

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 1, 1969

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

ASSENTS

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Appropriation (No. 1),
Supply (No. 1),
Supreme Court Act Amendment.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE FINANCES

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I thank the House for the privilege of being permitted to make a statement. Wishing to comment on the financial result for the year ended June 30, I have asked for this privilege for two reasons: first, because I should take the first opportunity available to me in the House to report on this matter; and, secondly, because I wish to make a few observations to clear up some misconceptions that may have been caused by the rather meagre treatment of this matter in this morning's *Advertiser*. The year's results, as stated, have produced a modest surplus in the Budget accounts of \$475,000, which will be applied to a reduction of the accumulated deficit of about \$8,300,000 with which we commenced the financial year just ended, thereby reducing it to about \$7,890,000.

It may be suggested that the surplus is a somewhat higher figure than we had budgeted for, but I point out to the House that in managing finance of about \$300,000,000 it is extremely difficult, first, to make a precise forecast of a result and, secondly, to achieve the result that has been forecast. However, I am happy to know that the forecast and the plans we made in the Budget last year have by and large been achieved. We budgeted for a small surplus which, however, did not at that time take into account possible, indeed imminent, increases in wage awards that might occur during the currency of the financial year. These amounted, in round figures, to \$4,000,000 as an additional cost to the State Budget. These were recouped in two ways: first, by exercising economies in the State's administration and, secondly, by Commonwealth grants that came to us in two parts.

The first part was the State's share of the \$12,000,000 general Budget assistance grant made available to the States by the Commonwealth in about March or April this year. Of that \$12,000,000 South Australia received about \$1,300,000. The second grant we received from the Commonwealth Government came only two or three weeks ago, when the Commonwealth Parliament, in the last days of its session, passed a Bill to give South Australia a special budgetary assistance grant of \$2,000,000.

In addition, the adjustment in the reimbursement formula between the Commonwealth and the States, which takes into account a number of factors, also takes into account the average wage level paid in all States during the financial year. Up to the end of March, the third quarter's review suggested a certain level of reimbursement under this section of the formula but in the last quarter, which has just ended, there was a noticeable up-turn and, therefore, under this segment of the formula South Australia's grant turned out to be considerably higher than had been earlier anticipated. Therefore, this has enabled us to finish the year with the surplus to which I have just referred.

The principal reason for the surplus being more than the Budget forecast was, as I have said, the average wages factor in that segment of the formula of the reimbursement grant. This does not mean, of course, that the State can relax the economy measures that we put into operation last year, nor does it mean that we can be unduly optimistic about the budgetary situation for this financial year commencing today. Indeed, the Budget obviously will be extremely tight and, in the absence of some assurance from the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasurer in Canberra last week that the budgetary assistance grants made to the States last year will be continued in this present financial year just commencing, we shall have, I think, almost inevitably to budget for a deficit. That remains to be seen after a closer examination of the Budget situation within the next few weeks.

On the Loan Account, we finished with a surplus of about \$6,810,000 on the current year's account. This is a surplus higher than we would have desired, but it has resulted from a somewhat slower rate of progress on certain major Loan undertakings during this year. This adds to the surplus that we carried forward last year and means that we have in the Loan Account at present an accumulated

surplus of \$12,470,000. Therefore, we will carry these surpluses forward into our new Loan works programme on the following basis: first, we shall have to continue to carry in the Loan Account the balance of the accumulated Revenue deficit to which I have referred (\$7,890,000), but over and above that it will give us about \$4,500,000 to carry forward into the working programme in the Loan Account this year. The sum of \$4,500,000 is committed for immediate expenditure within the next few weeks of this financial year. The fact that this has been brought about by a somewhat slower rate of spending this year means that we will disburse a large proportion of the \$4,500,000 to meet accounts which, had the rate of progress been somewhat faster, would already have been paid out of the Loan Account.

The important thing I see about the Budget situation is that, because we have arrested the movement into deficit of the Budget accounts that had to be financed necessarily out of Loan funds in past years, we shall now be able to use the available Loan funds for developmental work in this State, giving a further fillip to the economy, which is on the up turn, as is already accepted widely throughout the community today. I believe that the re-established confidence in the State's accounting methods and its attitude towards its responsibility in balancing its Budget is a notable advance in the State's situation generally. I believe this fully justifies the measures that we were bound to pursue in presenting the Budget last year.

QUESTIONS

CHOWILLA DAM

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the last 24 hours the Premier has made a number of statements in which he has wrongly stated that members on this side will vote for the provision of the Dartmouth dam as a priority storage on the Murray River system. However, despite questions asked of him, the Premier has so far not declared whether this programme is regarded by the Government as a matter of confidence in the continuance of its administration. I ask him now whether, when he introduces the relevant legislation, it will be indicated that this is a matter on which the Government considers that the confidence in it of the House stands or falls.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Leader has asked a very revealing question: it reveals that he is more interested in the politics of

the situation regarding the next storage on the Murray River than in the storage itself. This is something I have suspected for a long while, whereas the Government is interested in the storage rather than in the politics of the scheme and all in good time will make clear its attitude on the vital or otherwise issue to which the Leader has referred.

Mr. CORCORAN: The Premier said the Leader's question was revealing, because it revealed that members on this side were more interested in the politics of the matter than in the matter itself. Yesterday the Premier said, in effect, that the political realities of the question would force the Opposition to vote in favour of Dartmouth, so indeed he must recognize that political implications are involved in the matter. Seeing that the Premier has refused to answer the Leader's question, I challenge him to say whether or not he is prepared to go to the people on this question, as are members on this side.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I thought I had already explained to the Deputy Leader's Leader that in fact politics were subsidiary to the Government's thinking on this matter, the Government being concerned to secure South Australia's future water supply. Having studied the position carefully, the Government has come to a decision that has been well debated in the community. Having made that decision, the Government intends to implement it, so it is not nearly so concerned with what may be the Party politics of the situation as the Leader and the Deputy Leader might be. Of course, it is up to members opposite, if they so desire, to secure, if they can, enough public support on this matter to embarrass the Government. If they believe that they can turn the political situation to their advantage, that is their affair and they are free to do so. However, that does not concern the Government: we are concerned with securing South Australia's future water supply. That is what we are working towards and there is no interest in the hypothetical question the Deputy Leader now puts.

NURIOOTPA HIGH SCHOOL

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Education now reply to my recent questions regarding the replacement of the many timber frame classrooms at the Nuriootpa High School with solid construction buildings?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: A new schedule is being prepared to include a library of at least 5,000 sq. ft., with provision for the use of audio and visual aids. It is expected

that as a result of the building consultancy with Peter Falconer and Partners Limited further significant improvements will be made to the design of secondary school buildings. It is believed that Nuriootpa High School should be one of the first secondary school projects to be undertaken as a result of the consultancy. This will mean some little delay in the preparation of plans, but the advantages accruing to the school could be considerable. The boys and girls craft blocks are under construction and expected to be ready for occupation by February, 1970.

LEGAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. LAWN: Has the Attorney-General any later information than that which he gave me recently concerning the dispute between a constituent of mine and the Law Society?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Just before the House met the honourable member told me he would ask this question. Unfortunately I do not have anything with me, nor have I had a chance to check with my office since the honourable member spoke to me. However, I will try to bring down a reply tomorrow.

UNLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Not so very long ago new toilets were installed at the Parkside Primary School, and since then maintenance work has been done in other schools in the Unley electoral district. Can the Minister of Works ascertain for me when the new toilet block at the Unley Primary School will be completed, as the present toilets are in poor condition?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will find out as quickly as possible for the honourable member.

DELIVERY VAN

Mr. GILES: Recently, I inspected a baker's delivery van known as a forward control unit, and I was appalled at the lack of protection for the driver of this vehicle. In front of him there was no solid construction whatsoever, and he complained to me about this. Can the Premier say whether this can be investigated and whether legislation can be introduced to provide certain protection for drivers in this type of vehicle?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall bring the honourable member's question to the notice of the Minister of Labour and Industry and also of my colleague the Minister of Roads

and Transport, because the honourable member refers to a type of vehicle fairly widely used in the community both in Australia and overseas and not just a vehicle peculiar to the type of trade with which the honourable member associated it when he inspected it. I will get a report for him and find out whether there are any statistics that prove anything in regard to the safety or otherwise of these vehicles.

JERVOIS BRIDGE

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently about the landscaping of the approaches to the Jervois bridge?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Minister of Roads and Transport states that landscaping proposed for the Jervois bridge project includes about 1,500 ground cover plants, 87 shrubs and 19 trees. The ground cover will be used on the embankment on the Semaphore side, and the trees and shrubs will be located along the Semaphore side approaches adjacent to Russell, Willimott and Deslandes Streets. The shrubs have already been planted. At the eastern end, the Highways Department intends clearing away any redundant filling and creating a fresh slope finishing against the line of the new bridge. This slope will be pitched with stone and will present a tidy appearance.

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of last week about when the new Jervois bridge was to be officially opened? Also, is it true that I am to be approached and asked to have the bridge named after me?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Frankly, the latter part of the question and its significance had escaped me until the honourable member drew my attention to it. In reply to the serious part of his question, the Minister of Roads and Transport has informed me that traffic will commence using the new Jervois bridge by the end of July, 1969, and this will permit demolition of the old bridge to commence. The whole project, including approach road systems, will be completed by December, 1969.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I address my question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport. A constituent of mine telephoned the other day to say that he, being a limbless person, was entitled to a reduction in third party insurance

but, since the introduction of the stamp duty of \$2 on the certificate of compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance, it appears that the Motor Vehicles Department (and I have checked this) has demanded that an applicant supply with his application a doctor's certificate to show that he is a limbless person. The result is that there is no reduction: in fact, it would cost more to get such a certificate. Will the Attorney-General take this matter up with his colleague to see whether a statutory declaration or something of that nature would not be sufficient instead of a medical certificate in order that the legislation providing for a reduction may be given effect to?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: There seems to be a need for a change in the arrangements that the honourable member has described to the House. I will certainly take the matter up with my colleague.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Works supply me with a progress report on the Modbury Hospital project?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The proposed tender dates are as follows:

Phase 1, part 1 (main hospital block):

Building call—August 4, 1969;

Mechanical work: (1) mechanical services—out to tender; (2) air conditioning—out to tender; (3) medical gases—out to tender; (4) pneumatic tubes—out to tender; (5) total energy plant—July 14, 1969; (6) basement plant—July 21, 1969;

Electrical work: (1) lifts—July 7, 1969; (2) electrical services—July 21, 1969; (3) inter-communication system—July 28, 1969;

Aluminium windows: June 30, 1969;

Precast concrete panels: July 7, 1969.

GAWLER SEWERAGE

Mr. CLARK: The Minister of Works will know that, for many years, I have been interested in the introduction of a sewerage scheme for Gawler, and I am delighted to see that work has commenced. Will the Minister obtain a progress report on this scheme and ascertain when work in the Gawler township itself will begin?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will call for a report as quickly as possible.

STIRLING SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Education say whether the department's recent surveying of the area between Branch Road, Ethel Street, Milan Terrace, and the main Melbourne railway line in the Stirling area has been done with a view to building a school in that area and, if it has, what type of school is envisaged?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The answer is "No". However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

WHYALLA HOSPITAL

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Whyalla Hospital is being taken over by the Government. Whilst a statement has been made publicly that everyone who starts under the new arrangement will do so as a new employee, apparently nothing has been said concerning accrued benefits of long service leave and sick leave for people who had been employed at the hospital for a long time. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary for an assurance that the previous employees of the hospital will be assured of these accrued benefits? These people are concerned about the matter and, I understand, it has been the usual practice in similar circumstances for accrued benefits to be paid whether or not the employees stayed on under the new arrangement.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I seem to remember something being considered along these lines, although I cannot recall the details. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question arises from a disturbing report in the *News* of June 26 regarding comments by Mrs. McNamara, a member of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. The report states:

"I am not going to promise my people all sorts of things when I know they are not going to get them," a member of the Aboriginal Lands Trust said today. The member, Mrs. Natascha McNamara, said the trust had met with nothing but frustration since it was appointed by the South Australian Government in December, 1966.

Is the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs prepared to comment on this report?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As members will recollect, the Aboriginal Lands Trust was established in 1966 pursuant to legislation that was introduced during the time of the Walsh Government. Before I make any further comment, I should like to give full and unstinted credit to the Government and to the then Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, the present Leader of the Opposition, for the idea behind the establishment of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I think it is a splendid and progressive idea and one that does something, at least, to make up to the Aboriginal inhabitants of this State for what has been meted out to them since the establishment of white settlement in the last century.

However, having said that and, I hope, having given credit for the idea where credit is due, I cannot but say that, once the trust had been brought into operation, it was given precious little help by either the Walsh Government or the Dunstan Government. I cannot help feeling that it was rather like throwing a man into a pool not knowing whether he could swim and leaving him to sink or to swim as best he could. I much admire the way in which the three members of the trust (Mr. Tim Hughes, the Chairman; Mr. Garnet Wilson; and Mrs. Natascha McNamara, to whose comment the honourable member has referred) have persevered with the trust since they were appointed in, I think, late 1966.

True, by the time we came into office a number of reserves had been transferred to the trust, pursuant to the Act, but the only economically profitable areas that were in its control were Block K and Gum Park, near Point McLeay Reserve. The income from these particular areas is only about \$1,000 per annum. The Governments since 1966 have, it is true, advanced moneys to the trust by a loan, and I think honourable members will see from the financial papers for the last year that the loan stands at something over \$10,000. This is all that the trust has had for its administrative expenses. Since we came into office, my objective as Minister has been to try to help the trust to make the idea that lay behind its formation a practical reality. I believe very strongly that, if the trust were to continue as it was left upon its establishment, it would soon fail.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable Minister, replying to the question, is really making a Ministerial statement. If he wants to make such a statement, he must seek leave to do so.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I ask for that leave, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I thank the House for giving me leave. During the time I have been in office I have had discussions with the members of the trust, and late last year the Government agreed to finance a report by W. D. Scott and Company Pty. Ltd. upon the possible future lines of development of the trust. That report was received some time ago. It is, I suggest, a document confidential to the trust: it is their document; but it will be used, I think, in future years as a

broad outline for the development of the trust. The first step that should be taken now is the appointment of an administrator for the trust. The members of the trust consider it desirable to appoint an administrative officer and, if necessary, staff to help him or her with the task. I am pleased to be able to say that yesterday Cabinet approved my recommendation to make moneys available to the trust for that purpose. It is essential, in our view, that the trust should have a staff if it is to fulfil the role contemplated by the Act, and this is the firm conviction of the members themselves. Once an administrator has been appointed, I expect that the trust will negotiate with the Government for the transfer progressively to it of other reserves in the State so that it may carry out the task that was given it under its Act.

WAGE PAYMENT

Mr. RYAN: Just prior to last Good Friday, I was approached by several workers who are daily-paid employees of the State Government and perform shift work. These people are paid on a Thursday, and they asked me whether it was possible, even at that late stage, to have the pay day altered to Wednesday when the following Friday was a public holiday, such as applies at Easter time each year and in those years when Anzac Day occurs on a Friday. At present, when Friday is a holiday and when these men are on shift work, starting late on the Thursday afternoon, their pay is not available to them when they commence work and they have to make a special trip during the day to their place of employment in order to collect their money so as to make it available to their wives before starting work. Although this situation may also affect others, it applies particularly to daily-paid employees who are on shift work just prior to a public holiday that falls on a Friday. Will the Minister of Labour and Industry ascertain whether, as in the majority of industries today, the people to whom I have referred might be paid on a Wednesday in preference to a Thursday?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I shall be pleased to investigate the suggestion made by the honourable member.

RAILWAYS INSTITUTE

Mr. VIRGO: Unlike previous questions that have been asked, this one is not a Dorothy Dixier. On October 16 last I asked a question of the Premier seeking an assurance from him regarding the future of the Railways Institute,

the social rooms, the band room and other associated buildings. In reply, at page 1916 of *Hansard*, the Premier said:

I assure the honourable member that, before the buildings are removed and before inconvenience may be caused in any way to the people who now use them, the Railways Commissioner will be fully consulted and alternative accommodation provided.

The rest of the reply merely reiterates that statement. On April 22 (the Premier possibly has not seen this newspaper cutting, because I understand he was then overseas), the *News* reported as follows:

Demolition of buildings on the site of the \$4,600,000 Adelaide festival theatre is scheduled to be completed by the end of June next year. Clearance work involves demolition of the migrant hostel, Railways Institute . . . the S.A.R. standardization office, railway lecture rooms and a gymnasium.

Will the Premier assure the House that he will honour the undertaking he gave on October 16 and provide members with a progress report on what he has done thus far to honour it?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

CAR NUMBER PLATES

Mr. ALLEN: An article appearing in the *Advertiser* on June 25, headed "Personal Car Plates", states in part:

So it was only natural that the New South Wales Department of Motor Transport was rushed when it announced that motorists, for an outlay of \$25, could have "personal" car number plates for as long as they liked. Since the plan was introduced on June 2, almost 4,000 motorists have paid in excess of \$96,000 to obtain plates bearing their own initials. The department is confident that by the end of the month, judging from the present rate of applications, it will have \$100,000. In the past, some people have managed to obtain "personalized" number plates. The former Director of Taronga Zoo (Sir Edward Hallstrom) has for years retained the number plate ZO-000, and the N.S.W. Commissioner of Police, the number plate COP-777—standing for Commissioner of Police, not cop.

I think some of the members in this House might benefit if this practice were adopted in South Australia; for instance, the Leader of the Opposition could have the initials "DAD", but I guess he would prefer "DON". You yourself, Mr. Speaker, could have "TCS", your own initials, but I guess you would prefer the letters "TOM".

The SPEAKER: I have no preference.

Mr. ALLEN: The numbers used could be "037", indicating the number of years' service that you have given to this House. The member for Rocky River, on my left, could have the initials "HMY", which could be interpreted as—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member should ask his question.

Mr. ALLEN:—"His Master's Voice". In my own case, the initials "ECA" might not convey anything, so I would suggest the letters "BOM". Will the Attorney-General ascertain whether the Minister of Roads and Transport has considered adopting this practice in South Australia?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If "NO" had three letters, I would answer in that way, but "NO" has only two letters—

Mr. Hudson: So you had better use "YES".

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Maybe I could.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You could use "NAY".

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That would fill the bill. The honourable member has made an interesting suggestion in a most amusing way, and I will certainly discuss it with my colleague.

SCHOOL PAVING

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about paving work at the Peterborough High School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I have been informed by the Public Buildings Department that a high priority has been allotted to the paving of the Peterborough High School grounds. To expedite the matter, it has been found necessary to engage a private consultant to investigate and prepare design documents, and steps are now being taken to this end.

ROAD TAX

Mr. EDWARDS: A constituent of mine has complained to me that, with the experience of an unusual harvest, involving a long delivery programme, it has been difficult for farmers to deliver sufficient wheat to meet certain commitments that they must make and that in some cases farmers have not been able to pay local carriers for the cartage of their grain to the silos. In addition, some carriers in these circumstances have had difficulty in paying their road tax dues and have been late in so paying on several occasions. Under these conditions, road tax inspectors are making

it difficult for carriers throughout the State to operate at present. Will the Attorney-General say whether it is possible for a person to be summonsed a month after paying his road tax and required to appear in court? If it is, will he say why it is possible? I know of two occasions on which it has occurred.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General is not obliged to answer legal questions. Does he wish to seek an opinion or answer the question now?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: There is none better to answer than I. However, in this instance the cautious course would be for me to make inquiries regarding the matters the honourable member has raised.

EASTERN STANDARD TIME

Mr. BROOMHILL: A news article in last night's *News* under the heading of "No Time Switch Likely" states:

The South Australian Government is likely to drop or postpone the proposal to switch to Eastern Standard Time for a trial period. The scheme, which would mean putting South Australian clocks forward, has brought a sizeable number of protests to the Premier, Mr. Hall.

Will the Premier say whether this is an accurate report and whether the Government has now determined that it will not proceed with the trial period of E.S.T.? If this is the case, will he give the number and type of protests he has received from the public?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Argument is still proceeding regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the matter and the honourable member will be aware of several letters that have been published in the press recently. A good deal of information is coming into my office from people involved in this question, which I am still pursuing in a very interested manner.

MINOR REPAIRS

Mr. JENNINGS: Recently, the Minister of Works was good enough to explain to me that he has now embarked on a policy which enables minor repairs in schools to be done on requisition by the headmaster or headmistress without their going through the massive structure of the Public Buildings Department. He was unable to tell me at that time whether this programme of minor works extended to departments other than the Education Department but he promised that he would give me this information later. I believe he is now able to do this.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Delegation of authority to incur expenditure on urgent minor maintenance of buildings under the maintenance control of the Public Buildings Department has not been extended to any department other than the Education Department.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: I understand that the Premier has an answer to the question I asked last week concerning the changeover from narrow gauge to standard gauge in the Peterborough Division. Can he now say whether narrow gauge will be used one day and standard gauge the next, or whether both gauges will be used simultaneously for a period? I was concerned about what would happen to the grain on the Wilmington line having to be transhipped at Gladstone and also about the grain from the Quorn-Orroroo Division having to be transhipped at Peterborough.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Planning envisages the conversion of the Port Pirie to Broken Hill railway to standard gauge in January, 1970, and that such conversion will involve the abandonment of existing narrow gauge operations and their replacement by standard gauge. This will mean that transshipping will be required at Gladstone and Peterborough for the Wilmington and Quorn lines respectively.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. HUDSON: In the *Government Gazette* of May 15, 1969, a proclamation was published excluding a number of deputy heads of departments and second line management public servants from the jurisdiction of the Public Service Arbitrator. The types of office excluded include people such as the Assistant Auditor-General, the Administrator of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Director of Mental Services, the Parliamentary Draftsman, the Assistant Under Treasurer, the Assistant Director of Lands, the Assistant Director of Engineering Services, and others. About 20 exclusions are made by the proclamation and there is considerable concern in the Public Service Association as a result of the proclamation, for two reasons: first, that the officers who have been excluded will not have the benefit of independent adjudication of their salaries but instead will have them fixed separately; and, secondly (and I think this is the association's main concern), it is considered that a ceiling will be placed on those salaries to limit the scope of the Arbitrator in

fixing salaries of officers below the exclusion level. Can the Premier give an assurance, first of all, that the officers who have been excluded from the Arbitrator's jurisdiction will not suffer as a result of that exclusion; and, secondly, that the limits on salaries placed on these people who have been excluded will not be such as to interfere in any way with the scope available to the Arbitrator in fixing the salaries of Public Service officers lower down the salary scale?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will obtain a report on this matter.

MOUNT GAMBIER COURTHOUSE

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of June 17 regarding the Mount Gambier courthouse?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The planned development of the site at present occupied by police and courthouse buildings at Mount Gambier was reviewed in view of the representations by the National Trust concerning the retention of the old courthouse as an historic building. As part of that review, alternative sites were investigated for the Government office building that was proposed for erection on the same site as a joint project with the proposed new courthouse. The purchase of an alternative site for the office building is now being negotiated. On completion of these negotiations the future of the old courthouse building will be decided.

PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL

Mr. RICHES: The Minister of Works undertook to obtain for me the date for the calling of tenders for the Port Augusta Hospital. These were expected to have been called in May and then it was thought they could be called in June. The Minister has told me that the date is imminent, but I would like to know the actual date on which the tenders will be called.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I know the honourable member appreciates that there have been recent submissions for additions and alterations to the original concept from a medical point of view at the hospital. However, it is expected that a submission will be made within the next few days for the expenditure involved in the proposed redevelopment of the Port Augusta Hospital. Subject to funds being approved, tenders will be called almost immediately for the demolition and provision

of temporary accommodation. Planning for the new buildings has been programmed as follows:

Stage I—Main block; kitchen and stores wing—Tenders expected to be called in September, 1969.

Stage II—Nurses home; nurses training school—Tenders expected to be called in November, 1969.

Stage III—Conversion of existing buildings; demolition of old buildings; siteworks—Tenders to be called for this work to coincide with overall construction programme.

Present planning provides for completion by December, 1971.

SOUTH-EAST HOUSES

Mr. CORCORAN: The Minister of Housing will recall that during a debate last week on the increased rentals on departmental houses I invited him to accompany me on an inspection of Woods and Forests Department houses at Mount Burr and Nangwarry or of any other Woods and Forests Department houses in the South-East. The Minister has since informed his colleague the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) that owing to pressure of business he is unable to make the journey at this stage but that he will as a matter of urgency send an officer to the South-East to reassess the assessments previously made. During my remarks I also asked the Minister whether he would consider deferring the payment of the increased rentals until a proper inspection had been carried out and a further decision had been taken on the matter. The Minister has not yet said whether he is prepared to meet this request, so I ask him whether he has considered it. At meetings I attended at Mount Burr and Nangwarry last week when this matter was discussed, it was resolved to ask me to make this request of the Minister, and I therefore place it before him and ask him for a decision.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As indicated to the honourable member, I did undertake to confer with the Minister of Forests and the General Manager of the Housing Trust about a check assessment being made of houses at Mount Burr and Nangwarry. This has been arranged. I conferred verbally with both these authorities and confirmed it in writing to the General Manager of the Housing Trust last week. I have an assurance that an officer will go to the South-East for this purpose—he may have already gone. Regarding the second point, I admit that I do not think I

raised it with the Minister of Forests or the Public Service Board. I thank the honourable member for reminding me of it. In any case, any adjustment to rentals that is determined as a result of the check assessment will, of course, be backdated. I accept, however, the honourable member's further point that rentals should not be increased until the check assessment has been made. I will discuss this matter with the Chairman of the Public Service Board and see what his views are.

DERAILMENTS

Mr. VIRGO: On June 19 I asked the Attorney-General a question about the report of the committee that the Government appointed to inquire into derailments. I have now received a note from him, which I hope the Premier will not misinterpret, because he has addressed me by my christian name, and I appreciate it. Has the Attorney-General a reply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The preliminary report by the independent committee to inquire into and report on derailments on the South Australian Railways was presented by the committee to the Minister of Roads and Transport on Monday, June 23, 1969. The report is at present being studied by the Minister and his officers.

BONDING

Mr. VENNING: I understand that a medical bonding scheme is still in operation in this State. Can the Premier say how many medical students are now studying under the Government's bonding plan, and what is the success or otherwise of it?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to obtain a report from the Chief Secretary on the working of this plan.

SCHOOL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about electronic surveillance of schools?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: In my acknowledgment of the honourable member's letter on this subject in February, I mentioned that inquiries would take some time. These inquiries have been taking place since then, and I am now informed that in Australia we can match the surveillance system used in Toronto. The Postmaster-General's Department does not provide similar protective devices, although private suppliers can do this with P.M.G. approval. In general terms, the costs of providing this system of protection in

286 metropolitan schools would be some \$286,000 for installation of the detecting devices, plus recurring annual charges of about \$51,000. Although the system would no doubt result in a decrease in the number of cases of vandalism, it would not eliminate them. The estimated loss sustained in our schools annually through vandalism and theft is about \$2,250. It is considered more practical on the grounds of economy for the Government to continue the present practice of relying on police protection, and to replace any stolen or destroyed equipment.

MORGAN-EUDUNDA RAIL SERVICE

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question relates to the proposed closing of the Morgan-Eudunda railway line. One of the problems on this line is that provision has not yet been determined for transporting firewood. Can the Attorney-General supply some information on this subject?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The haulage of firewood on the South Australian Railways is an unprofitable operation which returns only 50 per cent of the full costs of the Railways. A comparison between States of rates for a distance about the same as that from Morgan to Mile End shows that South Australia is by far the cheapest and, as such, the South Australian Railways is giving what is in effect a considerable subsidy to the firewood industry. However, I understand that the Transport Control Board has been further investigating the closing of the line between Morgan and Eudunda and will shortly be forwarding recommendations concerning the firewood industry in the Morgan and Mount Mary area to the Minister of Roads and Transport. Until this report has been fully considered by the Government it is not possible to say what will, or can, be done for woodcutters in the area.

WEST LAKES SCHEME

Mr. HURST: The Premier has announced some details of the West Lakes development scheme that have appeared in the press. As this particular area is within my district, and as I am being inundated with requests for details, will the Premier have the courtesy to give details of the agreement proposed and say what is the Government's intention in relation to this scheme?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I can give some details about the scheme. As the honourable member will be aware, the scheme is of long standing. I think it was first promoted 19 or

20 years ago when it was suggested that this swamp land be developed usefully to supplement the public demand for recreation areas and also to provide a most desirable housing area. Since then it has been looked at by the Public Works Committee and considered by Governments. Until just before the last election it remained something to be contemplated. Just before the last election, the Government of which the honourable member was a part very hurriedly drew together a plan for the development by private enterprise of the West Lakes scheme.

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

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be only one question at a time. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The previous Government did this hurriedly indeed because some Directors of departments were given only 24 hours to report on various needs and services in that area, and on that basis the thing proceeded.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I deny that.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I have in my possession minutes that prove my statement, I shall be happy to bring them along to the House. Also, the document was signed in a great hurry, I believe on the last business day before the previous Government vacated office. Since then my Government has had an opportunity to review the indenture and the arrangements that were then concluded, and they have been found to be totally inadequate to carry out the scheme both from the point of view of the Government and of the company concerned. It has taken since that time to have the agreement properly drawn and signed, as it has been by the Minister of Works, Mr. Marks and Mr. Hanson of Development Finance Corporation Limited, and me. There were very significant changes, so much so that the old indenture was rescinded and a new indenture signed. The new indenture fully protects the Government and public interests in this very major development. Of course, it was my personal worry that the first indenture did not protect the public interest in this scheme.

I can give some of the main points of the scheme and show one or two of the differences between the present indenture and the first inadequate indenture. The previous indenture granted to the corporation wide powers to control and regulate the development of West Lakes, and to acquire property compulsorily.

These were beyond the scope of normal local government and outside the normal powers of South Australian laws. The new indenture provides for the corporation to follow, in the main, normal legal processes. It gives to local government and State Government planning authorities the power to administer planning laws within the framework of existing legislation. A 2,000-metre straight rowing course has been provided for, and has now been included in the lake configuration. The honourable member should realize that this was dropped in the indenture to which his Government subscribed and has now been restored in the new indenture.

The developers have agreed to the construction, at their expense, of foreshore facilities and recreation areas, which include car parks, boat ramps, and fully landscaped recreation areas. The sandhills and sea-coast frontage will be protected by the provision of reserves, and the prohibiting of building in close proximity to the waterline. During the review period, a high degree of co-operation has been achieved between the Housing Trust, the Corporation of the City of Woodville, and the developer. Over 700 blocks will be made available to the Housing Trust and the new West Lakes scheme will thus become a joint operation involving private enterprise and the Government housing authority.

Mr. Riches: Do those blocks have \$6,000 on them?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No, of course they will not all be \$6,000. There will be a great difference in the price of blocks, according to their position and surroundings. In the previous indenture, substantial uncertainties existed with respect to titles to land, and in the delineation of the boundaries of the scheme. These have now been resolved and are clearly shown in the indenture. The corporation has now assured the Government that every opportunity will be given for South Australian institutions to invest in the scheme. Moreover, it is now planned that the corporation will become a permanent entity based in South Australia. Accordingly, it may undertake in the future other development schemes in South Australia.

During the review period (and I refer to that period between when we came into office and the new indenture was signed), detailed planning and investigation by various Government departments and the corporation has enabled both parties to have inserted in the indenture agreements on various matters

which, under the old arrangement, could have been sources of serious dispute to the extent of endangering the scheme. Furthermore, provision has now been made for disputes to be resolved by agreed methods of arbitration. Specific areas where firm agreements have been made between the corporation and the Government are as follows:

- (a) Mining leases have been correctly defined, and will be terminated by the Government at an early date.
- (b) Agreement has been reached for a stormwater drainage planning to be integrated into a major drainage scheme for areas both within and outside the scheme boundaries. Precise formulae have been set down for the sharing of costs among all parties concerned.
- (c) Planning regulations have been included in the indenture to ensure a uniformly high standard of development throughout the life of the scheme.
- (d) An expert committee has been formed to define standards of water quality which will be met by the corporation.
- (e) A firm agreement has been reached with the Engineering and Water Supply Department with respect to the construction and sharing of costs of the water and sewerage services.

The road system has been much improved and is now designed to integrate with the requirements of future transport planning. The Government has sought and obtained from the corporation a schedule of the works and a cash flow associated with the construction of the scheme. Specific assurances and guarantees, including capacity to proceed with the scheme through to completion, have been given as follows:

- (a) The corporation has undertaken to commit a sum of \$4,000,000 to the scheme prior to the transfer of ownership of any land whatsoever to the corporation.
- (b) The Minister has the right to finally approve detailed plans and designs for the whole scheme before construction is commenced.
- (c) The corporation has undertaken to commence the major works within six months of the passing of ratifying legislation.
- (d) The corporation has agreed to a defects liability period of one year on all major works.
- (e) The transfer of lands to the corporation will remain strictly under the control of the Minister at all times.

If the honourable member considers those points along with the old indenture he will see the very many major improvements in the new indenture.

NORTHERN ROADS

Mr. CASEY: Earlier this year I asked many questions about the northern roads in this State, referring specifically to the Birdsville Track, the Quorn-Hawker district road, which is being sealed at present, the Mount Gunson mine road, and, particularly, to the road between Hawker and Marree. After a considerable time I eventually received a reply that the overall planning of the whole roads system in this particular area was currently being investigated, that a firm decision had not been taken on the future programme of construction north of Hawker and that the road from Hawker to Marree was one of those currently being considered. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the road from Hawker to Marree has been considered specifically and what action the Highways Department expects to take? Also, will he obtain for me a detailed report on whether this Government has approached the Commonwealth Government seeking improvements to the North-South road from Port Augusta to Alice Springs and, if it has, what those improvements are?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Obviously, I shall have to seek information from Mr. Hill. I imagine I am right in believing that he intends to make a personal inspection (next week, I think) of a number of the roads mentioned by the honourable member. I am not certain when it will be but it will be soon. I have no doubt that, following that, if not before, it will be possible to supply the information the honourable member seeks.

GLENGOWRIE SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: My question concerns the position that has arisen at the Glengowrie High School with the laying out of new ovals. Some ovals have been grassed as part of the general contract for the building of this school, and the areas between the ovals have been let go to weed, the weeds there now being between 1ft. and 2ft. high. Nobody seems to know what the policy of the Education Department will be with respect to these areas, where the weeds are now having a whale of a time. Can the Minister of Education indicate the department's policy in respect of these areas between and adjacent to the various ovals of this school? Will they, too, be put down to grass by the department? Will it be the responsibility of the parents to sow the grass, or is something else contemplated?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will bring down a report on this matter.

RECEIPTS TAX

Mr. BROOMHILL: In common with most other members, I have received many inquiries about the effects of the recent receipts tax and, being unable to answer most of them, I have referred them to the State Taxes Department for expert advice from its officers. Can the Treasurer say how many additional officers have been required by the department to administer the new receipts tax and indicate the approximate wages bill incurred as a result?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: When this legislation came into operation there were, of course, in conjunction with it several other adjustments within the State Taxes Department: for example, there was a rearrangement of the Land Tax Department involving the Chief Government Valuer and much amalgamation and reorganization took place. I shall have to get this information for the honourable member, if indeed I can get it segregated from the other rearrangements. The incidence of the administration of the receipts tax would, I think, be hard to separate from the rearrangement of the department as a whole. However, additional appointments have been made. In the initial reorganization of the department (not solely for the purpose of receipts tax) about 15 positions were created and appointments made thereto. Some of these were new positions created in lieu of old positions that subsequently have been or will be abolished. I will see whether I can get this information for the honourable member. It is a proper question and at least I will try to give him a reasonable indication of what the administrative costs of this legislation are.

SCHOOL CLEANER

Mr. JENNINGS: Recently, my attention was drawn to the position of the cleaner at the Angle Park Girls Technical High School and the Angle Park Boys Technical High School. As the Minister of Education knows, they adjoin each other, and the same cleaner works for both schools. He took on this job mainly because he lives close to the schools. In fact, he is really a caretaker more than a cleaner. I understand he cleans conscientiously the maximum area and receives (I am not quite sure of these figures) for his cleaning work only \$38 a week. However, his emolument is increased from the funds of the schools to \$48 a week. As he works a 48-hour week, he gets \$1 an hour. This is the work he does apart from the work that he is not really asked to do—such as telephoning the police every

time somebody breaks into either school, going into the schoolgrounds to remonstrate with people trying to break into the school, or things of that sort. The Minister knows that this is an area where this type of thing is likely to occur frequently.

The gentleman concerned is, I should imagine, saving the Education Department many hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars a year; yet the department is so parsimonious that he gets only \$1 an hour for his work apart from the work he does voluntarily in the interests of the schools. He is not interested in keeping up this work on this basis much longer, even though he is interested in the two schools and highly respects both the headmaster and the headmistress. Will the Minister say whether the department has any means by which the wages of people like this can be raised to some sort of realistic figure?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will call for a report on this matter.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Minister of Works obtained a report on the completion date of and progress of work on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The major extensions and improvements to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are being undertaken in five main stages: stage I—additions to nurses home and new nurses training school; stage II—resident medical officers quarters; stage III—ancillary building works; stage IV—new north wing, etc.; and stage V—new floor above existing main block, alterations, etc. Stages I and II are physically completed. Stage III is expected to be completed at the end of 1969, stage IV at the end of 1970, and stage V at the end of 1971.

PORT AUGUSTA ROAD

Mr. RICHES: I will quote a telegram I have received, because it explains in detail the request I am about to make. The telegram, sent by Mr. J. Thomas, Secretary, Davenport Reserve Council, states:

I am informed that the sealing of Tassie Street extension to Yorkey crossing turnoff is imminent. Sealing proposals fall 1,100ft. short of reserve entrance. As original intention of grant was to give reserve residents benefit of sealed acreage road to Port Augusta and to include Davenport within the sealed network of Port Augusta suburbs, appreciate your intervention and representations for inclusion of additional 1,100ft. into road sealing programme which I believe starts in July.

The Yorkey crossing road passes within a short distance of the Davenport Reserve and the Government has agreed to up-grade this road throughout and to seal the road between Port Augusta and the Davenport Reserve turn-off. This work is to be carried out by the Corporation of Port Augusta and is to commence this month. As residents of the reserve are concerned that their bitumen roads and the new road will not be linked but that there will be a gap of 1,100ft., will the Attorney-General make representations to the Minister of Roads and Transport for the Highways Department to have this work completed?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to do that. I am not quite sure of the detailed financial considerations, but I agree with John Thomas and with the honourable member that this work is most desirable. When I was at Davenport a couple of weeks ago the weather had been pretty wet and the roads were in a shocking condition. The residents of the Davenport Reserve certainly deserve better roads not only on the reserve but also on the approach portion referred to by the honourable member. I will do what I can to ensure that it is sealed.

FLUORIDATION

Mr. BURDON: Some time ago I received a letter from the Secretary of the Mount Gambier Chamber of Commerce Incorporated that states:

I have been directed by the council of this chamber to ask you to raise the following question at the next sitting of Parliament. The question is: Is it true that fluoridation of the water supply causes decay in water pipes and adversely affects hot water services and water reticulation systems?

Will the Minister of Works comment on that question?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The short answer is "No" but, if the honourable member would appreciate it, I will obtain for him as quickly as possible a full statement so that he can inform his constituents accordingly.

LAND BEAUTIFICATION

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of June 17 about the policy of the Engineering and Water Supply Department concerning beautifying areas owned by the department?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: It is desired that Engineering and Water Supply Department properties should conform in standard of appearance generally to the properties in their immediate vicinity. As development and

housing take place in the immediate vicinity of departmental tanks and reserves, and gardens and lawns are established on those house properties, the department endeavours to establish lawns and plant trees on its properties so that the whole area will harmonize. The rate of development of these reserves is sometimes limited by the availability of funds to permit this work to be done. The type of beautification carried out varies from site to site. Generally, it comprises the treatment of banks by planting them with suitable ground-covering creeping-type plants, the planting of trees suitable for the particular soil or the particular locality, and the planting of some lawns. There are some garden beds in the larger reserves, for example, at Clapham and Belair.

The department is happy to co-operate with local progress associations and work in with the wishes of the local community as far as is possible. A specific instance of this occurred with the Springbank tank reserve, where many varied native trees and shrubs were planted at the request of the local progress association in preference to lawns. These trees and shrubs screen the tanks from the view of people living higher up the hill and overlooking the tanks. Progress associations interested in this matter should contact the department's Regional Engineer, Metropolitan, at Kent Town, who will be happy to discuss any proposal in detail with them.

STOCKWELL MAIN

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of last week whether water from the Stockwell main will become available to primary producers whose properties adjoin the main?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: It is not intended to consider the laying of normal branch main reticulation until the permanent pumping equipment is installed and fully operative. This position is expected to be reached late in 1970, after which each extension will be treated on its merits. Services have already been granted as sought to those landowners whose properties adjoin the rising main, and it is intended to grant services on the gravity section of the main after the satisfactory completion of tests of the summit storage, which are scheduled for mid-August.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mr. LAWN: I am not sure whether to ask this question of the Minister of Works or the Premier, because last year when I asked a

similar question of one Minister the reply came from another. For some time the South Australian National Football League and the South Australian Cricket Association have been negotiating on the use of the Adelaide Oval but, recently, it was announced that negotiations had failed. However, according to a newspaper report the spokesman for the football league said that the league wanted to contribute \$500,000, and possibly more later, but that it wished to share equally in the management of the oval, although Sir Donald Bradman was alleged to have said that the football league wanted sole control of the oval: obviously, they both cannot be correct. The land belongs to the Government, Parliament has given the Adelaide City Council power to administer it in the interests of the people, and the council has granted a 50-year lease to the cricket association. I do not understand why the league and the association should squabble over the management of the oval. As the land belongs to the people, it should be used by the people. I do not want followers of football to have to go miles north of Adelaide, possibly to Elizabeth or Bolivar, to watch football matches. Will the Minister of Works say whether the Government will investigate the dispute and, in the interests of the people of South Australia, try to settle it?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will examine the matter.

MILLICENT SOUTH SCHOOL

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about connecting the Millicent South Primary School to the sewerage system in Millicent?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Tenders for the erection of a new flexible building at the Millicent South Primary School close today. Provision has been made in the specification for this new building for the school to be connected to the Engineering and Water Supply Department sewer system. Meanwhile, the existing effluent disposal plant will be maintained.

MAIL SERVICES

Mr. VENNING: My question relates to partly a State matter and partly a Commonwealth matter. Recently I have noticed that a private company operates mail services on our northern roads, and last weekend I was told unofficially that the mail services between Crystal Brook and Merriton were to be discontinued soon and that mail coming to Crystal Brook would also be carried by this road

service. As my concern is for our railways, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what is the position regarding rail transport of mails in the northern part of the State?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will find out for the honourable member.

WATER CHARGES

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about a constituent's having to pay excess water rates twice in the one year?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: This matter has been investigated and I have obtained the following report:

Excess accounts for water consumed during 1968-69 have been fully processed by computer techniques, whereas previously some manual steps were involved. This has resulted in greater efficiency and accounts are now rendered more quickly following the final meter reading than was previously possible. In this case, the final meter reading was made in April in both years. The excess account for 1967-68 was processed in June, 1968, and was payable early in July, whereas this year the account was processed in May and was payable in late June, about two weeks earlier than in 1968. It is not expected that this circumstance will occur again.

It is regrettable that this incident occurred, but it happened inadvertently and is not expected to recur.

COMTEL INTERNATIONAL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A company known as Comtel International Proprietary Limited went into liquidation some time ago in South Australia and Mr. Winter, a chartered accountant, was appointed receiver for the company. The employees of Comtel have not yet been paid wages and holiday pay due, and a question was asked in the House last year about that matter. I have been told that, although the receiver has asked the company to give him a statement of affairs, the company has not fully complied with his request, and he has reported the position to the Registrar of Companies. Apparently, further steps have not been taken yet. I am also told that funds are available but the claim cannot be met until the statement of affairs, as required, has been lodged. As the former employees of the company are anxious to get an early settlement, will the Attorney-General have the matter investigated urgently to find out whether it can be finalized?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will inquire.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last week I asked the Minister of Works whether he would be good enough to get a report on the progress being made with the Watervale water scheme. With his usual efficiency, he now tells me that he has a reply. Will he give that reply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I appreciate the honourable member's interest in this matter. Some time ago a scheme was designed to supply Leasingham, Watervale, Penwortham and Seven Hills. However, the estimated cost of this proposal and the likely revenue therefrom were such as to make it impossible to recommend the whole scheme. The Auburn supply system has been inadequate for some years, and it is now intended that augmentation of this system be dealt with at the same time as the examination of an extension to serve as far as Watervale only. Currently, designs have been prepared and estimates of cost and revenue sought of an extension to serve Leasingham and Watervale concurrently with an estimate of cost to upgrade the supply to the Auburn system. Cost estimates are near completion, and an assessment is at present being prepared by the Valuation Department. It is expected that the complete report covering costs and the economics of the proposed scheme will be available in about three months.

TEXTBOOKS

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the non-availability of some textbooks in high schools?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I have had further inquiries made concerning the non-availability of some textbooks in high schools this year and can confirm that the information contained in my letter to the honourable member dated April 18, which replied to his letter of March 25, was correct. I repeat the statement I made in that letter that there was no evidence to show that heads of schools or local booksellers were responsible for the delay in receiving textbooks, but that reprinting needs had slowed delivery this year. I also said that late ordering, resulting from actual enrolments exceeding estimated enrolments, was responsible for delay in some instances, although only a few books were involved. My latest advice is that four textbooks have still not been delivered in full to the Daws Road High School.

The book entitled *Introducing the Humid Tropics*, for Leaving geography, is a new publication which, when ordered last October,

was promised by July. Teachers have organized their work accordingly. Extra copies of *Think, Talk and Write* (Leaving English) were ordered in February this year because of increased enrolments, and a reprint is being made overseas. The domestic science book *Between Ourselves* was ordered in February and is being reprinted. It should be available by the end of August. As it covers only a part of the course, teachers have been able to compensate for its late delivery by programming. Orders for *Schools Mathematics Series, Algebra Book II* placed in February to meet with increased enrolments have not been met in full. The book has been reprinted overseas. Supplies have reached Australia and should be available now. Everything possible is being done to ensure that orders for books will be placed as early and as accurately as possible to try to prevent late supplies.

In future, high schools will be advised by June by the Public Examinations Board of the textbooks for the following year, and it is considered that this target cannot be bettered without recommending inferior or out-of-date books. It is considered useless for headmasters to place book orders before about August each year as they could not be very accurate and, in any case, booksellers would be wary of placing orders with overseas publishers (for which returns are not acceptable) until they were reasonably accurate.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

Mr. WARDLE: Some months ago a deputation from Tailem Bend waited on the Minister of Education concerning a high school for the town, and out of the discussions came the suggestion from the Minister that school buses might replace the present method of rail travel to the Murray Bridge High School. Will the Minister obtain a report on the progress being made in implementing this change of transport?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I cannot recall offhand exactly what I undertook to do in this matter, except to indicate that it might be possible for some alternative form of transport to be provided. However, as some information should be available by now, I will ascertain what is the present position for the honourable member.

PARK LANDS INTERSECTION

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the park lands intersection of Greenhill and Peacock Roads?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The design of the intersection of Greenhill and Peacock Roads is currently in hand, and this includes provision for traffic signals. Construction is expected to commence in March, 1970, with completion and traffic signal installation by about September, 1970. Work at this intersection will be part of the general improvement of Greenhill Road between Goodwood and Glen Osmond Roads.

WHYALLA INTERSECTION

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Whyalla City Commission has been concerned for five or six years about the unsatisfactory traffic conditions at the intersection in Whyalla of Norrie and Jenkins Avenues and Lacey Street. I understand several designs have been submitted for improving the intersection, but none has been approved by the Road Traffic Board. However, I believe a design is now being prepared by Pak Poy and Associates and, as the intersection is becoming more dangerous with the increased volume of traffic, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to have this matter regarded as urgent and to expedite a decision?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will bring the honourable member's question to Mr. Hill's attention.

PARLIAMENTARY UNDER SECRETARY

Mr. HUDSON: We have all been impressed by the appointment of two gentlemen to positions with the high-sounding title of Parliamentary Under Secretary. So far, however, I am a little puzzled concerning what these gentlemen do and, as the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) is one of the gentlemen concerned, will he be so kind as to explain his functions to me and to other members?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I shall be pleased to bring down a departmental report.

Mr. HUDSON: Will the Treasurer be so kind as to bring down a departmental report on the cost of carpets for the offices of the Parliamentary Under Secretaries, together with the cost (or imputed cost) of office space, and any other costs, such as the cost of secretarial assistance, associated with the Government's appointment of the two Parliamentary Under Secretaries?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know why the honourable member has addressed his question to me, because none of the matters he has raised comes within my direct Ministerial purview. As the honourable members

who are acting as assistants to the Premier receive no additional salary, there is no direct outgoing. So far as I am aware, the accommodation they are using was built into the floor on which they work prior to their appointments and not specifically for that purpose. However, I will talk to the Minister of Works and see whether any useful information can be provided for the honourable member.

HILLS ROADS

Mr. GILES: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about providing guard rails on three roads in the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: A continuing programme of guard-rail erection is planned in the Adelaide Hills area, and all roads hazardous in this particular respect have been inspected and details recorded. Work on any individual road or section depends on relative priority, available finance, and resources. It is hoped to erect some six miles of guard rail in the 1969-70 financial year, including work on the Norton Summit Road, the Old Norton Summit Road, the Belair-Crafrers Road and the Belair Road.

TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION

Mr. BROOMHILL: I noticed a recent newspaper report to the effect that the Minister of Roads and Transport had visited Victoria to examine matters associated with transport, including the co-ordination of Victoria's transport agencies. The Minister is quoted as saying that he wanted to see how Victoria handled this kind of co-ordination, because it might be necessary to set up a more permanent body in South Australia. The Minister is reported as having said that he also wanted to find out how Victoria intended to pay compensation for properties acquired under the plan. As South Australia has experienced compensation problems in respect of people who are displaced because of transport plans, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what he ascertained in Victoria relating to the payment of this form of compensation?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. RICHES: Some time ago the Port Augusta corporation met with the Fire Brigades Board, asking that the Davenport Reserve

be brought into the Port Augusta Fire District. It was considered a considerable fire risk existed on the reserve and, indeed, that would be obvious to anyone visiting the area. The Fire Brigades Board had an inspection made but excluded the reserve from the Port Augusta Fire District because of the lack of water pressure. Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs have this matter examined urgently? I am sure that, if proper representations are made, this matter can be attended to satisfactorily; indeed, it is not good that the present situation should be allowed to continue.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will look into the matter straight away.

ROBE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Works obtained a report on the progress being made regarding the Robe township water supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Mines Department has reported that the test bore for a water supply at Robe when drilled to 948ft. commenced flowing at about 30,000 gallons an hour. The quality of the water was 800 parts a million. Because of the variation in the strata, this bore is to be drilled possibly to 1,000ft. In the light of this favourable report, which shows that water of good quality is available in adequate quantity, detailed revised estimates of the cost of a scheme to supply the township of Robe with water and of the revenue that such a scheme would produce are being prepared. When these estimates have been completed a recommendation will be made.

EUDUNDA SCHOOL

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I recently asked about providing reticulated water to agricultural land at the Eudunda Area School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am pleased to be able to tell the member for Light that it has been decided to expedite the provision of reticulated water for the agricultural land at the Eudunda Area School. An indirect extension will be undertaken from a meter located at the existing terminal point of the Engineering and Water Supply Department's main, and this will result in a saving on the original estimate of cost. I have been informed that the Public Buildings Department will take early action in this matter.

DENTAL CLINICS

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of June 17 regarding the establishment of dental clinics?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: My colleague the Minister of Health states that in selecting areas for the location of clinics consideration must be given to a number of factors, including the actual and probable future primary school population in the areas under consideration, the availability of private practitioner services and supervisory dentists. As a result of detailed surveys, Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Peterborough, Renmark and Murray Bridge were selected for the location of clinics for the current year. To enable the employment of the second group of school dental therapists during 1970, approval has been given for clinics to be erected in Millicent, Kingscote and Loxton, and additional clinics to be erected at Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie to take advantage of the best utilization of departmental supervisory dental staff. Mount Gambier, like some of the other larger towns in country areas, has been omitted for the present because it is considered that reasonable private dental services are available. Although further clinics will be required in future years, no decision has been reached on further proposed locations at this stage.

LIFTS COURSE

Mr. VIRGO: At the commencement of the current school year a new class was commenced at the Kilkenny Trades School on lift and escalator operation and maintenance. A term fee of \$7.50 is charged and the lessons cover three hours a week. About 40 or 50 people, including employees of the Electricity Trust, the Tramways Trust, the Public Buildings Department, the South Australian Railways, and private enterprise are members of the class. I have been informed that all of the employees whom I have mentioned (including those of the Electricity Trust and the Public Buildings Department), with the exception of the railway employees, have been told that all students who, undertaking the course for the benefit of their employer, pass the examination will have their fees refunded at the end of the year. Unfortunately, however, the Railways Commissioner has refused to do this. Will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, ask his colleague to take up with the Railways Commissioner the possibility of reimbursing railway employees

who successfully undertake the course for the benefit of the Railways Commissioner?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask Mr. Hill about the matter.

FOREST RESERVES

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of June 17 regarding the setting aside, as national parks, of forest reserves in the South-East?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Conservator of Forests reports that the area of native forest known as Honan Scrub referred to by the honourable member is adjacent to a large area of pine plantation and that it is not the intention of the department to relinquish control of it. On present indications it is most unlikely that much of it will ever be planted, and it is the intention of the department to retain it as an area of natural forest. There is no objection to interested bodies visiting this scrub, subject to the approval of the local district forester in charge.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (on notice):

1. Who are the consultants appointed to report on standardization of the railway line from Adelaide to Port Pirie?

2. Why was it necessary to appoint consultants rather than use departmental staff?

3. What are the terms of reference for the consultants?

4. When are the consultants required to report?

5. What present agreement exists between the South Australian Government and the Commonwealth Government concerning the construction of a rail link from Port Augusta to Whyalla?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The replies are as follows:

1. The Commonwealth and State Governments have agreed that consultants be appointed. No appointment has yet been made.

2. The Prime Minister proposed that independent consultants be employed. Departmental staff carried out their study and the State Government approved their recommendation. The proposal was forwarded to the Commonwealth, but was not accepted by it. Instead, it proposed that independent consultants be appointed to undertake a feasibility study,

following which it would be prepared to consider the matter further. The State Government agreed to this on the understanding that the consultants would not take longer than six months to complete the study.

3. The final terms of reference have not yet been finally determined in writing between the Commonwealth and the State.

4. This has not as yet been determined.

5. There is no agreement at present, but discussions have been held between the Commonwealth and the State.

SENATE VACANCY

The SPEAKER laid on the table the minutes of proceedings of the joint sitting of the two Houses held on June 25, 1969, to choose a person to hold the place in the Senate rendered vacant by the death of Mr. Keith Alexander Laught, at which Mr. Martin Bruce Cameron was the person so chosen.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 24. Page 195.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): The position of South Australia that is revealed in His Excellency's Speech is one that can give little heart to South Australians who are concerned to see that adequate plans and preparations are made for the due expansion of this State and for the undertaking of proper services and reforms within it. It was long the case that the Liberal and Country League in South Australia used as an election cry, as a political cry, that South Australia must concentrate on industrial development. That is not something with which the Opposition disagrees but, if South Australia is to go in for effective industrial development, we have to take advice as to how effectively we are to do it in an extremely competitive situation as far as the attraction of development capital is concerned.

Mr. Rodda: You frightened most of it away.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: South Australia faces a considerable number of difficulties simply because, although it has some basic resources of value it has, generally speaking, rather fewer natural resources in proportion to its size and population than has any other area of Australia. It has, however, a certain number of things which are of advantage to

it in industrial development and which can be built on. Particularly in South Australia have we been able to develop industries relying on the skills of artisans within this community. It was partly because of the existing skills of artisans and craftsmen in this State that the motor vehicle body-building industry and associated supply industries grew up here. Then there followed the consumer durable industries that surrounded them, and this became the industrial base for South Australia. South Australia has a high concentration on the skill industries and we had going for us this peculiar advantage to the State. Nearly 71 per cent of our industries are either directly involved in the manufacture of consumer durables or in the supply industries to consumer durable goods industries. This makes South Australia particularly vulnerable to fluctuations in the markets for consumer durables in those areas where South Australia has markets.

Until recently South Australia's major markets in the consumer durable area were in the Eastern States. Consequently, fluctuations could occur in our economy as a result of fluctuations in the markets for these goods, and these have affected South Australia previously. The extent to which a State Government can in present circumstances directly affect that situation is merely marginal. No State Government of whatever complexion can prevent adverse effects to the South Australian economy of fluctuations in the consumer durable goods market, nor is any Government of whatever complexion specifically responsible for a revival in the economy that derives from an improvement in the consumer durables market. Those politicians in South Australia who would allege that the State Government is, in fact, to a great extent responsible in this sphere are only misleading the public, and doing it for political purposes.

Mr. Hudson: They do it constantly.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and to the detriment of the State. Of course, politics have been more important to our friends opposite than have questions of principle and questions concerning the good of the State, as I shall point out in specific detail as I continue this speech. What are the courses open to South Australia to take action locally, first, to protect our industry and employment from fluctuations in the markets, secondly, to diversify our economy to obtain that protection, and, thirdly, to promote and plan expansion?

Previous to the appointment by the Labor Government of officers in the Industrial Development Branch of the Premier's Department, which branch was set up by our Government, the activity undertaken in South Australia tended to be somewhat catch-as-catch-can. Someone had a bright idea and endeavoured to develop it without adequate staff or research facilities. Someone whispered somewhere that it would be a good idea to approach someone with a suggestion, a whisper was heard on the Rialto or somewhere, and the approach was made. However, there was no overall planning for development, no research in depth, no economic feasibility studies.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Would you agree that the results have not been too bad?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The results early in the life of the Playford Government were good, because there were a number of factors determining the course of industrial development here that were encouraged and assisted by the then existing Government. I want to pay a tribute to it on that score, and I have done so often. Latterly, however, since the other States have set up adequately staffed promotion departments, we have fallen behind badly in the race and we have run into difficulties from the very nature of the work undertaken in the department. The most obvious case was in the South-East in connection with the proposals for the pulp mill at Mount Gambier, and in that region—

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Why did your immediate predecessor take no action?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He did take action: he set up the Industrial Development Branch and brought in as the senior officer of that branch an experienced officer of the Department of Trade. An economic research officer, a graduate of the Adelaide University, was appointed to assist him, and I expanded his activities. Prior to the steps taken by Mr. Walsh, however, there was no branch at all.

Mr. Jennings: The Premier and two typistes!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is so. We could not afford to neglect this area as it had been neglected before we took office, nor could we afford to make the type of mistake that was made in connection with the pulp mill in the South-East. When feasibility studies were eventually done, it was shown clearly that investors had been encouraged to invest their money although it was impossible

to supply the raw material for a pulp mill operation without gravely and adversely affecting existing industry in the area. Cellulose and Apcel would have been adversely affected through trying to supply sufficient wood pulp to a pulp mill at Mount Gambier. What course was then planned by the Labor Government? We wanted to see not that we would have the kind of operation that other States were going in for and which would produce some kind of promotional activity such as was being undertaken by the Housing Trust at Elizabeth: we wanted to get an operation that would leap-frog that of the other States in attracting that kind of expansion and development for which South Australia was best suited.

The way to do this was to have an effective survey of South Australia's industrial potential to show where were the areas of likely expansion and where were the gaps that needed to be filled. This survey would provide us with information as to the existence of potential investors in the spheres shown by the survey and, in addition, would show whether governmental action of one kind or another would be required to promote expansion or to fill gaps shown by the survey—planning of the kind that is being done in a number of other countries, as I shall show in a few moments.

In addition, it was possible for the Government to concentrate on what was already shown to be a vital basis for the expansion of industry in South Australia—the exploitation of local skill and know-how, and the use of the existing technical and research facilities. We had to become the kind of economy that has been built up in the skill industry areas of Europe and the Middle East, in Sweden, Switzerland, northern Italy and Israel. To do this a number of things had to be undertaken. First, we had to encourage and retain the technical facilities available to the State.

We were able to obtain, whilst our Government was in office, the setting up of the headquarters of International Technical Services in South Australia, a most important advance for industry in Australia, and it had its headquarters here. It provides a most effective service in advising industry on technical problems anywhere in Australia. Unfortunately, that show has transferred its headquarters to Sydney since the new Government has come into office. We proposed setting up an industrial research foundation associated with one of our universities; it would concentrate, as does the Weitzman

Institute in Israel, on the development of projects for industrial research and expansion in South Australia aimed at what were the needs in this State, not only (as does the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization) looking at particular things that could come anywhere in the Commonwealth but looking at the particular needs of this State.

However, nothing has happened under the present Government about this. We needed to have the whole of our industry informed with knowledge of the best practices of industrial design. In consequence, we made available the money for the best industrial design centre in Australia. The present Government has been in office now for about 15 months, and what has happened to the industrial design centre? We made the space available and the money available for the local authority to obtain the subvention from the Commonwealth. More than a year has passed and there is no design centre. Therefore, we are not even beginning to do the basic groundwork necessary for expansion in the skilled industry areas.

The officer who was appointed to oversee the development of South Australia's industrial planning on this basis has, of course, been driven out of the service of the Government, and in a way that can only bring the most condign of obloquy on the Government. The way in which this Government has acted towards Mr. Currie is utterly shameful, and the excuses that the Government has uttered in this House will not wash with anyone in industry or among the public. To say that there is a report (and the Government has refused to table it) stating that Mr. Currie was not qualified in background or performance for the job of Director of Industrial Development is the veriest nonsense. How was the report obtained? It was obtained under instruction, because the Government redefined the requirements for the consultants to report on. The Government made it clear that it considered that the man who was involved in this job should not have the qualifications to be able to direct the necessary research work to be done in a programme of the kind I have outlined, but that it wanted a salesman. Then it quotes one sentence from a report that gives none of the hypotheses upon which the report was prepared, and says, "Oh well, he doesn't have the qualifications." No-one has suggested that Mr. Currie was a salesman, and he was not appointed

as such. He was an effective Director of Industrial Development and, in a few moments, I shall quote the Premier's own words to show that.

What has now happened is that, under the Government, we are back to the old catch-as-catch-can business without any sort of effective overall plan for the Government to note and to take the necessary action in relation to the needs of this State for industrial development. We are back to the old "come to sunny South Australia" approach. We are not getting the kind of survey originally required of the consultants. In consequence, we are not getting or acting upon advice for the development and expansion of industry in certain areas and for the filling in of the gaps in the others. We are not getting the cost studies in detail to convince oversea people with development capital that they need to establish here, and that is the kind of information that they want these days. Let us face it: if South Australia is simply to go into the market for development capital by saying, "Well, here is our list of goodies; this is what we can offer you to establish here; these are the economic advantages and special benefits we can give you to come to the State", then we are not in the race.

Just have a look at what other countries in this region can offer by way of specific economic advantages. A significant tax holiday is available for any industry establishing in one of Singapore's industrial estates. How is that arranged in South Australia? Can we obtain from the Commonwealth Government a specific tax holiday available to companies establishing here? No, we cannot. The most that we can do is give some minor tax or charge advantages, but they do not compete with those of Singapore or of other countries at the moment engaged in attracting development capital. They do not compete with those offered by Ireland or Japan, and it is not possible for a State in Australia to give similar cost advantages State-wise. If we are merely to go into the promotional business we are at a disadvantage at the start. In simply producing the kind of list of benefits that we can tabulate in South Australia we are in difficulty in competing. What we have to do is concentrate on the particular industries which will be of advantage to us (and they would be shown by the survey) and those to which we can give some specific advantages related to the nature of the terrain, of the resources we have, or of the skills that are available.

Mr. Rodda: In other words, you are talking about the whole of Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, in South Australia we are not able to give tax holidays in the major tax area.

Mr. Rodda: I thought you said in your opening remarks that it was beyond any State Government to do this sort of thing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is.

Mr. Rodda: Are you talking about the Commonwealth or the State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am saying that it is beyond any State Government to give tax holidays of the kind that comparable economies are able to give in the attraction of development capital. Many of our industries will have to attract development capital and serve very much larger markets than Australia; therefore, we are competing not merely with other Australian States but with other countries with economies comparable to our own that are seeking development capital. In many cases industries are quite as prepared to establish in Ireland as in Australia. Members should look at the type of benefits offered in Italy. We have been going to Italy for development capital, but we cannot begin to offer to developers a similar kind of tax holiday, and specific State assistance as is offered in the developing areas of Southern Italy.

Therefore, if we are merely to go in for the promotional approach to people with conceivable development capital, we will run behind in the race. What we have to do is concentrate on the kind of approach which was prepared by Mr. Currie and recommended to the previous Government and upon which that Government was acting until this Government took office. The present Government has torn that up. The Premier does not listen to what is said to him on the subject of industrial development. He does not read in any detail the reports given to him. As a matter of fact, when the House last met I heard the Premier say that I had advocated that in South Australia we should concentrate on the development of cottage industries as the main method of our industrial expansion. What nonsense! I did not say that, nor did a newspaper print that I did. At no time did I use the phrase, "The development of cottage industries." What I did say was that countries such as ours, with a high degree of skill, had been able to develop industries that relied on highly technical craft skills, and that therefore

the development of these craft industries (not cottage industries) had been a significant feature of the industrial development of places such as Sweden and Israel.

In Sweden, the average factory has 20 employees, but because of the high degree of skill that country has labour-intensive industries involved in the production of high quality products. Because we are the area that has been able to expand on the basis of significant artisan skills, this was an area we could not afford to neglect. Therefore, as part of the overall development of South Australia, we should remember that this was something that could be of significance to us, as it has been to comparable countries. That does not mean concentration in South Australia of the development of cottage industries, and it is obvious that the Premier in this, as in so much else said by anybody on this side of the House (and particularly me), has a mental block. He does not want to hear what is said; he prefers to put his own gloss upon it and completely misinterpret it for political purposes.

We cannot afford to neglect the skilled areas of South Australia's industry. There can be valuable developments for South Australia in small as well as large industries, and we cannot afford to neglect any area of industry and say, "All we will do is look for the big things." Even supposing we look for the big things, what have we got as a result of the new regime and its overthrow of the course that was being followed in industrial development—not a course that could be said to be the result of some doctrinaire Government determined to set down private interests, and private interests did not find it so, either? What significant industrial development has occurred under the present regime?

Mr. Clark: A briefcase full of possibilities.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have heard about that. The Premier was headlined when he was overseas on his second sales tour, because he headlined himself earlier as South Australia's chief salesman: his briefcase was bulging with prospects of multi-million dollar investment in the State. Then he had a target list, which read "England—two certainties, six possibles; the United States—eight possibles; Japan—one possible; Germany—one possible." There was one target in Switzerland (apparently, that was not a possible) and another in Bulgaria, put aside for further study. When we look through to try to find out any specific cases at all, what do we

discover? We have heard other grand announcements of the high degree of likelihood of the Fiat Company establishing in South Australia. We do not hear about that now. The plain fact is that the Fiat Company has no intention at all of establishing a plant here under any conditions.

The Government cannot deny (it knows it very well) that the announcement of great developments here of that kind was just so much persiflage, to try to boost what was happening. If we go through this report, we get to one particular case of an industry wishing to establish—a Japanese project. This Japanese prospect was a joint venture with a South Australian company involving metal manufacture. Who was responsible for going to Japan and setting out the basis of the work in relation to that company?

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: It was Mr. Currie.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly; it was Mr. Currie. It was his own good work and his knowledge of Japanese alone that managed to dig out that particular prospect for us but, according to the Premier, he did not have the qualifications for the job, so he was forced out of it. At the moment the Premier is saying that there are signposts for South Australia's upsurge, that there are improvements in the markets for consumer durables. However, that started before the present Government took office, and it has continued since then. The Premier says that the market for consumer durables, which was the main feature of the difficulty facing the South Australian economy, has improved. I hope it will stay improved, because the present Commonwealth Government has always adopted the attitude that, if it sees inflationary pressures in the Australian economy, it has to depress the consumer goods market. If it does that, we will be in trouble again and there will be nothing that the Premier or his Government can do about it. It is the people in Canberra who make the decisions, and they are now making ominous noises.

It is true that there has been an improvement in this market, and it was occurring when we were in office. In the last months of our office Chrysler Australia Limited and General Motors-Holden's took on significant numbers because of the improvement in the market, so the economy has ironed out a little. But what about the market that can be affected by South Australian Government plans? There are no plans.

What we get is this kind of brilliant statement from the Minister of Industrial Development, who assumes this new portfolio. He says that there are three ways to attract industry. The first is by setting up the Industrial Development Branch in the Premier's Department. I have already dealt with what has happened to that. The second way is by telling industry that once again a free-enterprise Government in South Australia looks favourably on industry. Thirdly, the Premier gives a benign smile to potential industrial investors and hopes they will say, "We will flock to South Australia. What a nice fellow you are in enhancing the importance of the development portfolio." The Premier gives himself another title and says, "This is a significant means of attracting industry to South Australia." These are the three ways he has said publicly he is attracting industry to South Australia.

Let me sound this note of warning: industry will not find this Government particularly benign when it looks to the basic costs of industry as affected by this Government's actions, because this is what industry needs to look at. To do any cost benefit study in depth, one has to be able to prove to the people, the potential investors, the people whom you are asking to expand, that they will make a profit. If they are not to be able to, they will not be very interested. In order to make a profit in this area in Australia, they have to be able to cover their costs and transport their goods to the market, which means that we have to be in a competitive cost situation. We on this side of the House agree with that. Honourable members opposite used to spout this as something that was gospel. I wonder what in the world has made them so disaffected with it now. Why have they tossed it out of the window? As regards industry here, members of the Liberal and Country Party would constantly get up here and say, "We must maintain a competitive cost position." What is the position? Labour costs generally in South Australia are increasing and are under pressure from a further increase because of the actions of this Government—actions which were not needed but which have been taken. First, of course, we were in difficulties once the Commonwealth court decided upon a total wage rather than a basic wage and a margin, but that was supported by the L.C.L. Secondly, we have a pressure through the taxes imposed by this Government, because the majority of these taxes are directly affecting the consumer and the cost of living. When we add 4c to 5c in

\$10 on every purchase that a consumer in South Australia makes, this brings pressure to bear upon the cost of living and destroys the cost advantage in every area in South Australia.

Mr. Broomhill: There is virtually no price control now, either.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is a further matter. This Government is now so doctrinaire, and the present Premier is always talking about the virtues of saying that he supports private enterprise. Non-governmental investors in South Australia gained real benefits from the previous régime's insistence on maintaining price control in order to keep a competitive cost structure, to see to it that money wages were lower but real wages were the same, and to ensure that we had the cheapest housing available in Australia, so that the total wage cost to an employer in South Australia was likely to be lower than it was in areas to which he had to tranship his goods to market them. However, destroying price control (and that is something that the Premier announced he hopes to see effected in the foreseeable future and something to which the Attorney-General has been constantly attached) will put a further pressure on wage costs in South Australia, because it will drive money wages up. The releasing from price control of a whole series of items, as undertaken by this Government, has caused a number of price increases to the household budget.

Mr. Broomhill: Particularly to purchasers of houses.

Mr. Hudson: And the building industry.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course these were the two extremely important areas of competition in costs, and if they are destroyed then what sort of feasibility study will we be able to present to potential investors in this State? How will we be able to show that this is the most profitable place for them to invest? Not content with that action, the Government has increased many Housing Trust rents and rents in Government undertakings. This action will bring pressure to bear on the cost structure in South Australia, will increase the price of numbers of products, and will increase the general pressure on money wages far more than anything that was undertaken at any time by the Labor Government in the provision of mere ancillary benefits. Contrast what this Government has done with what we did and about which members opposite complained: giving service pay to daily-paid

and weekly-paid Government employees, giving an extra week's annual leave to public servants, and improving workmen's compensation.

Mr. Virgo: To the best in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The effect of every one of those items on the cost to private industry was either nil or purely marginal. We then had the most satisfied and stable labour force in Australia. None of those things had anything like the pressure on costs that the actions of the present Government have had. What is the effect on private industry of the actions of a Government that states that it believes in private enterprise and looks so benignly on it and states that private enterprise can trust it and benefit from it? Ask the private industrialist what benefits he gets from this Government and the answer is, "The sooner we have an election and get you blokes back, the better." Why does this Government not try it? The Opposition would be happy to give the Government a go any time. I notice a certain smiling coy reluctance on the faces of members opposite when it is suggested that they test this matter before the public.

Mr. McAnaney: You would be wasting public money.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think you would find that the public would not be upset. What is more, we can find from the present Government none of the planning for development or co-operation between Government and private undertakings that is quite clear in comparable countries. This system has been the means of getting significant industrial growth in many areas. The recent figures of the rates of industrial growth show that Japan is first and Italy second. Italy! Italy has obtained its rate of industrial growth because it has a series of Government-financed corporations that co-operate with private industry in providing finance and technical knowledge for expansion and for creating new corporations to fill in the gaps that are shown by their surveys and their planning and research staffs. Both Government and private finance are involved in the undertakings, and this has meant a rate of technical expansion and industrial growth which is unexampled in Europe and which we could count on if we started it here.

At the last election, as a first step, the Labor Party suggested that we should be able to take up shares in undertakings in South Australia

that showed potential but which were under-capitalized and needed State assistance. Members opposite know that this cannot be done at present unless a special Act is passed, as was done with Cellulose Australia Limited. What can be done is that when a proposal is received from someone who can get bank finance, a Treasurer's guarantee may be given. If there is no hope of getting the bank finance there cannot be a Treasurer's guarantee and no submissions are made to the Industries Development Committee. In several areas in the country there are viable enterprises, provided they could get more capital, but because they are under-capitalized they cannot get going, and there is no provision for this State to assist them adequately.

We should be active in the area of direct industrial promotion of industries that are valuable to this State, and we should not leave it to the whims of private investors alone. If we do that we are likely to be subjected to decisions that do not bear much relation to us at all, but would provide for the interests of particular investors. We should be promoting directly and involving the State with private undertakings, so that jointly we could develop this State. However, that is not being undertaken by the present Government. If we are to have the kind of development that South Australia needs we must have adequate water. At present, the people of the State cannot have much confidence in the Government or its administration, because of what it has done about the water supply in this State. The Government went to the people with a clear undertaking concerning Chowilla dam.

Mr. Langley: The Premier was going to build it himself.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Liberal Party said, without qualification, that Chowilla would be built.

Mr. McAnaney: What did you do when you were in office?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Apparently, the member for Stirling considers that spending about \$6,000,000 was doing nothing. For the most part the planning and design work of the dam was accomplished under our administration, so I do not know what the honourable member is talking about. Obviously, he has not bothered to read the history of it any more than did the Premier take careful note of the bases upon which the technical report was

presented to him and then presented to this House, because since that information was given to the House and the public many other things have become known. South Australia was to get from the Chowilla dam a guarantee of its flow in the Murray River (that is, a guarantee of the total water commitment that we had made) and at the same time we would have had at the head of our area of the Murray River a buffer between us and the salty water in the other States. In addition we would have had a major investment in South Australia that would be a considerable boost to industry and employment. The Premier has given this away in favour of a proposal concerning a better flow in the Murray River and he thinks that more water will come down normally than could be guaranteed from Chowilla. We will have no buffer between us and the other States and we will not have the investment here.

The Premier does this because the crucial point upon which the whole issue turned was the rate of flow of water at Mildura. The reason why it is blithely stated by the River Murray Commission and the technical committee that the Chowilla project could not proceed was that it was required to have at Mildura a flow of water that is not guaranteed to South Australia and a level of salinity about half that which can often be expected at Waikerie. Therefore, Victoria and New South Wales were to be allowed to go back on their undertakings about Chowilla, and we had to subscribe to an investment in Sir Henry Bolte's area in order to provide to his settlers benefits that we could not ensure to our own people.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It was an entirely unrealistic assumption.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and it was unwarranted. After all, we had a legal agreement by which they had undertaken to build Chowilla.

Mr. Burdon: This was agreed to by 500 Parliamentarians.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and their signature is on the dotted line, but the Premier has said that that does not matter. Despite all the undertakings that have been given and despite these facts, he favours this project in Victoria and he considers that South Australia will support him in this and that we on this side of the House will be forced by public opinion to support him on the matter. I assure him that we do not intend to give away the interests of the public of South

Australia for some proposal of his about a dam in Sir Henry's area that will not give to South Australia the guarantees, protection and investment that Chowilla will give.

Clearly, the people of South Australia do not want us to give away their rights to have Chowilla. The people of South Australia are more than two to one in favour of insisting on the Chowilla scheme. If the Premier does not believe that, I suggest that he go to the people on that issue. We will be pleased to oblige him at any time he likes to test that as a single issue with the people, because we consider that our case is just and right and that it is political realism to allow the people to judge this issue.

If ever anyone was carrying on a political campaign about the water supply of South Australia, it was the Liberal Party before the last State election, and the campaign has continued. Members of that Party said that action should not have been taken in 1967 to allow the River Murray Commission to proceed to get evidence about the Chowilla dam and alternatives. They said that, in some way, utterly unspecified, we should have built the dam. When honourable members opposite were constantly asked what action the South Australian Government could take in these circumstances, there was polite silence. They would not say precisely how it was to be done. Did they suggest that we go up and build it? They knew perfectly well that, even if we had the money, we alone could not have built it.

Mr. Rodda: Would you build it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assure the honourable member that I will use every legal means available, including going to arbitration, to insist on getting our rights. I have never claimed that my Government alone can build the Chowilla dam.

Mr. Broomhill: Liberal members did.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course. Honourable members opposite said before the last State election, without any qualification, that they would build it. I will produce quotations to that effect that appeared in the *Renmark Pioneer*, the *Advertiser*, and other newspapers many times. The present Government stated in its election posters, "We will build the Chowilla dam." There was no qualification about it.

Mr. Broomhill: As a matter of urgency.

Mr. Casey: You said that, didn't you?

Mr. Rodda: No.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We will produce the advertisements, if the honourable members wishes.

Mr. Rodda: I asked you whether you'd build it. I don't want any of your clever remarks.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have told the honourable member that I cannot claim that my Government could build the Chowilla dam. All we can claim is that we will use every legal means available to insist on our rights under the agreement. This Government is not using legal means that are available. We will go to the limit to support Chowilla, not to give it away.

Mr. Rodda: You won't be happy until you have an election?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The simple question at present is, "Is the Government prepared to fight for Chowilla dam, or is it prepared to give it away?" The Government has said quite plainly that it is giving it away, but we will not do that. That is the difference. When we were in office we did not claim without qualification that we would be able to build the Chowilla dam. We could only say that we would fight to the utmost for it. We intend to do that and we will use every means available to us. The Premier, instead of trying to insist on our rights under the agreement, has said, "Chowilla is not the best proposition for South Australia." He is giving it away.

Mr. McAnaney: Do you say it is the best?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. McAnaney: Better than Dartmouth?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. McAnaney: You want to refer things to experts, yet you ignore their advice.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe in getting the advice of experts on many matters but I consider that it is absolutely essential, in the interests of the State, that those who have the responsibility of public office evaluate the report of any technical expert, because the technical expert is not elected or given public responsibility. If members opposite think the advice of experts is to be taken always, why do they now say that the original advice of the experts on Chowilla was wrong? They cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Rodda: We are looking forward, not back.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is much evidence that members opposite do not understand the public responsibility of evaluating the advice of public servants or expert committees.

Mr. Clark: The Premier consults astrology.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and that is a horror not only for him but also for South Australia. The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study is just an example of the Government's refusal to evaluate expert advice. If there were any case where a piece of financial nonsense was presented to the Government, it was the financial section of that report. It was utterly absurd, it was quite ludicrous, and it contained a whole series of provisions, which the member for Stirling, in his wisdom, must know were utterly unconstitutional. If that section had ever been shown to the Under Treasurer, he would have thrown his hands in the air with horror and said, "What are these people thinking of?". Apparently, it was shown to the Treasurer, but he could not have read it.

Mr. Corcoran: They were the recommendations of experts.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. I notice now that the financial section has somehow or other been deferred. I wonder why. Why is the Government not accepting the advice of the experts on that section? Why has it deferred the report on that particular matter? Is the Government evaluating it?

Mr. McAnaney: Very definitely.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In that case, why is not every other member of Parliament involved in evaluating any technical report that comes into this place and in making a decision on behalf of his constituents? I assure the honourable member that when I was in office there were numbers of occasions when technical reports were presented to me and when I said, "That is no good; it obviously will not work. Go back and do it again." If the present Government does not do that from time to time it ought not to be sitting where it is and is not capable of doing its job in regard to evaluating reports.

The next thing we have seen is the action (or inaction) of the Government relating to the building industry. This industry asked for two things when we were in office: first, that the industry should be stabilized and the service to the public effectively controlled to ensure adequate standards of service and undertakings by the registration of builders.

A Bill for the registration of builders passed this House with the support of all sections of the industry. It is certain that the Premier (Leader of the Opposition, as he then was) said it was a piece of dreadful Socialist regimentation, and he endeavoured to ferment some disaffection in certain sections of the building industry in order to try to have attacks made on the measure, but he was unsuccessful.

Then, when I had got agreement with the building industry about the terms of the Bill, he said I was vacillating when, in fact, I was accepting the submissions of members of the industry. Their submissions were accepted, the Bill passed, the appointment was made of the Builders Registration Board, and initial appointments were made to the advisory committee, which was to advise on the regulations. What has happened since? The Government has shelved it. The regulations have not been promulgated, although the Government has had ample time to do this. The relevant sections of the Bill have not been proclaimed to bring builders' registration into force, and the public is not receiving any more protection from incompetent builders than it was receiving prior to the passing of the Act. The building industry, in consequence, has not been stabilized and, if there is an expansion in speculative building in South Australia, we will have the same uncontrolled situation that led to disaster previously in South Australia, with people who are in no way qualified going into the industry as building brokers and using subcontractors to jerry-build houses. What else did the building industry ask for? The builders asked for greater investment in building in South Australia and, in consequence, I set out to obtain a greater investment in building here. Over a period of many months, I negotiated to obtain an undertaking for investment in South Australia in the West Lakes scheme.

Mr. Broomhill: It took 24 hours, we were told today!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The negotiations lasted many months. In fact, the initial submissions for the consortium were made to me in November, 1967. Prior to that, there had been discussions concerning the formation of the consortium, lasting about three months.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: But the Premier said this afternoon that the departments had to make a decision within 24 hours.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will deal with that in a moment; that is just the usual sort of statement he makes. The original plans of the Playford Government which had been put to the Public Works Committee were evaluated by the consortium's engineers after the consortium had made its original submissions to Government, and the engineers produced a new proposal, because the original engineering advice given to the Public Works Committee was said to be quite unsatisfactory. Therefore, the original scheme had to be redesigned and the costs re-assessed, and it was significant that the original plan submitted by the Playford Government had itself been based on a financial proposition which the Under Treasurer had said was impossible.

That was quite correct: it was impossible. There was no way of providing the money as had been submitted by the Playford Government, and that was clearly the Under Treasurer's opinion. Moreover, the costs of the original Playford scheme had been hopelessly under-estimated, and it is significant that not a penny piece had been set aside or any evidence given relating to the mining leases that existed in the area.

Mr. Corcoran: That is fairly important, too, isn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It involves only about \$600,000! There was nothing on this score in relation to the costs of the proposal. This was the efficiency with which the Playford Government had prepared the scheme! Therefore, we had to do the whole thing over again. The consulting engineers for the consortium were brought in, and they advanced a scheme which was then submitted to all relevant Government departments. It was submitted, first, to Cabinet; the Ministers took away the submissions to their departments; and I asked that the next day the Public Service heads of their departments meet with me so that we could outline the basis of work that was to proceed. Those officers met me at the Highways Department building and an outline was then given to them of the plan. They were asked to go on from there, to evaluate it and to bring back any objections from their departments. They were not asked to do that in 24 hours.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: They were asked to meet you in 24 hours to hear the proposal.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly, and they did so. That all took place, and the departments reported on their views of the submissions of the consortium before a public

announcement was made; and the public announcement was made before the election campaign began. However, the indenture was not completed and signed until April, so where was this 24 hours business involved?

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Only in the minds of people with an uncontrollable imagination.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The indenture was completed urgently at my request, not because the Government demanded that the indenture be completed at that date but because (as the Premier well knows—this is the way in which he tries to mislead this House and the public) the Chairman of Development Finance Corporation, Mr. Marks, asked me urgently that it be done. He required it and he told the Premier that he required it, and I know he did. So, for the Premier to come here and talk about political gimmickry—and that was all it was—is playing the lousiest kind of politics. What has come out since? The Government did not proceed urgently with the scheme. Its basis had been agreed.

The indenture contemplated that a number of further details would be required in further work to be done by the engineers, by the Local Government Department, by other departments, by the solicitors consulting the consortium and by the Government. It was contemplated that they would be incorporated in the indenture and in the legislation. It was months before the Government took any further action in that matter at all. It considerably delayed proceeding with the West Lakes scheme. Before the election it had condemned the proposal and said that if it got into office it would go on with the original Playford scheme. The present Treasurer, who had been Minister of Works in the Playford Government, said that that was what they were going to do.

When the present Government got into office it found that this political gimmick, as the Premier calls it, was so well founded that it had to base the whole of its action on it. All that has come out of the subsequent work on this scheme has confirmed the original basic design and the original arrangements made with the consortium, the very consortium with which we signed an indenture. There is only a minor modification in the original design.

The Premier has said that the Housing Trust will be involved, but it was to be involved in the original scheme. The Premier has said

that South Australian builders will be involved, but that was a term of the original indenture. The Premier has said that the Minister will have control of the design, but he was to have control under the original scheme. In fact, the Labor Government obtained an undertaking that a vast sum of money, then set at not less than \$85,000,000, would be involved in the development of the West Lakes area by the consortium brought together by the Development Finance Corporation. This was a complete departure from the previous proposal of the Playford Government, and it is the basis on which the present Government has acted. Now, although the Government was correct in acting on it, I am sorry it has been so slow about it.

I knew what was going on. Great heavens, the Premier must think I am blind or deaf or something if he thinks I did not know what was transpiring in regard to this matter. After all, it was I who negotiated the whole original deal and I wanted to see that it was done for the benefit of South Australia. I am not condemning this scheme or the modifications. I believe the West Lakes scheme is good for the development of South Australia, and I am glad that the present Government has at last got the new indenture signed and that it is going to proceed. For the Premier, then, having worked out his scheme on the basis of the one prepared by the previous Government, to try to play the kind of politics that he did this afternoon exposes who is playing politics with South Australia's interests at present.

It is significant that, at the time that a public announcement was made on this matter jointly by the Chairman of the Development Finance Corporation and the Premier, none of that material in it was made public. Why not?—because Development Finance Corporation, I am sure, is not going to involve itself in a scheme that is used for political gimmickry and as a political football. I am sorry that the Government's record on each of these things has not been a record of building adequately or with sufficient speed upon the basis that was left to it. In many cases the present Government's departures from the plans previously laid and from the provisions that were made for development in this State have been to South Australia's detriment.

I wish that we could persuade the Government to get away from doctrinaire politics. It should not simply talk about private enterprise and the benignity of its attitude towards it—it should get down to some practical work.

If the present Government goes on as it is doing—not effectively using all the bases provided for it, not developing South Australia in the way that it must go in industrial development—if it increases the costs here so that it inhibits future development, if it produces such a credibility gap as it now has over water supply and development in South Australia, then South Australia will suffer further. I hope that the next Governor's Speech that we hear will be from a Government that has at least listened to some of the advice given to it or, alternatively, I hope that the Speech will be prepared by a Government that has the support of the majority of the people of South Australia.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I thought that my speech might be easy to make, but the Leader of the Opposition has simply gone over the same ground that has been covered again and again. He covered no new points. The weakness of his speech is that he did not produce any figures at all, and it is by facts and figures that one must prove whether things are successful. There is a saying that it pays to advertise, but one has to deliver the goods. It can be seen from statistics that, when the Leader of the Opposition was Premier, he did not deliver the goods. Now, South Australia is going ahead again because there is a feeling of confidence that there will not be the restrictive attitude that the Labor Government pursued.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the building industry. Why did it go slack?—because our growth in population fell from 3 per cent to 1 per cent in three years, the lowest figure for any State. Empty houses were available and it was unnecessary to build more houses quickly. Now we are getting an upsurge in population and our dynamic leader has been overseas and told potential migrants that jobs are available to them. This will get the housing industry going! The Leader of the Opposition wanted builders to be registered, and perhaps this is necessary. However, would it have resulted in the building of one more house? No! Indeed, it might have restricted the number of houses built. The Leader of the Opposition wanted electricians to be registered. Now, no-one is available in Strathalbyn to mend pumps because the person who previously did this work is not allowed to do it. That is the type of restriction that keeps us back and destroys confidence in the State.

Mr. Langley: Read the Act. The country is exempted, and you know it.

Mr. McANANEY: That is not so, because this person applied for a licence and the committee set up by you refused it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. McANANEY: I thought I should reply to the member for Unley. As long as your ruling applies to all members, Sir, it is all right with me. We came into office two months after we should have, because the Leader of the Opposition hung on to the reins of Government as long as he could. Therefore, for two months no major decision was made in South Australia.

Mr. Clark: No major decision has been made since.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. Hughes: What do you mean by implying that you were entitled to come into government?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stirling will be seated. Honourable members are aware that, under the Standing Orders, interjections are out of order. Having repeatedly called the House to order, I ask members to observe my request. If they persist in interjecting, I shall have to take other action.

Mr. McANANEY: Thank you for your protection, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think that the building industry will definitely go ahead now if we can attract back to the State sufficient of the trained people who went to other States and if we can bring in migrants skilled in this industry. It takes a little courage to invite more migrants to South Australia. When they come they bring their skills and capital, thus creating a demand for housing. Our economy under the Labor Government went down the trough, but now that there is confidence that the State will progress it is coming up again. The Leader tried to pull South Australia down, saying it lacked something. Possibly this is the poorest State agriculturally, but our farmers are the leaders in agriculture, having gone to Western Australia and Queensland to show farmers there the way to do things. Perhaps people here have had a harder time but they are prepared to rise to the occasion and have achieved many things that have not happened elsewhere.

As a Socialist, the Leader says that the State must do all the planning for the future.

State planning is always found to be too rigid and slow and does not achieve what it is set up to do. Recently I went to an accountancy conference at Victor Harbour, where I shared a room with a leading company secretary from Adelaide. He told me that his firm has a conference every month, attended by the sales manager, planning and manufacturing executives, and so on, to analyse the market and to work out what has to be provided. Private industry can accomplish this sort of thing. The facilities are there to be used. Being on the University of Adelaide Council, I know that many people from industry call on professors (who are accused of being impractical and of giving students the wrong idea) for advice, which they readily obtain. The State Library can supply information from any part of the world. We will progress more by leaving things to individual thought, activity and initiative than by saying, as the Leader says, that it must be practically the whole responsibility of the Government to create the right conditions and do the necessary planning.

Mr. Clark: When did he say that?

Mr. McANANEY: Let us consider the railways and other utilities with which the Government is connected. An example of efficiency is not set there. I do not criticize public servants as a whole, for I find that they are energetic and conscientious.

Mr. Corcoran: Is this the square off?

Mr. McANANEY: However, it leads to a different sort of attitude to life from that found in private enterprise.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think we should sack them all?

Mr. McANANEY: The Public Service plays an important part in the administration of Government, but when the need is to plan and meet what the consumer wants it is far better to leave this to private enterprise.

Mr. Corcoran: What you're saying is that they are inefficient.

Mr. McANANEY: I have a very sore point to raise with the ex-Minister of Lands regarding something he did about drought relief. He said to the people of South Australia, "Rush out and buy hay and we will pay for it," but, when it came to the point, the Government did not pay for it.

Mr. Corcoran: That's a lie.

Mr. McANANEY: I was at the meeting at Wunkar.

Mr. Corcoran: It's still a lie.

Mr. McANANEY: It is not: it is the absolute truth. He said, "Go out and buy hay and send the bills to us." In the emotion of a big meeting the ex-Minister of Lands got carried away.

Mr. Corcoran: That's a lie.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Millicent can reply in due course.

Mr. Rodda: Haven't they been paid yet?

Mr. McANANEY: Most were paid, but in certain instances of people who did not have the wherewithal to show that they could pay for the hay the Government said it would not pay and that the person who sold the hay to such people would have to take the responsibility.

Mr. Corcoran: You are telling lies.

Mr. McANANEY: If the honourable member can prove I am wrong, I will apologize. When I have been proved wrong before, I have done so, and possibly I am the only member here who will do that.

Mr. Clark: You're often wrong.

Mr. McANANEY: The Leader of the Opposition criticized us for lifting price control on a number of items. He never worries about figures, and he did not refer to the cost of living index to see how costs in this State have risen over this period compared with costs in other States. If he had done this he would have found that during that period costs in South Australia have not risen as quickly as those in some of the other States. Also, despite the fact that we had price control and the other States did not, our cost of living is not below that of the other States.

Mr. Clark: We don't have price control any more.

Mr. McANANEY: The point I make is that the cost of things has not gone up as much as it has in other States.

Mr. Clark: Who are you kidding? Ask your wife.

Mr. Broomhill: Give us some of the figures you say you have.

Mr. McANANEY: The Leader of the Opposition is considered a bright boy by a lot of people, but many of them wondered what was wrong with the Hon. Don when, referring to the report on Chowilla dam, he said that when experts came up with something not in his interests he did not agree.

Mr. Clark: Who told you that?

Mr. McANANEY: He said this afternoon, "You do not consider the expert advice: you consider yourself." That is right: no-one will get one into more trouble on a particular matter than an expert will. I have lived near the lakes for 30 years: I was born near them. No reservoir would be better than Dartmouth for the people living on the lower reaches of the Murray River. The more we analyse what the experts say and what their findings are, the more we realize that Dartmouth is much the better proposition for South Australia.

In time, we will drain Lake Albert and Lake Alexandrina to save evaporation. As we have an average of 8,000,000 acre feet of water coming down the Murray each year, we cannot afford to lose 1,000,000 acre feet a year at Chowilla. This is my personal opinion, not necessarily that of the Government: I doubt whether, from a scientific point of view, Chowilla will ever be built. I qualify that by saying that I am already making inquiries about the flow of water down the Darling and its lower reaches. I am confident that New South Wales and Victoria will in the next few years have sufficient dams in their rivers to control or contain all the waters that come from the tributaries in an average year. When they do that, the water coming from those tributaries will have no effect on South Australia. Only in the wet years would we get much water in the Chowilla dam.

I was one of the first to start irrigating from Lake Alexandrina, and I know that it is the dry year we are worrying about. This year the lake is full and water will be running at the end of summer. I have difficulty in convincing the Engineering and Water Supply Department that it should be possible to get a licence to irrigate temporarily in the coming year, on the understanding that the licence will be revoked when there is a shortage of water.

Mr. Corcoran: This is the trouble they had in New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr. McANANEY: The impractical and theoretical honourable member is not using common sense in his argument. Much water is available in the lake now, and people could be planting potatoes and various other crops that would not need water after Christmas. Lucerne could be irrigated this year, and it could be left for a year without damage to its future in any way. Just now I was stressing the rigidity of mind that we find in Government departments: they are not flexible in

their ideas, and they must be flexible. We must be ready to adjust ideas to changing circumstances. It was stated that an irrigation licence would be issued only to those people already irrigating. Now we find through administrative action that people have licences for areas that are not planted. That is a serious administrative mistake; it should not have happened.

It was said that we were not looking after South Australia's water supplies, but the indication is that we shall get more water from Dartmouth in the dry years, in which reservoirs must provide the water. In most years we do not have to worry about it because there is plenty of water higher up in the system. In every country in the world water storages are always in the upper reaches of rivers. Even though a reservoir takes a year or two to fill, when it is filled it is a reservoir in the correct sense of the word, in that it reserves water for the years when it is required. Chowilla will not do this because, although it will be filled frequently in wet years, the amount of evaporation will mean that it will not tide us over a dry period, as Dartmouth will. When one has lived on the lakes, one can appreciate the effects of evaporation on this dam.

I congratulate our two new members who moved and seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. They have shown they are people who look up statistics and have demonstrated that there is growth in South Australia at present. It does not matter what aspect we look at—whether it is building or other things that show signs of improvement.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Tell us about the new industries.

Mr. McANANEY: In the last three years of the Playford Government 40,000 people went into employment. Those are the things that count. What happened in the last three years of the Labor Government? The number of people in employment increased hardly at all. Now the courageous action of the Premier in inviting more migrants here means that our population rate is growing, which is important. The number of people in employment is increasing, and increasing more rapidly than during the term of office of the last Government. I am told that there are 13,000 more this year. That is getting back to the good record of Sir Thomas Playford. These are the things that count—more people in employment, which means that more goods are produced. The trade unions advocate this.

Mr. Hawke, in the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission some time ago, said that the wage proportion of the gross national production had been more or less static over the last 30 years and he wanted an improvement in some way or other. It does not matter whether we increase wages or what we do: they more or less remain a static proportion of the gross national production. The Government has recreated confidence in South Australia and, if these additional men are being employed, that indicates that more goods are being produced and more overtime worked.

Mr. Broomhill: How much more overtime?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stirling is making his speech.

Mr. McANANEY: The more employment there is, the more every man, woman and child shares in it. We have a record of achievement of which I think we can justly be proud. One matter that is of interest to the man on the land at the moment is the future activities of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. I am looking forward to the report that is issued every three years indicating what we can do to maintain these vital killing works in South Australia. I feel strongly that the private abattoirs at Murray Bridge and other towns had been unjustly penalized in having to pay excessive charges for health inspections. Perhaps they got them at a reduced price for some years but we must face the fact that they are now paying more than they should; we must see to it that in the interests of decentralization these killing works are not held back in any way.

The member for Gumeracha said that forestry was growing in the Adelaide Hills. Some of this land must be given over to forestry so that our reservoirs can be protected. I support this. There are some areas where land is being bought for that purpose. In time, this will be regretted, because this land will be needed for grazing to keep the people of Adelaide supplied with produce. If more of this land comes under afforestation problems will arise for district councils in those areas, because they have to maintain roads into these plantations but are not paid rates. I give the Government full credit for its policy of afforestation and for its past achievements, but it should pay rates on this land. Many Government-owned buildings do not put a strain on the road system and perhaps the Government should not be responsible for the rates

in every case, but where it uses its land as a business proposition the Government should not place burdens on councils in those areas. The Leader of the Opposition criticized the M.A.T.S. plan after he returned from America with ideas that we should use capsules. Recently, I spoke to an expert from America and he said that capsules were only in the experimental stage in America, and were used on a small scale in Japan.

Mr. Freebairn: Will they hang the capsules on stobie poles when they are not being used?

Mr. McANANEY: Capsules may ultimately be used, but at present something must be done about our overcrowded roads. The main arterial city roads are being widened gradually but this is expensive, and this cost is one of the main costs under the M.A.T.S. plan. The cost of improved public transport will have to be met from Loan funds, and not sufficient revenue will be returned to finance the service charges on the loans or pay the running costs. Public transport is an important part of the plan, and more people should be encouraged to use it.

The Royal Australian Institute of Architects criticized the plan and said that if it were introduced fewer hospitals and schools would be built. I cannot understand this attitude, because the cost of freeways will be met by the motorists who use them and the freeways will be paid for when completed. The institute's argument seemed to be that fewer hospitals and schools would be built because money would be used to provide public transport, but this is not so. I think that those who were responsible for the M.A.T.S. plan exceeded their duty when they suggested how it should be paid for. This is a Government responsibility, but the plan itself is similar to that which practically every city in the world has had to introduce. In Melbourne it is difficult to find the way out on the Sydney road: it is a narrow road with trams and other public transport, and the traffic is usually in complete chaos. If the M.A.T.S. plan had been introduced some years ago when our population and industrial growth were much greater it would have cost less and been more effective.

Country people seem to be concerned that less money will be spent on country roads if the M.A.T.S. plan is implemented, but this is not so, as a certain proportion of money will also be spent on country roads. The construction of freeways will also benefit

country people who will be able to transport their goods on them, thus making the journey more quickly and cheaply.

Mr. Burdon: Are you supporting the M.A.T.S. plan and the \$10 increase in motor registration fees to pay for it?

Mr. McANANEY: The question of financing the M.A.T.S. plan has yet to be determined. It is suggested that it will be completed in 18 years, but the plan is flexible and no doubt will be developed according to the demands of the people and the revenue received from motorists. If we could get back to the growth rate that we used to have, with more employment and more motor cars, more revenue would be received and, although the need for roads would be more apparent, the plan would be implemented more quickly. I cannot see any reason for changing the route of the freeway through the southern areas to the south coast. More open areas were to be used under the original scheme, but now the route is through Edwardstown, with a subsequent increase in cost. Perhaps the experts may not have considered the cost aspect as much as they should have done.

Generally the idea of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transport Study plan is good and it should be introduced. The main benefit of the plan will be that when it has been completed it will have been paid for by the people using the roads. If this philosophy could be introduced into the running of Government business, Governments would operate better and there would not be the hindrance to the community where losses are made by providing services to one section so that a tax has to be imposed to compensate that loss. If the Budget were analysed it would be found that most money raised by the States in taxation was spent on servicing capital that had been borrowed and from which there was no material return. Admittedly, schools produce educated children, and hospitals are necessary, but most money raised by taxation helps to pay for losses sustained on such things as drainage works, railway operations, and the provision of a water supply. These losses cause other taxation to be imposed on people who are not receiving a service. This is why government is becoming more complicated and is not being respected as it should be, because we are getting away from the basic principle that those receiving the service should pay for it. The taxation reimbursement received from the Commonwealth should bear some relationship to the increase in national production each year.

We must avoid incurring losses and must make our public utilities, such as the railways and the water authorities, more efficient. If our railways are not providing adequate service, we must allow road transport to take over.

Mr. Freebairn: You agree with the closure of uneconomic railway lines, don't you?

Mr. McANANEY: I hope members realize my point that, if a utility is not providing an adequate service at a reasonable cost, an alternative must be adopted.

Mr. Freebairn: How many lines in South Australia would you say were making a reasonable return?

Mr. McANANEY: We must have the main arterial lines, and there is something wrong with the Railways Department if it cannot compete with road transport. If it cannot do so, experts should be appointed to find out the reason for any loss being incurred. The State has the responsibility of cutting down the drain on its resources and income. The aspect on which I condemn the Commonwealth Government is that that Government receives about \$500,000,000 each year in taxation (much more than is being spent on such services as defence and health) and, in addition, in almost every year the Commonwealth Government issues varying amounts of credit funds and lends these to the States, at interest.

This money should be given to the States as a grant for the provision of such facilities as schools and hospitals. True, no material cash return is obtained from these facilities, but they are an extremely important and necessary part of our way of life. However, the Commonwealth Government lends a part of the money collected in income tax to the States, requiring repayment over 53 years. For every \$1,000,000 so borrowed at little cost to the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth receives back \$2,600,000 in interest and principal repayments over 53 years.

The Commonwealth Treasurer says that, if he does not get the money back, he will have to increase income tax, but this increase would be only gradual. In the next year the Commonwealth Government's cost of getting it back would be a few million dollars. Ultimately, this taxation must be increased if the Commonwealth Government does not get the money back, but the taxation would be in the form of income tax. University professors and other people who advocate increased expenditure on education say that they are willing to pay additional income tax to enable this to be

done. We get back to a better system of bookkeeping and, provided the States put their own houses in order and the Commonwealth Government takes a reasonable approach, the States would get out of trouble. I am a little afraid that, if the States receive increased taxation reimbursements, they will still borrow and have a problem because the money collected will not always be spent wisely.

The Attorney-General, when in Opposition, was keen on the appointment of an ombudsman. Because of the additional matters in which the Government is becoming involved (such as the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, which involves acquisition and other matters) there is a need for an ombudsman who can act neutrally and at no great cost to the individual. Although our British justice is the highest and fairest form of justice in the world, many people find that stating a case, or engaging counsel to do so, is beyond their resources. An ombudsman could handle many matters at little cost to the individual.

The Minister of Roads and Transport (Hon. C. M. Hill) has said that it is the Government's policy to build bridges to replace ferries, but some ferries will never be replaced.

Mr. Rodda: Are there any fairies in your district?

Mr. McANANEY: Yes. The Hindmarsh Island ferry will never be replaced and I do not think the Minister is looking far into the future when he makes such statements. Already, the ferry cannot handle the traffic. As tourist traffic develops south of Adelaide, and such areas as Christies Beach expand, many more people will visit the area, which provides the best boating and fishing facilities for tourists. A bridge must be built at Hindmarsh Island ultimately.

I think the Government has achieved much and I have stressed what has been done in regard to the building industry and the population increase. A consideration of the various items, such as education and health, in the Consolidated Revenue accounts for the period ended May 31 shows that we are taking a definite lead and providing things that are important to our people. When we have the economy going we get more revenue from the various taxes, without increasing the rates. In a disastrous year or two when the Labor Government was in office the amounts coming in and the estimates were often much lower than they are now. Before the last election the present Premier said that, if we get things

going, we will get more in. Despite the statement by the Leader of the Opposition that the demand in other States for motor cars dropped and got us into trouble, let us consider the registration figure for South Australia. This figure was down to practically half what it normally would be, but vehicle registrations in South Australia are now increasing, and we are maintaining our position in comparison with that, for example, of Victoria. Therefore, more money is coming in which can be spent on roads, and we shall be able to implement M.A.T.S. more quickly because of increased revenue. We are again becoming a dynamic force, and things are now really moving.

I am sure that we shall be able to progress even further if the Leader of the Opposition does not in the future see fit to get up and decry South Australia, implying that it is incapable of doing something on its own or of accomplishing anything without there first being much Government planning and interference. We will maintain the present growth rate provided we can offer improved education services, etc., to people whom we invite to come to our State. New schools have been built and contain every necessary facility. Indeed, we have very good schools: when I was undertaking night courses in my younger day, I used to sit on a wooden box which, albeit uncomfortable, kept me awake. Perhaps in that statement is implicit criticism of the fine new schools.

Although I am not offering a solution here (and perhaps, therefore, I should not be criticizing this aspect), I point out that the older schools are definitely at a disadvantage at present. We must help these schools establish ovals and certain other amenities by providing a subsidy, whereas, in the case of a new school, the oval and everything else required are provided at the outset. Although the policy in this regard is slowly being changed, a priority list still exists and in many cases only the larger schools are receiving the things they require. I hope and trust that sufficient money will soon be provided so that every school in South Australia, whether it be big or small, and irrespective of the area in which it is situated, will uniformly receive amenities. I congratulate the mover and seconder on their contributions to this debate; they did a splendid job in pointing to the marvellous improvement that has taken place in South Australia's growth rate. Indeed, I am confident that, under our strong leadership and with the energetic members occupying the

back benches behind our Leader, South Australia will continue in the future to regain its rightful position in relation to the other States.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): In supporting the motion, I am somewhat in a state of confounded confusion, having listened to the member who has just resumed his seat and who opened his remarks by challenging the Leader of the Opposition. When he set out to quote figures to try to prove his facts, I was led to believe that we would hear some sort of argument advanced by the honourable member but, in fact, not one figure did he show (other than his own ugly figure) to prove his case. He continued at length to make wild statements, and finally told a fairy tale (or a tale about a ferry), concerning which I was not surprised; indeed, his whole speech was one of a "furry" nature. We are accustomed to hearing the honourable member speak along these lines, but it is difficult to understand how he has the effrontery to get up in this place and challenge someone else to prove a case when he himself carries on so ineffectively in trying to prove his own case.

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

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not want to say much more about the speech of the member for Stirling. I have much sympathy for him as he made a gallant attempt at short notice to fill in: obviously other members were not ready to speak. However, I was a little disappointed at his criticism of some Government departments. Having had considerable dealings with Government departments, I say without qualification that we have an excellent Public Service. I believe that the heads of departments are men with outstanding qualities who apply themselves sincerely and with ability to their task. One of the most gratifying things about public servants is that I have never known them to play politics: they serve the Government of the day with all their ability. After I had to leave the Ministry because of a change of circumstances, I said that all I asked of the Public Service was that it support the Government of the day as it had supported me when I was in the Ministry.

I wish His Excellency the Governor and Lady Harrison well during their stay in South Australia. With due respect to all his predecessors, it is with pride and pleasure that we welcome as Her Majesty's representative a truly distinguished Australian. I thank you,

Mr. Speaker, all members, and the House staff for the kindness shown me during the time of my indisposition. This was greatly appreciated. Many members were exceedingly kind and I assure them that my wife, my family and I appreciated this very much. I offer special thanks to the member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday), who so graciously took over most of my work. Also, I thank the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) and the Hon. A. F. Kneebone, who rendered valuable assistance.

I join with those members who have expressed sympathy to the families of those members of this Parliament who have passed on in the last 12 months. Except for the Hon. Mr. Goode, I knew all of them personally. While expressing appreciation for the sincere and faithful service given by all of those members, I wish to refer to one of them with whom I differed politically but whom I was honoured to look upon as a personal friend. In expressing my sympathy to his family, I am joined by thousands of people because, as he lived, he proved to all with whom he came in contact that he was a man of understanding who gave detailed attention to the welfare of his fellow man. If ever it can be said that this earth was better off for a man's being, it can truly be said of the late Bob Wilson.

At this stage I should like to refer to the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It is with feelings of envy and sympathy that I refer to the member for Gumeracha. How I wish I could write as he did! I appreciate that his speech was made with little research by himself but rather from the materials supplied by the departments.

Mr. Venning: They worked well together.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I must admit, nevertheless, that it was well compiled. The member for Rocky River said they worked well together. I agree—pulling in opposite directions most of the time. The member for Gumeracha, although being a rather better reader than I am, I am convinced read most poorly, and the events of the day proved undoubtedly that the House was bored beyond what it could take. On the other hand, the speech by the member for Onkaparinga, who seconded the motion, was most interesting by its variation in a display with patches of arrogance and ignorance and signs of common sense. I say this with a desire to help the honourable gentleman.

Mr. Clark: You could have omitted the last few words.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I believe in giving credit where credit is due and reserve the right to criticize where I feel that criticism is justified. This honourable gentleman has undoubted ability and, if he applies himself constructively, he will go places. I suggest to him, however, that before he talks about what should be done in a manner that implies that others, particularly public servants, do not know what they are doing, he should talk with them and learn the true facts, because the officers of the departments are always willing to talk. I am confident they never move without making thorough investigations.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I thought your Leader this afternoon did not go along with that idea.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: He did not say anything different from what I am saying now. He said we had the right to examine their proposal.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: And I believe that. As Minister, I examined proposals and sent some back for reconsideration. I do not think there would be a Minister on the front bench who would say that that was not the right thing to do. I found it difficult to toss them, though.

Mr. Rodda: Having said that, your Leader galloped off madly in the other direction.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Of course, a mentally cross-eyed individual sees all sorts of things. I should point out something further to the member for Onkaparinga. He said, "I know that Labor members have called me the garbage collector at different times." This may be correct, but I assure the honourable gentleman that this was first said, and forcibly so, by a member of his own Party, and it was not intended to suggest that he had ever been engaged in the honourable occupation of collecting household or industrial waste. I ask the honourable member not to suggest that it was Labor men who said that. I do not subscribe to this view, and all Labor members should not be branded as having said this.

Mr. Casey: He said this himself.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Perhaps this may be the time to deal with the speeches in the order in which they were made. We know that the Governor's Speech is prepared by the Government of the day, so that whatever is

said about it is criticism only of the Government. Having read it a couple of times, I say that it is a remarkable document, not because of what it contains but because of what it does not contain. One must admire the skill with which it was prepared, because a corroded Government, eaten by conservatism, indecision and deficiencies, and with a deep division in its own ranks, was painted to appear perfect.

Mr. Edwards: When was this?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It was delivered whilst the honourable member was asleep in the Legislative Council.

Mr. Edwards: I don't go to sleep.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It will be delightful to see the honourable member when he is awake. Paragraph 8 of the Speech refers to education, and I have little fault to find with that which is written, but surely there is another side to education. If there is, should not Parliament and the people also be told? A little political honesty would not be a bad thing. In quoting from a letter I received recently, dated June 23 this year, I will not name the school council or the headmaster. I do not name them, because of a recent sad experience associated with a public servant who, it was claimed, pointed out facts in an indirect way. The letter states:

The high school council took the decision at their last meeting that its members should inform their local member of Parliament that the position at the high school with respect to the teaching staff has deteriorated to a point where the teaching staff is now barely adequate. The headmaster reported to the council at their last meeting that, with four teachers leaving at the end of the first term and inadequate replacements available, the only course available to him was to reduce the number of first-year classes from nine to eight.

Mr. Rodda: It sounds like a "Dear Zara."

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member's interjection was, like the honourable member himself, out of place. The letter continues:

With some 330 first-year students, this means that there are over 40 children in each class. The headmaster made it clear that the school in no way was being treated any worse than any other school in this respect. It would seem that the often quoted term, crisis in education, is no exaggeration.

This is an important factor in the development of our economy and I submit that a matter as important to the welfare of the State as education is not a matter for laughter or

joking. These statements have been written into the Governor's Speech so that we might believe that all is rosy. This is sad.

Mr. Evans: All is better.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member, being antiquated and conservative in his outlook, does not want improvement. He is prejudiced against it. All is not well with education. The problem is real and must be treated seriously. The only way to create interest in education and enthusiasm for it is to tell the truth about the position, because the people of South Australia will meet any call that is made in the interests of the State. I have some sympathy for the Minister of Education and am not blaming the department for many of the present conditions. It is extremely difficult to do better than has been done.

However, I ask members of the Government to recall that, when the Labor Government was in office, we were saying what members of the present Government (particularly the Premier) have been saying loudly and clearly: that the Commonwealth Government must appreciate the financial needs of the country in education. When we said that, we received no support at all from the honourable gentlemen opposite. We were told that we were blaming the Commonwealth for our own deficiencies. I doubt that Government members have the regrets which they should have at this stage. We have seen how they have been prepared to sacrifice respect for popularity.

Mr. Lawn: They can't claim to have even popularity, now.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No; it has been short-lived. Popularity gained by sacrifice of respect is always short-lived.

Mr. Rodda: You found that out.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: We have made observations.

Mr. Rodda: What about the transport Bill?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Members on this side are pleased to belong to a Party that puts the interests of the State first, thus enabling our Leader to show positively where we stand.

Mr. Edwards: We put the State's interests first.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will let the people be the judge of that, if the honourable member's Government gives us the opportunity, and it can do so any time it likes.

Mr. Rodda: Of course, your Leader referred to that today.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: He issued a challenge that the Government was not game to accept.

Mr. Broomhill: Is it accepting his challenge?

Mr. Rodda: He did not give us the basis of it.

Mr. Lawn: You can't speak for Jeff Bate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hindmarsh.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I repeat for the benefit of the member for Victoria that we will go to the people whenever he likes, and the sooner the better. I was pleased to read (as was, I am sure, the South Australian public) the following in the *Advertiser* last Saturday, under the heading, "I Said the Same"—Dunstan":

The Premier (Mr. Hall) was quite right in saying that the Commonwealth was wrecking the very existence of the States by its attitude over Commonwealth-State finances, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday. "In fact, the things Mr. Hall has said on this occasion are thoroughly justified and were almost exactly the same as I said two years ago," Mr. Dunstan said. "At that time, of course, Mr. Hall said I was simply excusing my own deficiencies in administration by blaming the Commonwealth.

The things I said then were true and I am glad he is now saying them also. I also wonder where the 'better deal' that South Australia was promised if we elected a (Federal) Liberal Government has got to. There must be a rewriting of the Federal-States financial agreement. The Commonwealth cannot continue to finance considerable increases in its own departmental expenditure at the expense of the proper rate of increase in States' expenditure on education, health, hospitals and development."

Mr. Rodda: Your Party's policy is to abolish State Governments, anyway.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not know about that. However, having heard such an interjection from the member for Victoria, I think our policy might be justified.

Mr. Rodda: You are not denying it, at any rate.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: We submit, and we have been saying it for years, that the Commonwealth Government cannot continue to finance considerable increases in its own departmental expenditure at the expense of the proper rate of increase for State expenditure in the vital matters of education, health, hospitals, and matters affecting our other departments. I assure you, Mr. Deputy

Speaker, that we urge the Premier to keep up his battle to correct the position, and that we will give him our utmost support in that direction.

Mr. Venning: He's doing a mighty job.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I submit that he is doing the right thing. However, it is a pity that he did not do it when we were in Government and give us the support then that we are prepared to give him in the interests of the State. At that time, he and his Party put politics first. We have heard great criticism this afternoon of the effects of private enterprise and public enterprise, and what was said to be great comparisons between them.

Mr. Rodda: About tax holidays, too.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: If the member for Victoria is not a tax on anyone, I do not know what a tax is. I wish he would make his speech at the right time.

Mr. Clark: Have we ever heard him make a speech?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have heard him make an effort. I wish the honourable member would do a little study, and perhaps then we may be able to listen to him at some future time. We had a suggestion this afternoon that all public enterprise was deficient, that it did not do the job, and that we should not have it.

Mr. Evans: I think the suggestion was that we should make it pay.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, and in many things we do make it pay; but if we made the Engineering and Water Supply Department pay and we reticulated water only where we could get a return for our expenditure, we would not get very much water in the country. I know that it costs \$1.60 in some areas to supply a certain quantity of water and that we get only 30c back. We do this in order to assist the primary producer. However, I submit that if we are looking at only the direct return we are making a false estimate of the value of some of our Government enterprises. It is the indirect returns from the expenditure that we should weigh up when considering whether or not something pays. How many of those interested in rural development would have been able to carry out the development without public enterprise? I appreciate the

work they have done, but would they have been able to do it without the electricity and water supplied by Government enterprises? Of course, they would not.

Mr. Venning: How would we get on without the primary producer?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No person in this House appreciates primary producers more than I do. I have put in more than half my life with them.

Mr. Venning: You should never have left them.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have never left them in spirit. Most of them are mighty people. I will say a little more about primary production later. The Governor's Speech referred to electricity. It is pleasing to members on this side to hear a private enterprise Government referring in such glowing terms to a State enterprise. We have noticed with some concern the unreasonable prejudice of Government members towards State enterprises. For years it has been thought that this so-called private enterprise Party referred to itself as such with the idea of fooling the people. However, some actions of the Government and some statements made recently by its supporters, with which I intend to deal in a future debate, lead me to believe that at least one Minister is prepared to reduce some departments to such an extent that they will not be efficient, and a future Government will be at the mercy of private contractors, who will turn to work that will provide them with the greatest profit. I do not blame private contractors for this, as they must do it. When work is plentiful these contractors will leave other work to Government departments, which will at that stage be stripped of skilled employees.

Years ago, when private enterprise had a complete monopoly over the supply of electricity, the development of industry was handicapped and expansion was almost impossible. The Premier of the day (now Sir Thomas Playford), knowing full well that the survival of the State depended on it, established the State Electricity Trust. His first attempt failed through the action of Liberal and Country League members in another place who voted as instructed by the Establishment. After a bitter power struggle between the Liberals and the Conservatives the former, assured of the support of Labor Party members, with a majority of one put through the Legislative

Council another Bill that brought into being the Electricity Trust of South Australia, the development of which has been tremendous. I have taken out a few figures and, unlike the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) I will prove my point by quoting them. In 1946, the year of commencement, there were 1,146 miles of transmission line; on June 30, 1967, there were 18,256 miles of transmission line, carrying power and light to all parts of the State.

Mr. Edwards: To some parts.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Well, those parts well and reasonably represented have electricity. I am getting some criticism now from the other side, but what private enterprise concern would have done this? None. Let us look at the number of consumers. In 1946 there were 118,262 consumers; in 1967 there were 380,644. Generation capacity increased from 79,000 kilowatts in 1946 to 781,000 kilowatts in 1967. It is good to ask "With what result?" I have not had time to make any comparisons regarding rural development affected by this but I think it would be fairly substantial and probably comparable with industrial development.

Mr. Langley: It makes it easier for them.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Of course it does. They deserve it, and I am glad they have got it. It is good for this State and for those who had the courage to go out and develop the State. In the years 1935-36 to 1939-40 the average number of factories was 2,025; the number of persons employed was 42,337; and the value of production in those years was \$26,338,000. From 1940-41 to 1944-45 there were 2,172 factories with 64,778 employees, the value of production at that time being \$50,210,000. With electricity and industrial development, the latest figures available are for 1965-66, when we had in South Australia 6,065 factories; with 118,343 employees; and the value of production was not \$50,000,000 but \$527,477,000. This is what State enterprise electricity has done in assisting the development of private enterprise. The two must be complementary to one another; we must have both.

I do not condemn private enterprise as such. Private enterprise, while it is private enterprise, is the best enterprise in the world, but it must be supported by public enterprise. These results were made possible by a State enterprise, which, had it not been for Australian Labor Party support, would have been denied us by those who were prejudiced against public enterprise.

Not wishing to take credit from where it is due, I pay tribute to Sir Fred Drew, members of the board, and the General Manager and his staff for their planning and administration, because supplies are provided to places as far apart as Woomera, Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln, and Kangaroo Island, and I predict that in a short time few, if any, places in the State will not have the services of the Electricity Trust. I believe that each member of the board has a great and special ability, and I would hate it to be thought that I was suggesting that any should resign, but when I was a Minister I was concerned that nearly every member of the board was ageing considerably. I looked forward to the time when a vacancy would occur and I would have the right to suggest to the Government that a younger man be appointed. I believe there is room on boards for men of experience and, in some cases, men of advanced years, but I believe that it is unwise to have a board the average age of the members of which is 74 years, as it is on the board of the trust. I should have thought when the most recent appointment was made that it would be wise to appoint a younger man.

The items referred to in paragraphs 15 and 16, with one exception, have appeared in the Governor's Speech for years past: the exception is the fluoridation of the metropolitan water supply. No new works have been announced. As the Bolivar sewage treatment works is a credit to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, I suggest to the Minister of Works that he should arrange for members of Parliament to inspect these works, because a visit would enlighten many of them. The works are magnificent and I should like to visit them, as would many other members, if it could be arranged. Many departmental officers have played an important part in the construction of these works, but a special word of thanks should go to Mr. Hodgson who, although he has retired, started planning these works many years ago. He did a remarkable job on this project.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Bolivar will be completed later this year, when it may be possible to arrange this visit you have mentioned.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I thank the Minister. I should like to know what progress has been made on developing the old Islington sewage farm area. I know that there are difficulties, but I should like to see this large and valuable piece of land used as soon as

possible. I refer now to paragraph 31, which deals mainly with the road systems and the metropolitan transport system. As the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report will be debated later, I shall not discuss that now. However, I am concerned about the way in which some people are being treated regarding compensation when land is acquired for road and highway widening.

Last year I drew attention to the case of a constituent who had been operating premises on the corner of Marion Road and Henley Beach Road. The members of this man's family put their life savings into a small business and then were told that the Highways Department intended to acquire the property. They inquired about compensation, and officers spent much time making assessments of what would be payable. These people were given to understand that they would receive about \$3,000 as compensation, so they continued to carry on the business. The operations were somewhat diminished because of the activities of the Highways Department in the area, but these people realize that that was unavoidable.

However, they were shocked when their solicitor told them that, as their lease had expired, they had no further interest in the business and were not entitled to any compensation. They had spent money on the purchase of plant, refrigerators, counters and scales, and they could not dispose of this equipment because there were no buyers. I wrote to the Minister, and that is where the matter finished.

I refer now to the case of an English lady who lives on the Grange Road. In order to provide her daughter with employment, she invested \$4,000 in a business and took out a lease with the owner of the premises. With this \$4,000 my constituent bought plant, including refrigerators and counters, but she has been told by the owner that after a certain date the Highways Department will own the premises and will be collecting the rent. From what she has been told, my constituent expects that after the lease expires she will not be entitled to any compensation. This poor lady has sunk her life's savings into the business in order to provide employment for her daughter and, although I believe the department is acting in this matter in accordance with its legal rights, I ask the Government to give these people a chance. Having seen the plant in the premises at Grange Road, I am convinced that the lady bought it when it had only a few years' use left and that no-one will now be prepared to buy it, so that it is only of

scrap value. The Treasurer seems to be looking at me with a sympathetic expression; I ask him not to commit himself but to examine the matter to see what can be done.

Mr. Broomhill: Something ought to be done.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: After a private lease expires, there is neither goodwill nor anything else left.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That is the position; no goodwill is left, but it is a pity that the people concerned cannot be told about this when they go into the premises.

Mr. Hurst: They would have expected a renewal of the lease.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: They did in this case. I have passed over paragraph 6 referring to what one used to call primary production, which now, because of industrial development, is referred to as rural production. It may seem strange to honourable members that I have retained an interest in this matter; nevertheless, I do have an interest in it which I am inclined to think will never leave me. Indeed, I believe that the primary producer deserves all the consideration we can give him.

Mr. Corcoran: They're not the only ones who deserve consideration.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Far from it, but these men, despite the dry years, are prepared to carry on. I believe that there is reason to be concerned about the canning and dried fruit industry, but to deal with this subject adequately would take more time than I think members would be prepared to give me. However, I believe that it is necessary for people engaged in this industry to speak with one united voice, for this has paid off in other industries.

Many of us including you, Mr. Speaker, will recall that primary producers were not originally represented by any organization, but when they became organized they were able to speak to greater advantage. Cereal production, particularly wheat production, seems to experience trouble most of the time, whether it be as a result of a dry season or of over-production. It seems to me that the introduction of a quota delivery system is a very sad thing, and is most undesirable. Goodness only knows, the average wheat producer has to be heavily capitalized these days, and in years of low yield he has great difficulty but fights on in the hope that in later years he will be able to find an opportunity at least to balance out. I believe that is how they work and that this is what keeps them going, and if they are

denied this opportunity to balance up the good years I see no hope whatsoever for the share farmer, who will find it unprofitable and impossible to carry on, with no sale for his plant. I believe that something must be done about this matter. I appreciate that a State Government can do but little about it, but I consider that it is time the Commonwealth Government took some satisfactory action in connection with this industry, which is one of our major rural industries.

I will deal now with wool, a product in which I have had the greater experience and in which I still have a great interest. I noticed with interest a line in the Governor's Speech as follows:

In the animal field, production was satisfactory but affected by the depletion in sheep numbers during the 1967 drought.

This may have some meaning, but I would think that to the average person it would have only little meaning. It is with some concern that I view the future of the wool industry in Australia. In the past, stud breeders have done a remarkable job, being favoured with ideal climatic conditions for the production of merino sheep. I acknowledge that, if the world's population was entirely dependent on wool for clothing, there would be many naked people. I say this because I would hate it to be thought that I was saying there was no future for wool. On the contrary, I believe that there are great possibilities for the use of wool in the world, in the future and right now. Further, I am sure that all countries will be using more wool and that, with a continuation of the production in Australia of high quality wool, this industry has a great future.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: At the present price?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Well, I would like to see the price higher. The Treasurer has brought to my notice a very important point. I agree that a small fluctuation in the price could mean the difference between solvency and insolvency.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It could be the difference between being able to sell the wool and not being able to sell it.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Unfortunately, some people think that, because in the past we have been successful in raising the type of sheep that produces some of the finest wool in the world, we can go on living on the reputation of the past. However, we must

not fool ourselves and fall into a state of complacency and isolation, something we seem to be in great danger of doing. I have noticed that many who have gained much wealth are buying up big holdings, indulging in wool production without the necessary background knowledge and carelessly producing a wool that is below the Australian standard, and this is causing me concern. If this continues, nothing but harm can be done to the industry. In 1964-65, the Australian sheep population was 171,000,000, of which 130,000,000 were merinos. At March 31, 1967, the sheep population in South Australia was 18,000,000, of which 15,000,000 were merinos. We must not think we have a world monopoly on merino wool production. On reading a Wool Board White Paper, I find that 50 other countries are so engaged. According to this White Paper of June, 1967, Australia's sheep population of 171,000,000 for 1964-65 was the highest of the five main wool exporting countries. However, it should not be overlooked that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has a sheep population of 135,000,000, of which 50,000,000 are merinos.

Therefore, it can be seen that other countries are engaged in merino wool production. Because of unfavourable environment, it may be said that none of these countries can become a serious rival to Australia in the production of merino wool. Merinos seem to do very well in the Australian climate. Nevertheless, certain facts must be considered. For instance, 20 years ago wool represented about 13.5 per cent of the world textile fibre market whereas today it represents only 8.5 per cent. If the present trend continues it will represent only 4 per cent by 2000, at which time man-made fibres will represent about 67 per cent of the total textile fibre market.

Mr. Venning: Have you any suggestion how the wool industry can be assisted?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I believe that Australian growers and the Government must continue with a full-scale programme of promotion, at the same time seeking the co-operation of all other wool-producing countries. This promotion can be successful only if it is coupled with thoughtful and careful production. Also, I believe that State Governments will possibly be compelled to play a greater role in achieving increased efficiency.

Mr. Rodda: Are you reading all this?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am trying to read my very rough notes.

I am not allowed to read my speech; I have copious notes here roughly written. They are not typed and were not written by anybody else. The State Government must get it over to the people in production that they should not use it as a sideline, that it is essential to produce the best in accordance with Australian standards where the production of wool is not as effective as it should be.

Leaving the Governor's Speech, I direct my attention to the Government's prop-in-chief. Since June 24, some have referred to him as the most merciful prop of crocks. I refer to the mover of the motion, the member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles). I have read his speech. He proves himself a member of great vision—there is no question about that. That is an uncommon quality in members opposite. He had seen clearly the weaknesses not only of the Government but also of certain members and, where he knew there were weaknesses, he made a gallant effort to prop them up. Unfortunately, however, he drew attention to some obvious weaknesses in the Government. He spent much time explaining the State projects and many public works and in giving a progress report on every project and work under construction; yet not once was he able to refer to one project or work that was originated by the present Government.

Surely the Government has done something. Of course it has! I would be unfair not to draw attention to some of the things it has done. When we were in Government, members opposite put out a pamphlet known as the *Voice of South Australia*, a lovely little pamphlet. No. 2 of the series has some beautiful remarks in it. I do not know why, but the writers made one or two errors. For instance, there is one article about a 43-year-old clerk. They made a mistake in the year, and what they did not write was that this clerk was an L.C.L. candidate, who said that the then Government spent too much money on Royal Commissions. It is a funny thing, but recently I learned of a Select Committee that had already spent \$4,670.55.

Mr. Broomhill: And it has only just started.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Of course. Further, I believe that the people of South Australia realize it was a committee appointed at the expense of the public for political purposes. I will quote several other items from this document, because they are so interesting.

Mr. Giles: Are they featured in the Governor's Speech?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: They would have made interesting reading if they had been.

Mr. Rodda: Where did you get your copy of the document?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: They were distributed, but we know full well that some L.C.L. members, realizing that they had made a horrible mistake, tried to retrieve them, but they were unsuccessful.

Mr. Broomhill: There were many in gutters down our way and you could pick them up anywhere.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Some were floating in pools of water in small pipes, too. Quoting from the pamphlet, a 38-year-old teacher, daughter of an L.C.L. member of the Legislative Council, said that the Labor Government was not capable of running the State's finances; a 47-year-old banker, who had been a member of the L.C.L. for 20 years, said, "I don't like the Government's sheer lack of performance since the election"; a 50-year-old company secretary, who was secretary of a country branch of the L.C.L., said that the Labor Government had allowed the cost of living to rise; and a 56-year-old fitter, president of a sub-branch of the Liberal Party, said, "They're not doing enough for the worker." This is the type of propaganda put out by the Liberal Party when we were in Government but, apparently, members of the Government have not been talking to these people since, because the Government's record is such that it would not like people to speak about it.

Let us consider the previous Budget and the subsequent actions of the Government. First, there is a receipt duty of 1c in each \$10, similar to that operating in Victoria: this may be extended to cover wages and salaries, too. Is this an action by a Government that is looking after the workers? Every extra cent is a charge that will be imposed later on the consumer. I wonder what the company secretary would say about this?

Secondly, a stamp duty of \$2 on a certificate of compulsory third party motor car insurance. Apparently, someone instructed the Motor Vehicles Department to send a notice to a poor limbless person, who normally would receive a concession on these charges, that he must supply a doctor's certificate to prove that he had only one leg. If he goes to the Motor Vehicles Department on crutches, the department will not accept that. Apparently, the authorities do not believe their own eyes. The man has to pay for a doctor's certificate, which eats up the concession he gets.

Mr. Ferguson: You have to provide a doctor's certificate to prove that you have a heart, too.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: If some members who interject so freely had to get a doctor's certificate to prove that they had a head, they would be paying dearly. This Government also imposed a gift duty at the rates comparable with those levied in the other States. Further, it increased hire-purchase duty by $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. As everyone knows, hire-purchase is the worker's system of getting credit. The man in business or on a high salary has a bank account and in many cases can get an overdraft. However, many people in the lower income bracket are unable to get an overdraft and have to indulge, sometimes extensively, in hire-purchase. This increase causes costs to spiral. The increase in the liquor licence fees also increases costs. I do not say that liquor is an essential commodity, but it seems to be one that the worker has a habit of enjoying.

Mr. Edwards: You'd say some would be better off without it, wouldn't you?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Many people in the honourable member's district would be better off without other things, too. There was also an increase in public hospital charges, as well as a charge in certain cases of mental illness. We have spoken of this matter before. However, the charge against us was that we were taxing too much! Other financial burdens were imposed by the present Government, such as the increase in bookmakers' turnover tax and in the stamp duty on betting tickets. These budgetary measures were introduced, although the present Government had given no warning of them during the election campaign. Members opposite said that they would remove the winning bets tax, but they did not say that they would add extra burdens in the same field as well as seven other taxes.

Mr. GILES: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

The SPEAKER: There is a quorum of the House present. The honourable member is out of order. The honourable member for Hindmarsh.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The state of the House is all right but, apparently, the state of some people is not. Other items, not mentioned in the Budget, are extremely interesting. Although we were condemned for our attitude to the fishing industry, our Government was the only

one that went to the trouble to inquire into the problems of that industry. Fishing licence fees have been increased from \$2 to \$4 and boat licence fees have also been increased. Bus fares have been increased to the extent that the average family travelling any distance to the city by bus pays more than \$1 in fares. Rail fares have been increased by an average of almost 13 per cent, yet we were accused of increasing prices which Government members told the world they themselves would not increase. The Government then removed certain items from price control. The price of bread has been increased by 1c to 2c a loaf, and prices for joinery products have been increased by up to 10c, yet this is a commodity important to the building industry.

The cost of living in Adelaide for the December quarter rose by 35c, and this was the second highest increase experienced by an Australian capital city. Yet Government members said that we did not look after the workers. Price control has been lifted on popular commodities such as soft drinks and ice cream: large bottles of soft drink have risen in price by 1c, while large bricks of ice-cream now cost up to 3c more. The price of novelty lines has also risen by 1c. Further, there has been an increase in hair-dressers' registration fees, with the result that the fee of a principal hairdresser has gone from \$4.20 to \$6.00 and that of an employee from \$1 to \$1.50.

Parking fines have been increased from \$1 to \$2 in accordance with the Police Offences Act. These are increases that the Government has imposed—increases which it said or implied it would not make. In this connection, the L.C.L. spent thousands of dollars in order to gain popularity, but I submit that the credit, which it has failed to receive, is worth more than any short-lived popularity that the Government may have been enjoying recently.

The Minister of Roads and Transport has implied that the M.A.T.S. plan will be implemented and, if that is so, we can expect increased impositions in addition to those already referred to. The M.A.T.S. Report refers to an increase in motor registration fees and driving licence fees, accompanied by a reduction in the minimum load capacity in connection with road maintenance contributions and to a repeal of the major exemptions in respect of road maintenance contributions. One could go on and on enumerating the number of taxes that have been and will be imposed on the people by a Party that said

we were over-taxing and putting on taxes that we should not have been putting on. It was the Government Party's purpose to try to convince the people that its members would not do this if they were in Government. I refer now to two matters raised by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans), who said at one stage:

Although I believe that we must make allowance for protests and demonstrations (they form part of our democratic society and should be allowed if carried out within the law), I believe that we have reached the stage where the average person looks down on one who says he is a Parliamentarian, a university student or perhaps a member of a particular profession. In other words, we are largely responsible for our own reputation. Whereas at one time a person might have been proud to admit that he was a university student, I do not think that is the case today, because of the actions of one or two radicals, and I think this situation has been brought about mainly by the news media's highlighting the efforts of those radicals. Had the activities of such people been relegated to the back pages, I am sure they would not have continued so vigorously with their protests, etc.

I believe, however, that most university students have the right to be proud of the fact that they are university students, for most of them are noble and studious citizens. Those people are studying to be our scientists, our lawyers, our judges and our doctors, and I believe that the writing down of them by a member of this House is unfair.

Mr. Evans: I did not say they did not have the right to be proud of being university students.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I know that the honourable member did not say that, but he rather implied that they had no reason to be proud. However, Mr. Speaker, they have every reason to be proud. I acknowledge that there are one or two radicals amongst them, but I also acknowledge that all the advantages and improvements of civilization came into being because of the actions of radicals.

Mr. Evans: Not all of them: many of them.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, the great majority of them. If we go back into our Christian history we find that Christ was a radical, and he was condemned then by the lawmakers for not obeying the law. As I walked through the Tower of London when I had the opportunity to do so, I saw evidence of the injustice done to people who were called radicals because they rebelled against impositions of the time. Who, then, can say

that a radical is an undesirable? I do not believe that he is. I believe that many of the radicals act in a responsible manner.

Mr. Evans: I don't think I said they were undesirable, either.

Mr. Broomhill: You implied it, though.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: We have a few misfits in every society.

Mr. Broomhill: We have some in the Government.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: We may have some in this House, but there is no reason why this House should be frowned on. Indeed, there is no reason why members of this Parliament should be ashamed of the fact that they are members of Parliament.

Mr. Evans: Yes there is.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member can speak for himself, but I am speaking for the majority, and I have been in this place for a little while.

Mr. Rodda: Many try, and few are chosen.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Many have tried, and many have been tried. I received a letter today from the Australian Universities Liberal Federation, and I think this letter originates because of the necessity for university students to defend themselves against the attacks that have been made on them. The letter is as follows:

I hope you will be interested in and find of value the following statement issued by the Council of the Australian Universities Liberal Federation (A.U.L.F.). The Council of the A.U.L.F. decided at its meetings in Perth (May 27, 1969) that the position of the university campuses could be summarized as follows:

Often the issues advocated by militant students are worthy of support. However:

1. Only a minority of students wish to adopt extremist tactics in supporting these issues.
2. Shock tactics are adopted to provoke an overreaction from authorities.
3. Such an overreaction is sought in order to draw the sympathy of the majority of students.
4. It is the objective of some militant groups to halt the operation of the university by:
 - (a) so acting as to bring police on campus.
 - (b) physically disrupting the administration of the university.
5. Attempts by students to physically counter extremist measures generally worsen the situation by increasing the likelihood of widespread violence.

Therefore, the council resolved that—

- A. Many aspects of our society need to be reformed.

B. Peaceful reform must be preferred to revolution as a means of social change.

1. Tactics such as sit-ins and non-violent demonstrations are legitimate when the seriousness of the issue warrants.
2. Such tactics must not lead to violence and disruption, and in particular we deplore the use of unnecessary force by police to break up peaceful demonstrations.

C. The autonomy of the universities is vital and we strongly oppose any threat to it. Whether by internal disruption by students or by—
external action in the form of
judicial inquiry under the present circumstances;
withdrawal of scholarships,
research grants and other
university finance;
security inquiry on campus.

D. Attempts by Government members to explain student protests as part of a national conspiracy or externally directed plot are factually incorrect and are only likely to worsen the situation.

I believe that sets out clearly the attitude of those university students who are decent citizens. They are opposed to violence and disruption but they say a demonstration is justified. I give the member for Onkaparinga credit for saying that demonstrations must be permitted. This is the only way that some people are able to make known their feelings. I believe this document does university students credit. I hope that members and other people will refrain from taking the worst of a section of society and saying that it represents the average. The member for Onkaparinga also said:

Some honourable members gave evidence several weeks ago that they were entitled to an increase in their pay. We are accepting an increase of \$1,000 but I do not know whether we are entitled to it.

I can talk about this subject because no future increases will benefit me: it is well known that I intend to finish my service at the end of this term. I have been in this place for nearly 20 years, and it may surprise members to know that I have seen more than 100 members come and go. The members of this Parliament apply themselves sincerely and give all their ability for the welfare of the country. The duties of a member of Parliament are not appreciated by people who would want to be here themselves. Some say that many want to be in here, but only a few are chosen.

s

Very few people are able to perform effectively the important duties of a member of Parliament. First, it is essential that he live with the people. Those members who have been here for some time know full well that wherever they go—to the races, to the Royal Show, or anywhere else—somebody seeks their advice on some matter. A member of Parliament's home is open to the public; his wife becomes almost his private secretary, for she has to answer the telephone and attend to his affairs.

I am proud to be associated with men and women who are prepared to make these sacrifices. The homes and businesses of many members of Parliament are suffering, and the members themselves are losing far more than they are gaining by being here. Many members who have chosen to serve the people have given up incomes greater than that of a member of Parliament. Some members have sacrificed opportunities in industry and professional callings to come here, with one desire only—to serve the people. There is no harder working person than the good member of Parliament.

Every man is worthy of his hire and to suggest that we may not be worthy of it is to write down the Parliamentary system. Any member who has had the experience that I have had would say the same, that a man who has served the people here has never regretted what he has taken on, because he has given in return far more than he has received. He gives it willingly. Members of Parliament are worth every cent they are paid, and so are the Ministers, who have a terrific job to do.

Many people have said that members of Parliament should have higher qualifications. It should be realized that a principle of Parliament is to keep the common man on top and the expert on tap, and what a member of Parliament needs is the ability to comprehend the advice given him and to understand the people he is called upon to serve. It is only men and women with these rare qualities who can be members, and they are surely worth the amount they are paid.

Members on this side (and, I guess, many members opposite) have received many circulars about child-minding centres. I hope this matter will be given serious consideration. While I know that councils are doing their utmost to see that these centres are properly run, there is a tendency for councils to ease

up a little to get people to come into a particular area. That, of course, creates a variation in the administration of these centres. There ought to be a central administrative body, so that no favour is done to any section of these people.

I believe that the lives of people are often moulded during their early years, and psychologists tell us that many failings of adults are caused by something that happens when they are children. Because of their economic situation, many mothers work, and use child-minding centres to care for their children. Any loose administration in these centres could harm the child, and eventually the State could pay for it, apart from the disability the child may suffer.

Today, when the Leader spoke about the registration of builders, I was reminded that some years ago the Health Act was amended to provide for a Clean Air Committee. Since then the only reply I have received to my questions to successive Ministers is that the committee is investigating and preparing regulations. The time is overdue when regulations should be written, because many industries that may establish in this State could build factories without providing the necessary equipment to purify the air and may be put to additional expense by having to alter what they have done because the regulations are then enforced. I urge the Government to expedite the issuing of these regulations. Anyone coming from the Adelaide Hills in the early morning can see the smog that envelopes the city and metropolitan area, and this will worsen in the future. Now is the time to nip this problem in the bud in order to prevent the additional cost of removing the smog, and so that harm will not be caused to future inhabitants. Much has been said about, and an inquiry made into, the introduction of Eastern Standard Time. The people I represent oppose its introduction.

Mr. Rodda: Why?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I assure the honourable member that I do not make a statement without giving reasons. Recently, the member for Port Adelaide, when asking a question, stated the views of my constituents fairly forcibly. Workers would have to rise before daylight to go to work.

Mr. Broomhill: What about the farmers?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am speaking about the people in my district. As industry would use more power and light, its costs would increase.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Who are you converting?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That remark leads me to believe that the Premier was flying a kite to see which side was more popular. Without concern for the welfare of the State, he was going to increase his popularity.

South Australia has much to be proud of. Nevertheless, I fear that the efforts of the past will fail to bring about their due reward until the people have the opportunity to elect a progressive Government. I am confident that they will do this at the next election. I am certain that, regardless of the boundaries on which that election is fought, the people will go forward and bring into being the light they now see on the hill; in other words, they will elect a Dunstan Labour Government.

Mr. ALLEN (Burra): In supporting the motion, I join with other members in expressing loyalty to the Sovereign. I congratulate the member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) and the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) on so capably moving and seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I express my condolences to the bereaved families of former members of this Parliament. The late Senator Laught was a young man when he entered practice in Clare many years ago and it was my privilege to know him for a long time. He went from Clare to Mount Gambier before becoming a Senator.

The late Hon. R. R. Wilson, who was a member of the Legislative Council for the Northern District for many years, was also well known to me. He held many positions in public life generally, apart from being a member of this Parliament. He was President of the Justices Association and of the Justices Bowling Club. I did not have the privilege of meeting either the late Hon. Clarence Goode or the late Mr. Hector Burnard White, but I knew the late Even Ernest George for 50 years, as he was a member for my district. He was an eloquent speaker and had the courage of his convictions. He always said what he thought. He was an untiring worker for the district and, although he served for only three years in the House, I am sure that he contributed much to the debates.

I take this opportunity of welcoming His Excellency the Governor, Sir James Harrison, and Lady Harrison to South Australia, and I hope they will find time soon to visit the part of South Australia that I am privileged to represent. It is now 15 months since I first

entered the House as member for Burra, but it seems more like 15 weeks. I find the Parliamentary work arduous, but extremely interesting. I thank members on both sides for their help and tolerance during that time and assure them that I am looking forward to this session.

When speaking in the Address in Reply debate last year I said that I was a man of few words. I think many members took this statement lightly. However, after 15 months, they probably realize now that I was serious about what I said then.

It is a pleasure to be a member of a Government that has done so much to get South Australia moving again. We made this promise before the last election, and we are well on the way to carrying it out. I am sure the people of South Australia are expecting great things from this Government over the next two years, and I can assure them they will not be disappointed.

During the last few months the Premier, several Ministers, and the Leader of the Opposition have taken the opportunity to make visits overseas to see for themselves what other countries are doing. I commend them for this, because I believe there is nothing like travel to broaden the mind and to keep up to date with world events. Too often we hear people criticize members for doing this, and I hasten to assure the public that in this instance not all the cost was provided by the taxpayer. I am sure that the members who have been away have come back with much information that will be of great value to this State, and I take this opportunity to congratulate them on their action. I should like now to canvass several matters to which His Excellency referred.

Representing one of the most assured wheat-growing districts in South Australia, I would be lacking in my duty if I did not refer to the proposed restrictions on wheat production in the coming season. Having disposed of my wheatgrowing interests last year, I hope I can give an impartial view on the present suggested restrictions. We are in the fortunate position of having experienced the largest wheat crop ever in the history of this State and of the Commonwealth. Financially, most people are very pleased with this result, but unfortunately it has brought about the need for restrictions. I do not envisage that this will have the effect of driving people off their land, but it will create hardship in some instances. I still remember the restrictions on wheatgrowing that were applied during the Second World War.

These were on an acreage basis, and they were effective. I think the wheatgrower is prepared to accept restrictions in times of war more than he is at present.

Ironically, we are asking farmers to accept less while most sections of the community are asking for more. Let us hope that the position improves sufficiently soon to enable restrictions to be lifted. Let us also hope that this is brought about by increased sales, not by drought. The Governments of this country could take a gamble on the season and not impose restrictions. If this gamble did not succeed, it would result in a huge surplus, with drastic restrictions to follow. I think most wheatgrowers would be prepared to accept some form of restriction rather than gamble with one of Australia's greatest industries. The farmers have fought for many years for a payable price for their product, and I hope that this price will not be sacrificed through overproduction.

We occasionally hear certain remarks made about the small wheatgrower. Indeed, I fear that too often it is said that the small wheatgrower cannot survive. I do not agree with that statement. First, we must decide who actually constitutes the small wheatgrower. I believe it is the person with a farm of, say, 500 acres and under in certain areas, including my own, although perhaps in districts receiving lighter rainfalls this figure may be increased. I maintain that it is still possible for the small wheatgrower to make a living provided, of course, he does not buy expensive and elaborate machinery. There is on the market much good machinery that is not too expensive or too elaborate, and with good management I am sure that this wheatgrower can survive, particularly when sidelines and other forms of income are considered.

I believe that too much emphasis has been placed on the statement that the small wheatgrower cannot survive under present conditions. I would have liked to see some consideration given to the small wheatgrower with the quota system on the suggestion of wheat restrictions for the coming harvest. I realize, of course, that this would be particularly difficult to do, because in putting a given figure for a small wheatgrower one might encourage production. However, I consider that the small wheatgrower should receive some consideration.

I heartily agree with the comment made by the member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) regarding how the share farmer will

fare under the present wheat restrictions. I have an instance in my area where certain share farmers have been share farming a large acreage for 20 years, but they have been in the habit of farming different properties over the various years. Some farmers have grown wheat for a year or two and then sold the property; other farmers have grown wheat for a few years and then gone out of production.

Only two years ago they started share farming a large property that had just changed hands. The first harvest was in the drought year and was a bad one, but this year they had a good crop. In consequence, these share farmers now have a very good farming plant but no quota of wheat to carry on working. I consider that the share farmer will suffer through these restrictions, and I only hope that the committee in its wisdom will have a sufficient wheat quota on hand to consider the share farmers when the appeals come through.

While on the subject of wheat, I should like to refer to the efforts of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited in handling the record harvest just completed. I do not think anyone would be rash enough to say that everything went well and that everything was well organized. However, in the circumstances the co-operative did a reasonable job in receiving such a record crop under difficulties. We know that plans are well in hand to increase storage for the coming season, and that additional storages have been approved. Additional storage will be available at Jamestown, Gulnare, Brinkworth and Farrell Flat, which will help my district considerably, but additional storage is still needed to help the Hallett and Mount Bryan area. This is an area that is badly served with storage at present.

Although many people may not be aware of this, wheat is grown up to 12 miles east of Mount Bryan. Even the member for Rocky River (Mr. Venning), who is a Director of the co-operative, was unaware of this fact until recently when I took him to Mount Bryan and went with him over the wheatgrowing area in that district. He was surprised at the amount of wheat that was grown east of Mount Bryan. I hope the co-operative will keep this in mind when decisions are made regarding further storage in South Australia.

The additional storage of 4,500,000 bushels at Port Adelaide should help these districts considerably. I do not think we should place too much emphasis on being able to move wheat by rail in an emergency. The farmers in this area still remember what happened last

harvest. After they waited three weeks for rail trucks to clear silos, a rail strike occurred and they were forced to transport their wheat by road to Port Adelaide. Unless additional storage is placed in this area, most of the grain will be carted by road transport, with a loss of revenue to this State.

His Excellency said that a Bill would be introduced to control agricultural chemical spraying, and I was pleased to hear this. Many farmers are dissatisfied with the present method adopted by some aerial spraying companies in regard to crop spraying. Instances have been brought to my notice where a farmer has a crop of peas close to a paddock that is to be sprayed, and he knows nothing about the intention of his neighbour to spray until after the work is completed. In the event of damage, it is extremely difficult to get compensation from the company concerned as it is up to the farmer affected to prove his case, and this is most difficult to do.

I have been advised that all aerial spraying companies have public risk policies to cover any damage of this nature, but very few claims have been obtained. I suggest that this matter should be policed in a way similar to the Bush Fires Act, under which, if a landowner wishes to burn off, he must give his neighbours several hours' notice. He must also notify his nearest fire control officer who, if he considers that conditions are too dangerous, can refuse permission. I suggest that if a farmer wishes to have his crop sprayed by aeroplane he should notify his neighbour several hours before spraying. If these neighbours consider that their crops are in danger, they should be able to appeal to a responsible person who would have the power to refuse the spraying company permission to spray. He could suggest waiting for a more suitable time, or perhaps an alternative method of spraying. I am glad the Government is to take up this matter with a view to overcoming the present unsatisfactory situation. It would certainly relieve neighbouring farmers of a lot of worry regarding their own crops.

I have received many complaints from landowners that employees of various Government departments enter private land, in order to carry out their duties, without notifying the landowner of their intentions. We agree that legally they are not compelled to notify the owner, but morally I think (and the landowners also agree with my views) they should notify

the landowner of their intentions before entering the property. Landowners are very co-operative in all matters of this nature, but at least their wishes should be respected in this regard. It may be only a matter of oversight, or it could be that the departmental officers are not aware of the landowner's thinking, but surely it is not too much to ask that the landowner be considered in this matter.

I speak from experience, as I have had the same experience as the landowners who have approached me. To have someone driving over one's property when one's ewes are lambing, or on a day of extreme fire hazard, is no joke. I know of one landowner who did not take his vehicle into the paddock owing to fire risk, only to find a departmental vehicle driving around his property. Survey pegs that have been put into the ground unknown to the landowner have been hit by implements at some cost to the owner. I appeal to the Ministers of the various departments to instruct their officers to see that this request is carried out. It would be appreciated by the landowners and would create a better understanding between landowners and the various departments.

In the Address in Reply debate last year I suggested that stricter control be placed on the use of firearms in South Australia. His Excellency said that this would receive attention during the current session. I received numerous letters of congratulation for raising this matter, particularly from the Clare District. It is feared in this district that with the clearing of timber and indiscriminate use of firearms the kookaburra may become extinct, unless restrictions are placed on the use of firearms. One landowner is so alarmed at the position that he is making approaches to have his land declared a sanctuary.

I can recall an amusing incident that happened to me recently. Needing repairs to my motor vehicle, I left it at Clare one morning and went to catch the road bus at the station. There was white frost that morning and just before the break of day kookaburras around about started to laugh. I was not sure whether they were laughing at me, but I suppose it was amusing to see someone standing in the white frost on the platform waiting for a road bus. Standing there, I thought what a tragedy it would be to the native fauna of

Australia if the kookaburra were destroyed, as it is a typical native Australian that we should preserve.

Various bodies have approached members of this House with a view to having more national parks set aside for the preservation of fauna and flora. I agree with those views, but I think we can go a step further and try to preserve our fauna all over the country, not just in national parks. I believe this can be achieved by the restriction of gun licences and much heavier penalties for offenders. I am pleased to hear that Cabinet is discussing this matter with a view to some alteration. In the *News* of Monday, April 28, the Acting Premier (Hon. R. C. DeGaris) said the Government would possibly tighten control of possession and sale of rifles in South Australia. He said that the subject was under discussion and that he would not comment on what controls were being considered. I hope we shall have an announcement on this matter soon. An article appeared in the *Advertiser* recently headed "Shooting restricted in station country". It reads:

There had been a big reduction in indiscriminate shooting in the pastoral areas out from the Murray River, it was stated yesterday. This improvement has been evident since the appointment of an inspector by the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department two years ago, landholders said . . . In the early stages of his appointment, Mr. Eves paid frequent visits to the station areas checking on the activities of shooters, and some prosecutions were made. Station owners and managers had become alarmed at the trouble caused by unauthorized spotlighters. Gates were frequently left open, and the remains of the slaughtered animals were strewn beside the tracks and gateways. In some cases sheep had been killed, and flocks were often seriously disturbed, particularly during lambing season . . . The whole of the Calperum station, north of Renmark, run by Mr. H. B. Martin and his three sons, has been declared a sanctuary in which shooting is not permitted, and other property owners in the locality agree that there has been a pronounced reduction in the operations of shooters.

It appears that our efforts over the last few years are at last obtaining results. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 2, at 2 p.m.