a result of that discovery?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Drilling of a bore was commenced in October, 1967, by the Mines Department in an endeavour to find suitable water for the provision of a reticulated water supply for the township of Beachport. This project was a failure and was abandoned in 1968. Subsequently, the department opened up the oil well bore No. 1 at Beachport, where water of good quality was found. Unfortunately, this bore is located about four miles from the town and to convey this water into Beachport

would be very costly. In view of this, the Director of Mines is being asked to estimate the cost of a new deep bore at Beachport and the degree of certainty that can be given that this second deep bore will yield an adequate quantity of suitable water.

WHYALLA LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Will the Attorney-General ascertain from the Minister of Local Government when the committee dealing with full local government in Whyalla will submit its report?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will certainly seek that information.

DERAILMENTS

Mr. VIRGO: On December 3, 1968, the Premier, replying to a question asked by the member for Mount Gambier about railway derailments, said that each derailment was subject to a departmental inquiry, but his innuendo was that these inquiries were not sufficient, and he announced the appointment of a committee and its terms of reference. As two months has elapsed since that committee was appointed, can the Premier say whether the committee has completed its findings and, if it has not, when the findings are likely to be completed? Further, will the Premier undertake to make available a copy of the committee's findings?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get a report for the honourable member.

PORT PIRIE HARBOUR

Mr. McKEE: The Minister of Marine recently visited Port Pirie to inspect the harbour facilities. Although I believe that visit was brought about by questions I had asked of and discussions I had had with him about the lack of accommodation for small craft on the Port Pirie River, I was disappointed that I was not told of the Minister's impending visit, so that I could arrange to meet him while he was at Port Pirie. Now that the Minister has made the visit, will he report on the inspection he made?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Although I visited Port Pirie several weeks ago, I assure the honourable member that no discourtesy was intended by his not being notified earlier of the visit. I think it was the eighth day of a long trip that we had made, and we had only an hour or so at Port Pirie. Among other things I inspected there (wharves and

other facilities, including the Harbourmaster's new quarters) were the facilities for the berthing of fishing boats in the river, a matter previously raised by the honourable member. I had earlier arranged for the Fishing Advisory Committee to inspect these facilities and, as a result, the Harbourmaster issued a questionnaire to the owners of boats in the area. It is now apparent that there are more fishermen with boats than there are berths to accommodate those boats.

At Port Pirie there are facilities for mooring boats (pleasure craft in particular) that are not provided at most of the other ports under the Government's control. However, I have laid down that any professional fisherman, who has applied by the appropriate date, will be given a berth for his boat (no professional fisherman in this category will be denied a berth) and that the remainder of the mooring places will be available for the craft of other fishermen (semi-professional and part-time, in that order). It is not physically possible, as the honourable member will know, to enlarge this berthing facility: on one side it would come into the swinging basin or the area in which vessels swing to moor at the bulk loading berth, and on the other side it would project too far into the channel. I must regretfully inform the honourable member that it is not possible to increase the number of berths. Therefore, priority has been given to professional fishermen, and the remaining facilities will be made available to others.

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS

Mr. HURST: It is reported in this morning's *Advertiser* that the Managing Director of British Petroleum Australia Limited (Mr. Fox) said, when presenting the annual safety award to his company's Auburn installation staff, that industrial accidents were costing Australia more than \$750,000,000 a year. Mr. Fox also said that companies had halved their accident rate after starting industrial safety campaigns. Can the Minister of Labour and Industry inform me of the cost of industrial accidents in South Australia; has he any record to show the benefits, if any, from the campaigns conducted over a few years by the Labour and Industry Department; and what are the Government's present proposals for conducting campaigns in industry to try to curb the industrial accident rate?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I saw the article to which the honourable member refers, noting with some interest the comments made.

Undoubtedly industrial accidents cost the community a great sum through loss of hours worked; they also cause great suffering to the individuals concerned. I do not have with me the figures involved nor do I know whether the figures referred to in the article are correct, but I will check this and inform the honourable member accordingly. I can assure him that, in the last two or three years since the campaign in South Australia was commenced to reduce industrial accidents or to avoid them, a marked improvement has taken place. In this regard, I pay a sincere tribute to both employer and employee organizations on the way they have co-operated to this end. As the figures showing the improvement are readily available from my office, I will get them for the honourable member. When speaking at the opening of the most recent safety convention which my department organized last November, I referred to this aspect. Regarding the current and future programme, the department has encouraged some of the larger industries in the State to embark on fairly comprehensive safety educational campaigns. This is being done by showing films and holding courses for instructors at which safety officers, foremen and others can attend. The programme is bearing fruit, and once again I appreciate the co-operation taking place. Wishing to foster this work, the Government recently invited employer and employee organizations to co-operate with it in setting up an industrial safety centre in Adelaide. Only this week I have taken action in regard to accommodation for such a centre. In addition, the advisory committee on safety, which is provided for under the Industrial Code, has recently been constituted. It held its first meeting a few weeks ago and from this I hope beneficial results will flow. Therefore, the honourable member can see the excellent work being carried out in this field. I will obtain the details he has sought and let him have them next week.

EGGS

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of October 9 last year on the state of the egg industry?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports:

I am in constant touch with industry representatives and have had several schemes examined by departmental officers. I point out, however, that it is essential to the success of any scheme that there should be general agreement within the industry, as well as between States. No plan has yet been devised

which meets these pre-requisites. The egg-production phase of the poultry industry has been through a difficult period. Production problems are common to all States and, if the present level of production continues or increases, it appears that the financial difficulties facing the industry will persist. It is essential that the organizations representing egg producers unite in their efforts to develop an equitable scheme, and that any plan for stabilization of the egg industry is established on a national basis. One State cannot move on its own, and South Australia has been working in with other States. Correspondence has been conducted with other Ministers of Agriculture, and it is hoped that an effective plan will be developed and placed before the poultry producers for their consideration.

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question about the present Government's policy regarding the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities of Australia, which was introduced by the Labor Government?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports:

The policy of the Government is unchanged in regard to egg marketing. The matter of the necessity for egg pulping and pasteurizing in South Australia is under investigation. The object of any scheme is to get the maximum possible return for producers, at the same time providing a quality product to consumers at a competitive price. This involves a careful examination of all aspects.

WATER RATING

Mr. BROOMHILL: In reply to a question last year, the Minister of Works told me that he was considering a new system of water rating based on water usage. He pointed out that a committee was considering the matter and would be submitting a report to him by Christmas of last year. Has the Minister seen the report and, if he has, does he intend to implement any changes as a result of the report?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter. I informed him last year that computer studies were being undertaken into the whole subject. Only last week I was informed that, following my inquiries, the studies were now complete. The facts are now being collated and a conference is expected to be held next week between the officers and me at which various facts will be reported to me and discussions will take place. Of course, it will take some time for the matters to be sorted out, after which a policy decision will be made. As soon as I have something further to report, I shall be happy to inform the honourable member.

TAXI-CABS

Mr. RODDA: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked before Christmas about the number of passengers that can be carried in a taxi-cab under the regulations and about the cover provided by an operator's insurance policy?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Advice from the Accident and Underwriters Association is that a taxi-cab driver driving any number of passengers allowed by the regulations under the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act would be covered within the terms of the Motor Vehicles Act compulsory third-party insurance.

AIRCRAFT WORKS

Mr. CLARK: Has the Premier further information on the matters I raised before the adjournment regarding the Parafield aircraft works?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have received the following letter, dated January 22, from the Minister for Supply (Senator Anderson):

I refer again to your letter of December 11, 1968, regarding a question asked of you by Mr. Clark about the decision to close the air-frame repair workshops at Parafield. In November I informed you that my department was to arrange a programme of retrenchment and it was to have discussions with the A.C.T.U. and the employees. The workload for the Parafield workshops was closely examined and it was found necessary to make an initial reduction of some 27 employees. Notices of intention to retrench were issued on November 22 to take effect on January 17. It is customary to give four weeks' notice of impending retrenchment but my department decided that, having regard to the nearness of Christmas, the notices should be issued in November to give those concerned the opportunity of seeking other employment before Christmas. It was also decided to make work available during the three weeks' closedown for any of those employees under notice of retrenchment who wished to save the leave due to them so that they could receive a lump sum payment when they ceased on January 17. The Commonwealth Employment Service was requested to assist in finding work for those who were being retrenched and arrangements were made for an employment officer to attend the workshops from November 25.

Alternative employment has been found with private industry for 13 employees currently under notice of retrenchment. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to place any employees in Government employment. Every effort is being made to find acceptable alternative employment for the remaining employees who are directly affected. Employees whose services are terminated will be given the utmost consideration and receive all award and statutory rights to which they may be entitled under the Commonwealth Employees Furlough Act and the Superannuation Act as a result of retrenchment action.

Present indications are that the estimated workload should be sufficient to sustain the bulk of the remaining industrial work force until approximately April-May, 1969, when working operations are expected to cease altogether. The position at the Northfield workshops remains unaltered. However, until administrative arrangements are finalized, it is not possible to draw up a programme for the disposition of salaried staff employed at Parafield. You may be assured that my department, in conjunction with the Department of Labour and National Service and the Public Service Board, will take every measure to assist employees affected by the closure of the workshops in obtaining alternative employment.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: On June 26 last the Premier told me, in reply to a question about the Modbury Hospital, that the Government did not intend to recast priorities in that matter. However, yesterday the Minister of Works, in reply to a further question I had asked, said:

I told the honourable members that there were certain design alterations and modifications and, certainly, the order of priorities had been affected.

Can the Minister say whether his statement yesterday means that the Government has changed its policy regarding the Modbury Hospital?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: No, it does not, as I made perfectly clear to the honourable member yesterday. The change is that certain minor buildings that were to go up first may not now be built first. I assure the honourable member (and I told her this last year) that the Government had altered the mode of construction and the programming of the whole hospital: instead of certain buildings going up first, other buildings would be built first. What is most important as far as the Government, the people of the district, and the honourable member are concerned is that the several assurances I have given regarding the completion date will be honoured. Despite the new method of building, the hospital will be completed by that date. The matter is merely one of re-arranging the order in which certain work will be done. That was the order of priorities to which I referred.

BUILDING STANDARDS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am concerned at all times about the shoddy workmanship in house building today and I wish to bring to the notice of the Premier, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Housing, another case in Whyalla to find out whether something can be done for the people concerned

by altering the arrangements. A couple who have contracted to buy a Housing Trust house have told me that, after living in the house for a couple of weeks, they have had a window in a bedroom fall out, frame and all, a crack in the back verandah step is now about 12ft. long, all the doors are ill fitting (the front door could not be opened), and in the lounge one can see daylight between the floorboards. There are also numerous other defects. These people have asked that trust officers inspect the house, but I understand that so far this inspection has not been made. These people have asked whether they can rent a house rather than continue with the purchase of what they consider to be a particularly bad investment and a house in which they have no interest, because of the defects and bad workmanship. If I give the Premier the name and the address of the people concerned, will he ask his colleague to investigate the matter with a view to granting the request that these people be given a rental house rather than be required to continue with an unsatisfactory purchase?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to bring the matter to the attention of my colleague, and I assure the honourable member that I and the Government would be concerned to ensure that these people get value for the savings that they put into the purchase. I consider the trust's record in attending to defects of this kind to be good and I am sorry that an inspection of this house has not yet been made. However, the letter that the honourable member gives to my colleague will assist in his arranging for an early inspection of these defects.

EASTERN STANDARD TIME

Mr. BROOMHILL: Last year the Premier was reported as saying, in connection with the proposed changeover to Eastern Standard Time in South Australia, that this State could not afford the luxury of being out of line with the Eastern States. The Premier also told me, in reply to a question on the matter last year, that the matter was before Cabinet. Can he now give the Cabinet decision in this matter?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No decision to adopt Eastern Standard Time in South Australia has been made. Further representations have been received since the question was asked by the honourable member and these representations are still being considered by the Government.

WILD DOGS

Mr. CASEY: The Minister of Lands may recall that last year I asked him a question regarding an increase in the bounty on wild dog scalps. Recently, I was pleased to note that the Stockowners Association had also taken up this matter with the department as a result of what I had to say last year. In reply to my question the Minister said that he would ask the Pastoral Board to investigate the matter and that a final answer would be given later. Has the Minister anything further to report, in view of the recent statement by the Stockowners Association? I think it is high time that more lessees were charged the dog rate, as only a small proportion of landholders in the North of the State now pay it. This responsibility is State-wide rather than merely the concern of a few landholders in the North.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot make a final statement on the determination of this matter because the attitude of the various States has a bearing on it. In addition to discussions with the honourable member, I have also discussed this matter with the Stockowners Association and the Chairman of the Pastoral Board. The matter has not been ignored, but I do not have in front of me a firm statement by the Chairman of the board. From memory, I think the Chairman was in favour of an increase in the bounty and said he would take up the matter with the other States, but I am not sure of the details, as it was before Christmas that I last spoke to him on the matter. I hope that a firm decision will be made shortly.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE ACCOMMODATION

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have recently investigated the situation in the corridor just to the east of this Chamber, on the first floor where the *Hansard* staff works. I have looked at conditions there, particularly last week, and they were absolutely stifling.

Mr. Corcoran: The Minister of Works replied to my question on that matter yesterday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Then I must have missed it. I was going to ask the Minister whether he would install air-conditioning promptly.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I had pleasure in announcing yesterday that I had already approved air-conditioning of the *Hansard* quarters on the floor above this Chamber. Air-conditioning of Parliament House as a whole, but more particularly the

upper floor east of this Chamber, has been under review for some time. The cost of connecting *Hansard* accommodation with the existing air-conditioning system would be prohibitive. Investigations are being made into the additional accommodation that will be required for the enlarged House as a result of the passing of the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Bill. When this is done the air-conditioning of the building will be considered as a whole and in conjunction with the accommodation required for more members.

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to Amend the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to increase the rates of salary paid to the Chief Justice and the puisne judges. The rates of salary were last fixed by the Supreme Court Act Amendment Act (No. 1), 1966, at \$16,000 a year for the Chief Justice and \$14,900 a year for each puisne judge. Since that Act was passed all other States are either reviewing the salaries payable to puisne judges or have granted their puisne judges substantial increases of salary and allowances. All the judges in South Australia are paying as contributions towards pension a proportion of their salary. No other State requires contributions from judges for pension rights, and account has always been taken of this fact when determining the level of judges' salaries in this State. The Government has taken these factors into consideration and proposes that the salary of the Chief Justice be increased by \$2,800 a year, from \$16,600 to \$19,400 a year, and that the salaries of the puisne judges be increased by \$2,600 a year, from \$14,900 to \$17,500 a year. The Bill gives effect to these proposals.

The amendments are contained in clause 2, which amends section 12 of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) of the clause strikes out subsection (1) of the section and inserts in its place a new subsection, the effect of which is to ensure that the present salaries

of the judges will remain in force until the Bill becomes law, when the increased rates will apply. Paragraph (b) is consequential on the amendment effected by paragraph (a), and paragraph (c) corrects an error that appears in the principal Act, the effect of which was to deem the increased rates of salary "to have come into force for all purposes (including contributions for pension and rights to pension) on the date of commencement of this Act", namely, the Supreme Court Act, 1935, which came into force in 1937. By paragraph (c) it is provided that the new rates of salary will take effect when the Bill becomes law.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 5. Page 3428.)

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support this Bill, but I agree with some remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition. I am sure that no member wants people, because of lack of finance, to be forced to suffer an undue hardship because they are required to pay for mental health services. However, the Act provides for a maximum charge and enables the Director or someone authorized by him to reduce the charge where necessary. The Treasurer has said that the legislation will be administered leniently and I consider that I am justified in supporting it. No doubt many wealthy people suffer from mental illness, and if we are going to extend our activities to mental health patients this can be done only by making more money available.

It is pleasing to hear the Leader say that he does not like the means test, which means that people should pay according to their needs. Generally, he advocates progressive taxation which means that taxes are levied on the wealthy rather than on those who do not have the means to pay. This is a contradiction in his attitude. He claimed that, during the three years the Labor Party was in Government, mental health activities and practices were improved. However, the foundation of those improvements had been laid before the Labor Party took office: plans for two new mental hospitals had been introduced and they probably would have been built much earlier had not there been a change of Government.

Mr. Broomhill: The charges would have increased, too.

Mr. McANANEY: The Labor Government increased hospital charges during its period of office and by doing so faced the fact that expenditure on medical services had increased rapidly. We must make an effort to meet these charges so that we can give increased services, particularly to people who need them. We are not taking them away from those unable to pay, but those who can pay will have to do so. This is provided in the legislation, and the Premier, when introducing the Bill, said that it would be administered most leniently so that if anyone was in difficulties he would be given concessions.

Mr. Broomhill: What do you mean by "concessions"?

Mr. McANANEY: I support the Bill on those grounds.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I have never heard a member support a Bill "on those grounds" yet never give one ground for his support. The member for Stirling tried to make excuses but he did not succeed. I do not know whether the honourable member has considered the Bill, because he said that the Government was entitled to the money and to charge the patients because of the increased services to be given them.

Mr. McAnaney: I did not say that at all.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member referred to "the increased services we are going to give".

Mr. McAnaney: I said that if more money was available it would be possible to give increased services.

Mr. LAWN: What increased services would the honourable member give? He said, "We need this money and must have it because of the increased services we are going to give these people." The honourable member also referred to concessions, but he did not reply when the member for West Torrens asked him what they would be. No concessions will be given these people. The Bill has 3 clauses only: clause 1 imposes a charge, or gives Cabinet permission to issue regulations to impose a charge on patients in our mental institutions; clause 2 provides that the Director may remit the charges according to the means test; and clause 3 provides that the Government can charge the relatives for the cost of a funeral.

Mr. Broomhill: There's nothing about improved services.

Mr. LAWN: Services and concessions are not provided for in the Bill. Since this Government has been in office seven increased taxation

measures referred to in the Budget have been brought into effect, but charges for mental patients was not forecast as one of them.

Mr. McKee: They are scraping the bottom of the barrel with this one.

Mr. LAWN: I'll say. Some people may be surprised at this Government's actions but I am not. I could never bring myself to trust a Liberal Party Government and I have said that for many years, even before I became a member of this House. Since I have been here, particularly during the Stott-Hall Government's period of office, I have learned how right I was. There was more honesty from the Playford Government than from this one.

Mr. McKee: He was dickie, too.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, but he was more honest. This Government announced in its Budget there would be seven increases in taxation and all these measures have come into effect. Also, the Government has increased the cost of fishing licences, fares, and has lifted price control on some items. The Commonwealth Statistician recently announced that during the December quarter the cost of living had increased by 35c in this State, and was then the second highest in Australia. For three years my Party said, "Live better with Labor", and we were ridiculed by Government members. Obviously, the Government cannot justify this Bill. The member for Stirling made his shortest speech on record, because he received no assistance from interjections by Government members, and left the Chamber as soon as he could. I understand from our Whip that no other Government member is listed to speak to this Bill. Some people may argue that there were some good years under the Playford regime, but no-one can deny that during our term of office the people lived better with Labor. I know that this State is in financial difficulties; indeed, it was in financial difficulties during the three years from 1965 to 1968 when Labor was in Government.

Mr. Broomhill: The Commonwealth Liberal Government would have had much to do with that, anyway.

Mr. LAWN: That Government stopped spending money in South Australia when the Playford Government was defeated. Sir Thomas Playford's last Budget (1964-65) was for a deficit, and he said at the time that worse years would follow. The Walsh Government then came into office at a time when the Budget position was indeed worse. With South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria are complaining that they are not receiving sufficient re-imbusement of taxation, and the

States are being forced to increase taxes and, in some cases, to introduce new taxes. During our three years in office our Government never saw fit to impose a tax of the nature provided for by this Bill and, had such a tax been suggested by the appropriate Minister, we would have been looking for his successor.

This is a tax on people who are mentally afflicted. I have visited our mental institutions, both at Parkside and Enfield, on a couple of occasions in company with members of this side (I do not know how many times Government members have made up parties to visit the institutions), and I have taken official visitors from New South Wales through the hospital at Parkside. The conditions under which some of the people exist in institutions are enough to make one cry. Some of the people concerned do not know they are alive, and one could not begin to describe the filthy conditions under which some of them exist. Doctor Birch, who was then the Superintendent in charge of the Parkside institution, did everything possible to help these people.

Mr. Broomhill: I wonder what he would think of this tax.

Mr. LAWN: He would be absolutely disgusted to think anyone would impose such a tax. Dr. Birch's whole life was devoted to making things better for the people in mental institutions and to doing anything he could to bring about a cure in those cases where it was possible. Even if they are told, many patients will not know that they have to pay under this Bill; they will not know what we are talking about. As much as the patients loved Doctor Birch, I was once approached by several who asked was I the doctor himself, and this happened also to the member for Enfield on one occasion. Doctor Birch used to walk on his own among the patients, and he believed that facilities should be provided in such places as Mount Gambier, Eyre Peninsula and Peterborough so that patients could live in local surroundings and be visited more often by friends and relatives.

It is most inhumane to inflict such a charge on the relatives of mental patients who are already suffering, having to visit patients frequently and seeing the conditions under which they exist. It costs the relatives enough as it is, because in many cases the Commonwealth Government takes away the pension of those who are certified and, in some cases, of those where there is no certification. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed,

Mr. LAWN: It was brought to my attention two or three years ago that a doctor, attending a certain number of mental patients, who was on his annual leave at one time, was replaced by another doctor who did not last long and who is no longer at the hospital in question. She went from there to the Education Department; apparently the superintendent was not too pleased with the treatment of the patients. This doctor told one of the patients (and I know of this case—there are probably others) to have the patient's parents contact her. On doing so, the parents were advised that the patient would be better off "inside". At that time, the patient was staying at Cleland House where she could receive a pension. As the doctor said that the patient would require treatment for six months or more and should be inside, the parents accepted this advice and the patient was transferred there. The next thing the parents knew was that the pension was stopped.

I was then approached to get the patient out but, although she had not been certified, I could not do this. Sir Thomas Playford used to tell me that no-one could be put inside without the certification of two doctors. When I used to say that people who were senile and had nowhere else to go could be placed inside without certification, at that time (it was during the the last three years of his Government) Sir Thomas disagreed with me. When the doctor who had originally treated this patient returned from annual leave he took her out, something that I had not been able to do. He told the parents that, in his opinion, the patient should be taken out and sent home as quickly as possible. He said that if patients were kept inside for too long they lost interest in coming home to their relatives and friends and were content to spend the rest of their lives inside. Within a month of this doctor's returning from leave, this patient was sent home. I have since learned that the other doctor, who obtained the parents' consent to have the patient put inside, is no longer with the Health Department but is employed by the Education Department.

I do not wish to speak for too long on this matter. It appals me that the Government should have introduced such a measure, and it will have to live with it as it will have to live with other measures it has introduced. Although I disagree with other measures that have been introduced by the Government, perhaps it could be argued that politics are involved in those matters, but surely this is

not a political matter but should be dealt with humanely. Each member opposite will have to live with his own conscience (if he has one) on this matter. There are at least two Cabinet Ministers who, over the years (including the time before they became Cabinet Ministers) have led the people—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! My attention having been drawn previously to the state of the House, I ask the Clerk to ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. LAWN: What a disgusting position we have this afternoon. Before the House is a Bill that will impose on patients or their relatives a charge for being in our mental institutions. Many of these people we regard as a danger to the community and, in the interests of its wellbeing, we put them into institutions. Others go to institutions voluntarily. This Bill provides for a charge to be imposed on these people, and yet twice within a few minutes the bells have had to be rung to get a quorum. I have not experienced anything similar in 19 years.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Not many members on your side are present.

Mr. LAWN: It is the Government's duty to keep the House going or to adjourn. During most of the time I have been speaking, only four members opposite have been present.

Mr. McAnaney: You attacked me.

Mr. LAWN: I think you will agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have spoken more quietly and moderately on this matter than I usually speak. No-one could say that they have left the Chamber because of what I am saying. Government members are ashamed to listen to what members on this side are saying. I know that many Government members are ashamed of legislation of this type, and they cannot listen to it being criticized, because they know that what is being said is perfectly correct.

Let us contrast the actions of this Government with those of the previous Government. The previous Government set up a number of places such as St. Corantyn at East Terrace, Adelaide, where people can receive treatment in the day-time. I understand that, as a result of places such as this, there has been a reduction in the number of patients during the three years from 1965 to 1968.

Mr. Broomhill: That is the way to tackle the problem.

Mr. LAWN: Exactly, but now the Government is imposing a charge. As I said earlier,

many of these patients will not know that they have to pay and, even if they know that, they will not know what paying means. The relatives will have to pay the charge for them just as at present relatives must take them clothing, spending money, sweets, and so on. What also disgusts me and proves to me how callous the Government is is that usually, when a Bill comes into this House, it is here for a month or two, or even three months, before it is passed.

Mr. Broomhill: We got this Bill on Tuesday night.

Mr. LAWN: It came here this week, anyway—I do not know on which day; it was either Tuesday or Wednesday, certainly no earlier than Tuesday.

Mr. Broomhill: The Government cannot wait to bleed these people, anyway.

Mr. LAWN: This afternoon we asked for an adjournment until next week, but the Government refused.

Mr. McKee: What additional revenue does the Government expect from the Bill?

Mr. LAWN: I do not know, but the Government is so keen on getting hold of this money from patients in our mental institutions that it wants Parliament to rush this Bill through as quickly as possible. Although we have unfinished Bills on our files from last year that could be proceeded with, the Government wants this money from mental patients in preference to continuing with those Bills. That shows how callous this Government is. It has refused an adjournment even for two days; it wants to finish the Bill today, if possible, and, if it cannot finish it today, it will do so next Tuesday; so the Bill will be in and out of the House within a week. I do not know whether the Legislative Council will deal with it as quickly. There, only one member speaks each day on a Bill; it would be breaking all the rules if two speakers spoke on a Bill on the same day, so I do not know how long it will take the Legislative Council to pass this Bill.

Mr. Broomhill: Perhaps the Government is ashamed of having it on the Statute Book.

Mr. LAWN: I believe the honourable member has hit the nail on the head.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member that the Bill came from another place; it has been through there.

Mr. LAWN: Then it will have to go back. I did not even know the Bill was in the Legislative Council. We hardly know that that place exists. The people in my district do not know that the Legislative Council even exists.

Mr. Broomhill: The Government wants the Bill off the Notice Paper as quickly as possible.

Mr. LAWN: Yes; it wants to start charging these people as soon as possible. The people of this State did live and will live better with Labor than they are living with Liberal.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): When this Bill was introduced in another place, it was said it was proposed to bring into effect charges for treatment and services rendered in mental hospitals in accordance with the Budget speech, in which the Government announced seven new taxes. This, of course, is one tax that undoubtedly scrapes the very bottom of the barrel. It is remarkable that we have to have an increased charge of this nature, ostensibly, as was said in another place, to induce the Commonwealth Government to do what it should do in providing assistance and benefits for people needing mental services and going into mental homes.

Mr. McKee: This will have the opposite effect.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Can anyone imagine the Commonwealth Government being impressed by these tactics when we have seen that Government turn a completely deaf ear to repeated approaches on far larger and more urgent issues than this? We have here another example of the most incompetent thinking imaginable placed into legislation. I say "incompetent thinking" because here we have a proposition to be put into operation ostensibly to influence the Commonwealth Government to operate its benefit policy: in other words, it is some kind of weird threat. How else can it be described? It is not a question of reasoned argument to get the Commonwealth Government to alter its practices; it is some kind of inverted weird threat—we are going to charge these poor unfortunates to alter the course of the Commonwealth Government.

We have heard one speaker from the Government side, the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney). Never have I heard a more unenthusiastic and dismal speech. It was obvious that the honourable member, who damned this Bill with faint praise, was anxious to get his speech over and done with because his heart was not in it; but he had to do his duty by his Party, so he got up and told us time after time that the administration and fixing of these charges would be done most leniently. Why did he have to keep repeating that there would be most lenient administration? It was simply because he was ashamed

of the measure. If the administration and fixing of these charges are to be on such a lenient level, what is the object of the Bill, anyway? What revenue will it bring in? What possible influence can it have on the Commonwealth Government? This is the lunatic reasoning of this Government. The member for Stirling is now trying to interject, having made the most unenthusiastic and dismal speech of the whole of his time in this House. It is now getting under his skin and he is trying to interject because I am saying that this is a piece of lunatic reasoning.

Let us look at the reasoning even further. It is proposed to place these people who need mental help and mental services in a worse financial position, to beggar them financially if they are not already beggared as a result of their long disabilities, to influence the Commonwealth Government. They are to be the bunnies, the martyrs, in this particular exercise.

Mr. Lawn: Shame!

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: If that is not lunatic reasoning, what is?

Mr. Clark: And who is to say it will have any effect, anyway?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The member for Stirling said that this would produce more money to extend the services. In the next breath he told us that the administration would be so lenient that nobody would feel it. More lunatic reasoning! He tells us in one breath that it will bring in virtually nothing, yet in another breath he says it will enable services to be extended. This is the gentleman who tells us he has a logical mind, that he has studied economics, and so forth; he is always telling us, in a paternal way, what we should be doing. In this day and age we are descending to a very low level when we have to impose charges on mental defectives in order to try to balance our Budget and to provide further services, as outlined by the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney). Of course, in fact, that was not the reason put forward by the gentleman in the other place who introduced it. That august other place, that great House of Review, has apparently laboured for nine months to bring forth this great measure: it has taken it nine months to think up this brilliant piece of statesmanship!

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: And the Government wants to bring in abortion!

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is a great pity the Bill was not aborted long ago before it came to this place. During the

debate in another place, when a Labor member was opposing this measure, one gentleman complained and said that the Labor member was playing politics in connection with these poor unfortunate people whom the Government was trying to assist. The Government was trying to assist them by imposing charges on them! These are people who are in many cases facing bankruptcy and whose relatives have probably poured out money for years trying to help them. Of course, the Government is not even satisfied with spreading the net over the poor mental defectives: it spreads the net in this Bill over the relatives in order to impoverish them a little further, if they have been assisting the poor unfortunates.

This sort of thing is typical of some of the legislation brought before us recently, and typical of the ridiculous and incompetent thinking of the present Government. When the measure was introduced in the other place it was explained that there would be a maximum charge of \$3.50 a day for in-patients, that individual cases would be considered and that the charges would be based on some sort of means test. It was argued that the wealthy should pay for these services, yet a maximum of \$24.50 a week was fixed. What will be the effect of \$24.50 a week on very wealthy people? If the Government is so anxious that the wealthy people should pay if they happen to have a mental defective in the family, why does it have a maximum charge? Let Government members answer that!

This measure of course, originated in the other place, which refused to bring in succession duties to touch the wealthiest people in this State and to bring them up to the level applying in other States. It has introduced this Bill in the guise of helping mental defectives. What an argument! What lunatic reasoning! No wonder members opposite do not seem very enthusiastic about speaking in support of this measure. No-one with any sense of decency could have any enthusiasm about it. Government members should condemn it out of hand.

Ask any man in the street whether he thinks the Government should impose charges on mental defectives and for mental health services. This measure is not supported by any person connected with mental health services, nor is it supported by anyone who attends to these poor people. It is the very negation of everything in the way of the treatment of the handicapped in this community. We have

recently had a succession of the most incompetent legislation and the most incompetent Government action that has ever been witnessed in South Australia, and this is on a par with other incompetence that has been exhibited at a number of levels. As a member who has been in this House since 1956, I have never known the legislation of this State and the Government's actions to sink to such a low level, and I say this with sincerity and conviction.

Mr. Broomhill: How many Government members have supported this measure?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Only one, so far. They may rake up one or two to make it look a little better, but it will be very interesting to see what reasons they advance in support of this measure. They know in their own hearts that they have no real right to be sitting on those benches in a really democratic society. Of course, this is not a really democratic society, however much they may prate about it. These are the actions we can expect from people who are quite irresponsible politically and who have no sense of responsibility regarding what should take place in a really democratic community. These are the actions that flow from this sort of Government. I hope that members opposite will exhibit some sense of shame about bringing forth and supporting a Bill of this sort, and that they will show what their real thoughts on it are, because I cannot believe that all members opposite really support this sort of measure.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I oppose the Bill and I hope it is rejected out of hand by the House. I am very grateful for the speeches of the members for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) and Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) this afternoon. True, many Government members have not spoken, and I should like to think that the reason they have not spoken is that they are too ashamed to speak on a matter of this nature.

Mr. Hurst: They have no shame.

Mr. JENNINGS: This is conjecture at present, but recent events seem to suggest it. This is a revenue Bill, and nothing else. I have had long experience with people involved in mental homes. Only last night I was at the Hillcrest Hospital talking to one of my constituents; to be quite correct, at present he is not a constituent inasmuch as he does not yet have a vote, but he will have a vote soon. I was at Cleland House and at Paterson House when they were opened by Sir Lyell McEwin,

who spoke about what a wonderful thing the then Government was doing in establishing these places.

I think all members will acknowledge that there is a twilight zone between sanity and insanity. Through proper treatment, people can be helped out of this zone back into circulation, back into ordinary employment, and back where they can contribute through taxation to the ordinary taxation field, rather than being put into a position where they or their parents or relatives have to pay to keep them there and never see them again. Apart from the humanitarian aspect, which is better for the State from a purely economic point of view? The answer surely must be that it would be better to do everything possible to help these people rather than, as this legislation does, deter them from going on. Because going into these institutions would financially embarrass their spouses or parents, many people do not enter them. If these people can feel that this financial embarrassment does not apply to them or to their loved ones, they are likely to go in and get treatment. I am not a psychiatrist but, as far as I can understand, many people who go into these institutions are people who have a very high intelligence quotient. They go in because they have been worried or upset about something or because they have had some kind of breakdown. Are we going to deny the economy the benefit of people like this by incarcerating them or, on the other hand, by putting them in a position where they will eventually finish up being put in compulsorily? Generally speaking, one stays in these institutions forever if one is put in compulsorily.

I would hope that many members who have not spoken in the debate so far but who have shown their support for the legislation would think about what was involved. I know that some people who are in these institutions have plenty of money, but is this important? Many other patients have no money. I have been told of a man who, for the past 20 years, has been having breakfast every morning at Cleland House, then washing up, helping in every possible way, and going out and doing his daily work. He does not go back to Cleland House until the next morning. It may be that that is the only home that he knows. Perhaps, according to the Minister, this man is in a way imposing on the department, but I do not think he is. This man, who is obviously not normal in many respects but quite normal in other ways, is able to help himself and, after having this breakfast (which in that

situation would cost about 50c), earn his livelihood. This does not embarrass the State, for that man pays his taxes and does everything else that a normal person in the community should do.

I think that those who have introduced this legislation have no conception of the humanitarian instincts that actuated Dr. Birch, Dr. Shea, Dr. Cramond and others in trying to help people who are in this twilight zone. I do not consider that the measure will enable the State to recoup the losses that the present Government has inflicted. I think that if the Government has to raise money it can find a better way of doing it than this.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I, with other members on this side, want to say a few words regarding this particular measure, which I consider extremely distasteful, to say the least. One has only to visit the mental institutions throughout the State to see the pitiful scenes that take place in them. For a Government, at this early stage of its term of office, to try to extract money in this way in order to swell the revenue coffers of the State is quite distasteful to me

As has been pointed out several times this afternoon, one of the main reasons given for increasing the charges for the mental defective is that it is sought to impose some sort of pressure on the Commonwealth Government. This is rather strange. I remind honourable members opposite that last year, when the Prime Minister (Mr. Gorton) was in Adelaide before the State election, he told the people of South Australia that, if they elected a Liberal Government, they would get a fairer deal from the Commonwealth Government, because they would be in one big, happy family. I also point out to members opposite that we have in this State the Minister for Health in the Commonwealth Parliament (Dr. Forbes). Why has some approach not been made by this Government to Dr. Forbes about our mental institutions?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Perhaps they haven't called him Jim.

Mr. CASEY: It seems ludicrous. All these people are of the same political vintage, and Commonwealth members are more or less committed to help the State that they represent. One reason why Dr. Forbes was appointed to the Ministry was that South Australia was the only State of the Commonwealth that did not have a Minister.

Mr. Hudson: He probably supports Dartmouth, too.

Mr. CASEY: Probably, because Mr. McLeay does. They are representatives of this State and who is there better to approach than the Commonwealth Minister for Health and explain the problems of mental health? He can inspect the institutions and summarize the position at first-hand, but this legislation has been introduced here. Some of the legislation that has been introduced and forced through this House in the last few days is absolutely disgusting, to say the least. I am ashamed that people of this State are being hoodwinked the way they are: they are kept in the dark about the manner in which legislation is passed and the sooner they realize the situation the better it will be for the State.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: This Bill was on the Notice Paper in December.

Mr. CASEY: I realize that, but we have not been sitting since then. It was introduced in the Legislative Council in December and there has not been much time since it was on our Notice Paper. Most of the legislation that we have considered recently is absolute rubbish, and the Government has no right to introduce this type of legislation as it has not received a mandate from the people to do so. If it had and also had a clear majority of members I would not be so critical, but the Government is naive when it introduces legislation of this kind. The mentally sick are usually people who, by some strange whim of fate, have been stricken with an affliction for most of their lives, and it costs them an enormous sum for hospital expenses during the period they are afflicted. Some cases are never cured and this causes hardship to the family. What does this legislation do? The Government will charge people for treatment in some mental institutions and if they cannot pay, the members of their family will be charged. This is a type of hi-jacking, daylight robbery, or bushranging.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: If that principle is good enough why doesn't the community, as the whole family, pay?

Mr. CASEY: The Minister, in his second reading explanation, said that people who had the ability to pay it would be charged the maximum, and I concur in that. However, those who are unable to pay and who will feel the pinch may be charged the maximum, too. Which of those two groups will be caused hardship? When a progressive taxation measure was introduced by the Labor Government members opposite were highly critical of it and said that people who had the ability

to pay should not have to pay, but that the taxation should be imposed on everyone, whether they could afford it or not. I doubt whether any Government member really believes that this legislation should be used to extract money from the community. This Government should not try to make those in necessitous circumstances contribute to the cost of treating an illness which is not of their doing, and which can be with them for the greater part of their lives.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Will you move an amendment to raise the maximum charge?

Mr. CASEY: Yes.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Why have a maximum at all?

Mr. CASEY: Why? It does not meet the requirements of anyone, because if people have the ability to pay they should pay. A private hospital has a maximum fee and if a patient in that hospital is in a private ward he pays more than a person in a ward with two or more beds. Those who are in a fortunate financial position should pay for those who are in necessitous circumstances. People who are mentally ill are usually in dire circumstances because their resources have been drained during the years they have been ill.

Mr. Jennings: They don't usually go for treatment until after five or six years of the illness.

Mr. CASEY: True. It would be stupid to think that this measure would influence the Commonwealth Government one iota or make it contribute to help people in mental institutions, and this is not the way we should bargain with that Government. An approach should be made by this Government to the Commonwealth Minister for Health so that he can consider the situation in its proper perspective. This State's Minister of Health should confer with the Commonwealth Minister and tell him of the position in this State, as it is claimed to be by this Government. It is wrong to introduce a measure of this sort at this time, and I hope the Government will have second thoughts about it.

This Bill is not in the best interests of the mentally ill or of those who may be responsible for the mentally ill in regard to the payment of fees, etc. The member for Stirling was not able to substantiate the reasons for the measure, and I doubt whether anyone else on the Government side can do so. I therefore have much pleasure in not supporting this Bill.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): With my colleagues on this side, I voice my disapproval of the Government's action in introducing this measure, which was foreshadowed in the Revenue Budget introduced last year. With the introduction of this measure and several others introduced previously, the Government stands condemned. Indeed, I believe the principle of charging mental patients is wrong and that the reasons advanced by the Government in connection with this Bill cannot be reconciled with the basic principles of helping mental patients. The member for Stirling could not substantiate the Government's action in this matter. Under the Bill, a mental patient could be charged a maximum of about \$24.50 a week, a factor that may well deter certain people who should be seeking treatment from doing so. Either the patient or the relatives responsible for that patient may not be able to meet these charges, with the result that a delay in seeking treatment may occur, and this can be harmful to the person concerned. I believe that the Commonwealth Government is responsible in this matter and that it should take some action now rather than merely pay lip service to the situation.

I believe that certain pronouncements are at present being made because the learned doctor, who is the Commonwealth Minister for Health and who represents part of this State in the Commonwealth Parliament, knows that he will be facing an election later this year. The Commonwealth Government should provide benefits for the people concerned which are comparable with the charges proposed in this measure. Indeed, I hope that the Commonwealth Government will demonstrate that

it is genuine in wishing to improve hospital benefits throughout Australia and act accordingly, thereby doing a service to the country as a whole. This Government, through its Minister of Health, should urgently seek to have the Commonwealth Government include hospital charges for mental patients in the Commonwealth health scheme, and I believe that this could easily be achieved. I hope that steps will soon be taken to enable a national health insurance scheme to be introduced in the Commonwealth sphere, thereby replacing the present Act, which I believe to be inadequate. This Bill certainly does not have my support.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

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

That disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments be insisted on.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Brookman, Dunstan, Hall, Hudson, and Pearson.

SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 11, at 2 p.m.