

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, July 3, 1969.

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

QUESTIONS**ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST**

The Hon. D. A. **DUNSTAN**: Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs supply me with a list of the properties, specifying the hundred references, which have so far been transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust?

The Hon. **ROBIN MILLHOUSE**: Yes.

Mr. **FREEBAIRN**: I refer to the statement made yesterday by the Hon. Mr. Loveday, the member for Whyalla, in reply to a question asked by the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches), in which he said that the projected estimate of the Aboriginal Affairs Department, during the period of the Dunstan Government, for the Aboriginal Lands Trust was \$35,000. Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say whether the statement made by the member for Whyalla is a truthful interpretation of the facts?

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I have been rather concerned about the question asked by the member for Stuart of the member for Whyalla about the administration of the Aboriginal Affairs Department. The member for Stuart addressed his question to the member for Whyalla, went on to explain certain matters in respect of which he was seeking information, and concluded by referring to the member for Whyalla as the Minister previously in charge of the Aboriginal Affairs Department. He was seeking information of a previous Minister concerning the administration of a department under the control of that previous Minister. Under the ruling of previous Speakers, a question seeking information from an ex-Minister who is not currently in office is not allowed. I did not realize at the time that the question of the member for Stuart came under this category but, now that the member for Light has asked a question about a statement made by a Minister formerly in charge of the department concerned, I am afraid that I cannot allow the question.

Mr. **FREEBAIRN**: Might I reframe my question?

The **SPEAKER**: Order! In regard to this matter I will quote the following passage from page 350 of Erskine May, which deals with questions to unofficial members:

Questions addressed to unofficial members relating to a Bill, motion, or other matter connected with the business of the House for which such members are responsible, have been allowed; though a question addressed to a member, the Leader of the Opposition, inquiring the course he intended to adopt regarding a motion by the Government, was not allowed. Questions may not be asked regarding statements made by members outside the House; and a question to an ex-Minister with regard to transactions during his term of office has been ruled out of order.

Mr. **FREEBAIRN**: Has the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs any comment to make on the finances of the Aboriginal Lands Trust?

The Hon. **ROBIN MILLHOUSE**: I thank the honourable member for asking this question.

Mr. Casey: You asked him to ask you.

The Hon. **ROBIN MILLHOUSE**: It was he who asked me about the Aboriginal Lands Trust's finances on Tuesday, and it was in reply to that question that I announced that the Government had decided to make a grant to the trust for the purpose of appointing an administrator. When replying to the honourable member's question on Tuesday, I tried to be objective in running over the history of the Aboriginal Lands Trust since its establishment during the time of the Walsh Government in late 1966, and I went out of my way to compliment the present Leader of the Opposition, who was then the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, for the original concept of the trust. I hope this is a matter—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I cannot allow the question to be answered in this way. I think the Minister is really making a Ministerial statement.

The Hon. **ROBIN MILLHOUSE**: I am sorry.

The **SPEAKER**: If the honourable member wants to make a Ministerial statement, he must seek leave of the House.

The Hon. **ROBIN MILLHOUSE**: If you think it necessary, Mr. Speaker, I will seek leave.

Leave granted.

The Hon. **ROBIN MILLHOUSE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for putting me on the right track, as always. As a result of my approach when replying to the question on Tuesday, I was surprised to hear the reply of the member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) to the question asked of him by the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches), although it is true that in my reply on Tuesday I did not mention him personally, even though he was my immediate predecessor as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

Yesterday, he said that the Dunstan Government projected an estimate of \$35,000 for the Aboriginal Lands Trust for the financial year 1968-9. I presume, from what he said in his reply, that this would have been of the same nature as the other payments made to the trust up to that date—that is, advances, loans which are repayable, the total of which now stands (as I think I mentioned) at \$10,700. As a result of the reply, I made inquiries of my department this morning to see whether I could obtain any information about this. I have looked at the Estimates working papers for last year and find that they were not begun until some time in April of last year, either just before we came into office or just after. Be that as it may, the first figure set down for the trust is \$2,600 and the final figure, after the fourth revision of the estimates, is that which appears in the papers tabled in this House—\$3,600. It is this figure which was paid and which goes to make up the \$10,700. I have not been able to see any figure suggesting that \$35,000 was to be set aside for the trust, nor have any of my officers to whom I have spoken been able to throw any light whatever on this suggestion, although I have inquired carefully about it. I am most interested in the suggestion made by the honourable member that this figure would be included in the Estimates had the Dunstan Government remained in office, and I am always anxious to get ideas which may help in the administration of the department or help the trust. I do not know on what the honourable member expected such a sum to be spent, but I should be glad if he would tell me privately or publicly what he or members of the trust (who have never mentioned this matter to me) had in mind for using the money, because possibly we could use the honourable member's ideas. I emphasize that I can find nothing written, nor have I been able to get any oral lead on the allegation made yesterday by the member for Whyalla when replying to a question asked by the member for Stuart.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Attorney-General expressed surprise that the question was asked yesterday about this matter, and in his explanation this afternoon he carefully skirted around the fact that after being so magnanimous to the Leaders of the Labor Government, to whom he gave some credit

for instituting the lands trust, he completely omitted to say that the point I raised was his additional statement as follows:

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 swim as best he could.

That was the statement to which, as a former Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, I took the strongest exception and which I said had no truth in it whatsoever. I repeat that today: it had no truth in it whatsoever. I made a statement concerning what had been done to assist the lands trust, and I draw the attention of the House to the fact that, although the Attorney-General made this statement discrediting the Ministers of Aboriginal Affairs in the previous Government, the *Advertiser* in reporting it did a careful piece of selective editing and left out most of the important parts of my reply. When this happens and comes from an Attorney-General who is supposed to represent justice, it is pretty poor stuff. Yesterday, in my reply, I said (and I quote from the *Hansard* pull):

The projected estimate of the department for this item in 1968-69 under the Dunstan Government was \$35,000.

I did not say that it was the estimate given in this House: I said it was the projected estimate of the department.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: And I say that I can't find anything about that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have a photostat copy of the projected estimates of the Aboriginal Affairs Department for 1968-69: these were prepared at my request as Minister at the time, and they show "Advance to Aboriginal Lands Trust, voted 1967-68, \$2,000: estimated 1968-69, \$35,000" and in the next column of plus and minus is shown "Plus \$33,000".

Mr. Broomhill: Perhaps you will get an apology now.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The suggestion made in the question put by the member for Light, in order to impugn my honesty and integrity, was entirely wrong. It is just another excuse to try to blame the previous Government for something that this Government is not doing to the best of its ability.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In view of the desire of the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs to discuss with the member for Whyalla his plans for

spending the \$35,000, will the honourable member agree to this suggestion and, in particular, will he make available to the Minister the projected estimates to which he referred in his personal explanation?

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is out of order.

STURT HIGHWAY

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the Highways Department intends to construct a by-pass road off the Sturt Highway just north of Nuriootpa and, if it does, when the road is likely to be constructed? Also, will he ask his colleague for details of the proposed route, as landowners in the area are concerned to know what land will be acquired?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Certainly.

SALINITY

Mr. CORCORAN: I have been informed that a broadcast news item from a regional station in the Upper Murray districts of the State indicated that one of the irrigation basins at Mildura, namely Lake Hawthorn, was filled to capacity. I believe that this has been caused by the Victorian Government's spending some of the money allocated to it by the Commonwealth Government for the control of saline waters in Victoria. As a result of the lake's filling to capacity, I believe that the level of this lake or irrigation basin is intended to be reduced by 3ft. In effect, this will mean that about 1,500 acre feet of highly saline water will be put into the river at this point. As irrigation will commence shortly (if it has not already commenced) in the Upper Murray districts, will the Treasurer, in the absence of the Minister of Works, have the matter investigated and, if there is any truth in this report, will he take whatever steps he can to try to prevent this happening at present, because much damage could occur in the river districts as a result of salty water coming down the river?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. In the absence of my colleague I will bring the matter to the notice of the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department at once.

OIL SEARCH DAMAGE

Mr. RODDA: This matter has been referred to me by some landholders in the Greenways-Lucindale area. Their complaint centres on the damage being caused to properties by people carrying out oil search in the area. I

am told that gates are being left open and that scant attention is being paid to the rights of the landholders. Will the Premier confer with the Minister of Mines and investigate the claims being made by these landholders?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am sorry if difficulty is being experienced as a result of the oil exploration projects in the honourable member's district. I will take up the matter with my colleague and get a report.

TELEVISION REPAIRS

Mr. VIRGO: Since last night I have had more telephone calls than I care to remember.

Mr. Rodda: You wouldn't be surprised?

Mr. VIRGO: I am greatly surprised, because I did not realize last night that this firm of Milleradio, which I exposed, had taken so many people for a ride, as has now been shown by the almost incessant and constant telephone calls that have come through today. Not only I but other members on this side, too, have received them. There have been many examples of people having paid \$20, \$30 or \$40 without getting the expected service. In view of this situation, will the Attorney-General give this House an assurance that he will take urgent steps to have this matter thoroughly investigated with a view to protecting the public and implementing the suggestions I made, particularly the one that qualified technicians be licensed?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Of course, it is not within my province to answer the last part of the honourable member's question: it is a matter of policy that must be decided at Cabinet level, and not by me.

Mr. Virgo: You are one ninth of the Cabinet.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, but it cannot be decided by any one ninth; it must be a Cabinet decision. I will certainly have the allegations of the honourable member investigated to the best of my power.

Mr. Virgo: As a matter of urgency?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. In fact, immediately I got into the office this morning, I made inquiries, because I know that this company has come under public criticism previously, and there have been complaints about it. I find there is a docket in the office going back to, I think, 1962 or 1963, when the Hon. Mr. Rowe was Attorney-General; but no action was taken then. My recollection was that the Prices Branch had taken some action or made some inquiries.

Through the office of the Treasurer I have already asked whether any information that would help is available to me.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Mr. FERGUSON: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport which department finances the construction and installation of automatic flashing lights at railway crossings and whether finance is readily available for this purpose?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall make inquiries.

PARLIAMENTARY UNDER SECRETARIES

Mr. HUDSON: Yesterday, I asked a series of questions about the duties of the Parliamentary Under Secretaries but was unable to get any satisfactory information, although I should think that both the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) and the Premier could have given me a straight answer immediately. As the Premier said yesterday that he would obtain a report, has he details of the duties and functions of his Parliamentary Under Secretaries?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am pleased to report to the honourable member as follows:

(1) There are two Parliamentary Under Secretaries: one the honourable member for Victoria, who holds the appointment of Parliamentary Under Secretary assisting the Premier, and the other the honourable member for Light, who holds the appointment of Parliamentary Under Secretary and attached to the Premier for duty.

Mr. Corcoran: Assisting the Under Secretary!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I know that the honourable member considers this to be an important matter because of the many questions that have been asked about it. The report continues:

(2) Each appointment is without salary or remuneration.

I am sure the honourable member would be pleased to hear that. The report continues:

(3) Their duties, that is, their legal obligation or what they are bound to do, are to assist the Premier.

(4) Their functions, that is, their activities proper to their appointments, are many and varied, including interviewing members of the public and conducting correspondence.

(5) As for every other member of the House, the Government provides facilities for the conduct of correspondence, but no additional staff are provided for exclusive use by the Parliamentary Under Secretaries.

(6) Office accommodation in the Premier's Department is provided for the Parliamentary Under Secretaries as an essential to the discharge of their duties and functions to the satisfaction of the public with whom they confer on behalf of the Premier.

McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yesterday, I asked the Minister of Social Welfare a question concerning the son of constituents of mine who have made certain allegations (and I emphasize the word "allegations") that their son, sentenced on January 19 to Brookway Park, had been transferred by an officer to McNally Training Centre, and they wanted to know why this had happened. Has the Minister further information on this matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I inquired further about this matter this morning and, as I have notes that I have made as to the circumstances, perhaps I can refer to them when replying to the question. I understand that the lad was committed to Brookway Park in January, 1968, and that in October, on the recommendation of the psychologist and head teacher at Brookway, he was exempted from further attendance at school because of his mental capacity, and then transferred to Lochiel Park. He left Lochiel Park (although I am not sure whether he should have, but he did), and in March of this year he was again committed by the court to Brookway Park on some charge. As he was not attending school he was sent to McNally and not to Brookway, in spite of the committal.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Is that customary?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, it is customary. Under the Act that was last scrutinized by the House in 1966, the Director, pursuant to section 122, has the power to do this. That is why he went from Brookway to McNally. I am told that he is now at McNally attending classes of his own choice and doing what can be called general remedial work.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to the question I asked yesterday about the Jamestown saleyards and the agreement with the Railways Department?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The provision of a site for new saleyards at Jamestown formed part of more extensive provisions, including roadworks, drainage, etc., in connection with which the department has been obliged to acquire land over and above that necessary for the construction of the standard gauge railway. In order to expedite the provision of the hard standings for the new saleyards, engineering surveys were carried out some time ago and contract documents prepared for the paving of the same and also for the formation of local roads required to give access

thereto. It has recently been discovered that extensive disturbance of survey pegs has occurred and it has been necessary to direct surveyors to re-establish the necessary marks. It is expected that the Railways Commissioner will call for tenders this month, and that a recommendation will be made to the Minister soon after.

The Minister is unable to give any assurance that the work to be done in preparing the site and the approach road can be completed within 10 weeks. The possibility of this situation arising was foreseen during May last and representatives of the stock agents were notified accordingly. At that time an offer was made to the agents by Railways Department officers to make land, at present under the control of the Railways Department, available for the erection of temporary saleyards in the vicinity of the present saleyard site. The offer included an undertaking that the department would bear all expense of re-erecting the saleyards on the new site after paving had been completed. Every effort will be made to have the new saleyards available in time for the offshears sales.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about progress of work on the Adelaide to Port Pirie standard railway gauge?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The report from the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner on the survey and priority of the proposed railway between Port Augusta and Whyalla has not yet been received by the Minister of Roads and Transport. In a letter dated October 22, 1968, the Prime Minister stated that the report would be available to his Government shortly.

ANGLE VALE SCHOOL

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about accommodation at the Angle Vale Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: A third teacher was appointed to the Angle Vale Primary School in February because of an expected increased enrolment which, in fact, did not materialize to the extent that had been expected. It was necessary to use the old school classroom as a temporary expedient, as it had been intended to provide an additional transportable classroom. While staff was available the third teacher was allowed to remain at Angle Vale, although the head teacher was made aware of the situation. It has now become necessary

to transfer the third teacher to a school with much larger classes, leaving two teachers for whom two very good classrooms are available.

SCHOOL CROSSINGS

Mr. HURST: The Port Adelaide City Council has told me that the Road Traffic Board has informed the council that it has been told by the South Australian Road Safety Council that that council does not intend to supply "stop" banners previously issued by it to school crossing monitors, and that, in respect of all new crossings approved by the board, the provision of the banners by the local council will be a condition of approval. The alteration of policy has left a gap regarding the provision of replacement "stop" banners and, although I appreciate the good work that the Road Safety Council does, this Parliament voted the organization money for this purpose and it now seems that the council has changed its policy in the middle of the year, placing an obligation on municipal councils, without compensating them. Will the Attorney-General confer with the Minister of Roads and Transport with a view to persuading the Road Safety Council to change its policy in this matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

CLASSROOM COSTS

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Treasurer, in the absence of the Minister of Works, a reply to the question I asked recently about the relative costs regarding temporary classrooms constructed of timber and classrooms constructed of brick?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Because of the percentage increase of labour and materials over the past few years, costs have increased for both timber and solid construction classrooms. The current cost of a solid construction classroom would be proportionately higher than that of a timber classroom. However, as a result of design modifications to the permanent type building, the difference in costs of both types of classroom has been maintained at about \$1,200; that is, the difference has been held steadily at about that figure.

PORT AUGUSTA BRIDGE

Mr. EDWARDS: I think most members have received a pamphlet concerning the proposed Port Augusta bridge. I am concerned about this bridge, as it represents a vital link between Eyre Peninsula (as well as Western

Australia) and that part of the mainland directly east of Spencer Gulf. I should like to see the bridge constructed as soon as possible and, indeed, on the back of the pamphlet there is a reference to the calling of tenders. As the construction of this bridge is vital to people living on Eyre Peninsula, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether tenders have been called and, if they have been, when work on the project is likely to start?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to seek that information.

Mr. RICHES: We have been told that tenders for the new bridge across the gulf at Port Augusta will be called in June next year and that the bridge will take some considerable time to construct. Will the Attorney-General draw the attention of the Minister of Roads and Transport to the necessity for policing load weights and speed across the existing bridge in order to make sure that there is no further deterioration of that bridge in the meantime? Concern has been expressed in Port Augusta particularly that the regulations regarding speed and weight are not being observed and that this is having a detrimental effect.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

ENFIELD INDUSTRIES

Mr. JENNINGS: On June 17 I asked a question about the noise nuisance resulting from the use of a compressor at the premises of the Bradford Kendall company in Kilburn, as the noise greatly annoyed the residents there. Admittedly it is an industrial area but many Housing Trust tenants reside there. In my question I also mentioned a complaint regarding the Stewarts and Lloyds company, which is nearby; however, that complaint dealt with a different subject. The Treasurer, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry, has told me that he has an interim reply to my question, and I ask him to give it. I am, however, rather disappointed that, after waiting this long, I can have only an interim reply to a question of this nature. I point out that the people are very worried about the nuisance being inflicted on them. In addition (and I am certainly not applying my remarks here to the Treasurer) I have noticed lately a tardiness by Ministers in supplying answers to questions asked in this House.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yesterday the honourable member was good enough to ask me to ascertain what progress had been made in investigating the matter he has referred to.

I have received a telephone report about it. The Department of Labour and Industry reports:

The object of the complaint is a compressor within the works and the complaints have come from close neighbours. The area is an industrial area. The department's inspectors have not yet completed their investigations into the matter.

I noted the remarks made by the honourable member when he explained his question. In all fairness to the departmental officers I think he will appreciate that this is probably a matter not easily solved, because the firms concerned are in an industrial area. They no doubt employ both local labour and labour from farther afield, and they have installed machinery necessary for the work they do. There may or may not be any simple means of abating the noise that emanates from the factory. In an industrial area people living near factories expect, and are in the habit of experiencing, problems of this kind. However, this does not mean that the department is not pursuing its inquiries and, if there is any means that the department can suggest or, indeed, enforce to abate the noise nuisance referred to, it will be used. The honourable member's remarks are noted and I will see, of course, that the Minister concerned is aware of them.

PINNAROO ROAD

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what work is projected on Highway 12 (from Moorlands to Pinnaroo) by way of resealing or reconstruction during this financial year?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: With pleasure.

ABORTION LEGISLATION

Mr. LAWN: Last session the Leader of the Opposition introduced a Bill which had for its purpose the lowering of the drinking age in public, the right to vote, and the right to make agreements at 18 years of age. In opposing the Bill, the Attorney-General said that it was not the time for a Bill of that nature and that we should wait until all States agreed to bring in uniform legislation to give effect to those matters. Does the Attorney-General not consider that the same principles apply to the abortion legislation under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill which he introduced last session and which he intends reviving this session, and that this also should await uniform legislation by all States?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I can see a difference between the two matters to which the honourable member refers. I agree with him that the question of uniformity of the laws of abortion is a very important element to be taken into account. However, that matter has not been formally raised at Attorneys' conferences—although there has been some discussion informally amongst the Attorneys—and the chances of our being able to reach agreement on any uniform measure on that topic are so remote as to justify us as a State in going ahead to consider the matter. That is why I do not think we should wait for a uniform approach on that topic.

However, in contrast to that, the question of the age of majority is one that has been raised. In fact, I think it has been raised at every Attorneys' meeting that I have attended and, as the honourable member's Leader could tell him, I think it was raised when the Leader was in office as Attorney-General. It has been raised since we debated in this House the legislation to which the honourable member referred; it was raised in Hobart last March, and I understand that it will be discussed again at the next meeting of Attorneys in Brisbane the week after next, and there is a far greater prospect of a uniform approach on this topic than there is on the other. I point out to the honourable member that the question of voting is one of the matters that would undoubtedly be involved in a general reduction. It would either be a part of that general reduction or it would be considered consequentially afterwards. This involves the Commonwealth because there are Commonwealth elections as well as State elections, and this reinforces our desire that there should be a uniform approach to the matter.

SCHOOL ANCILLARY STAFF

Mr. LANGLEY: When I have called at many primary and secondary schools I have noticed the large amount of writing and book-work carried out by headmasters. This seems to be increasing every day under the present system, especially in large schools. Also, headmasters and headmistresses are called upon to teach and to perform many other essential duties such as keeping in contact with parent bodies and scholars in the schools. Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government is considering providing office help (part time or full time, according to the size of the school) to all primary and secondary schools?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The officers of my department, the Government and I are aware of the desirability of providing what is known as ancillary staff in the schools of South Australia. Under certain conditions ancillary staff are provided in secondary schools. This was one of the matters raised by the South Australian Institute of Teachers when it waited on the Premier and me earlier in the year. We indicated then, as I have done personally since, that, much as we would like to satisfy this desire, the extent to which we can do so is limited by the money available. Year after year the line on the Education Department's estimates dealing with ancillary staff has appeared, and year after year, as the previous Minister of Education would know, we have had to curtail our activities in this direction. We still hope we may be able to provide extra staff in our schools so that teachers do not have to devote their time to doing clerical jobs. Frankly, it is uneconomical that people who are highly trained and have cost the State a large sum of money in the course of their training should be used for tasks that can be carried out by someone not so highly trained. I assure the honourable member that I am fully aware of this, and that my department desires as soon as possible to be able to provide the type of ancillary staff to which the honourable member referred.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have in my hand acknowledgements from the Attorney-General of 16 nominations, dating from September 3, 1968, to June 6, 1969, for appointments as justices of the peace. Apart from two nominations that were forwarded on to me by the Hon. A. M. Whyte, the rest were forwarded by me. The slips I have relate to nominations from Tarcoola, Andamooka, Coober Pedy, Woomera and Whyalla. In one case I have been informed that a nomination will not be made but I have had no communication regarding all the others over the whole of that time. Having a little more (shall I say?) sense of responsibility than the Attorney-General, I will not blame him entirely for that delay, because he has been overseas, but at the same time I should like to know whether or not the Attorney-General has a habit of informing honourable members when he makes an appointment of a justice, for I have received no notification whether these justices have or have not been appointed. I thought it would be just a matter of ordinary

courtesy for the member who had sent in the nomination to be informed if and when the appointment was made. Can the Attorney-General say whether any of these justices have been appointed and, if none has, will he expedite the matter? In future, as a matter of courtesy, will he inform me when justices are appointed?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Apparently the honourable member was not in the House last week (I think it was) when I said that within the next few weeks I intended to bring down the various district folders containing the nominations and go through them with honourable members, thereafter making recommendations. I can now say that I intend to do that when the House next meets on July 22. I cannot tell the honourable member whether or not any of those whose names appear on the bits of paper in his hand have been appointed; if he gives me the names I will have a look. I think it is most unlikely that they have yet been dealt with. Let me explain what has happened. When we came into office about 15 months ago I found, on going through the files, that for a very long time there had been no system whatever in the making of recommendations for appointment, and the number of nominations in the various district files was great indeed. The honourable member may recall that I brought them all down here, discussing them with each individual member, including the member for Whyalla. Thereafter recommendations for appointments were made, the appointments themselves were made and, following the usual custom in the department (a custom that I inherited from my predecessors), members were informed, I think on the same day as the appointments were made, by letter that they had been made. That is what I did last August. Last December, when the House was out of session, I went through the folders and made a number of recommendations for appointment, those appointments being made by His Excellency in Executive Council in, I think from memory, January. Again, to the best of my knowledge (and I believe this is so) members were informed in the usual way that the appointments had been made. However, no nominations have been made since then, unless for departmental reasons. The honourable member became a little heated as he explained his question, but I suggest there was no need for that. I thought he would know that the appointments were made periodically. In the

meantime, until there is a batch (and the batches are now ready), nominations simply lie in the folder while the normal routine inquiries through the police are made. There has been no slight on the honourable member or, I hope, on any member. In a fortnight's time, I will make a point of bringing down the Whyalla folder as one of the first.

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Attorney-General state the full policy of the present Government in relation to the appointment of justices of the peace?

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member must have been out of the Chamber when the previous reply was being given to the member for Whyalla.

Mrs. Byrne: I heard it.

The SPEAKER: If the Attorney-General thinks this is an additional question on the same subject he need not reply.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I always try to help members when they ask questions, but it is a very difficult question to answer. I have not made any alteration in the policy pursued by my immediate predecessor (the present Leader of the Opposition) and by Mr. Rowe when he was in office. That is not to say that the policy is inflexible, but I have followed the same policy, as must surely be known to the honourable member as well as to other honourable members. One of the guide lines of the policy is that I believe appointment as a justice of the peace should be regarded as of value in the community; therefore, the number of justices should be kept down to a constant level. I think that South Australia has about 5,000 justices of the peace. In other States there is a far higher number in proportion to the population. I have been anxious not to increase the number above the level we have had, for I think that would detract from the honour of the appointment. We get many more nominations than can therefore be appointed, and it is necessary to go through the various districts to see whether appointments are justified, and if they are, how many. Normally this is taken on a residential basis. My predecessors worked out a rather elaborate scheme (which has not proved very practical) of quotas in the suburbs. The difficulty here is that the justices of the peace move, die, resign, and so on, and it is hard to keep track of the number actually living in any area. I have used those quotas as a guide, though, in going through the various nominations, both with members and on my own. There are several classes of persons

who, because of their occupation, are normally not appointed to a commission of the peace. I do not think it is necessary to go into those classes: they are fairly well-known. These are the broad principles upon which recommendations are made to His Excellency. If the honourable member thinks that any of the principles should be varied, I shall be glad to talk to her about it.

STONEFIELD SCHOOL

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked on June 19 last relating to the proposed closing of the Stonefield Rural School? In particular, can she say when it is proposed to close the school and to what other school it is intended to transport these schoolchildren at present attending it?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As the honourable member has said, the enrolment at the Stonefield Rural School has dropped to six, and the closing of the school is being considered. A full examination of the alternative transport possibilities has been made. The wish of the Stonefield parents that their children be transported to the Truro Primary School has been taken into account but, if they wished to do this, they would have to do so at their own expense, as the number of children is too small for even a subsidized service. Some of the children attending Stonefield live very close to the bus service from Dutton East to the Eudunda Area School. I am informed that there is no possibility of the Dutton East parents agreeing to a change involving the transportation of their children to Truro, which is the only way a departmental bus service could be provided to Truro to include Stonefield children. For Dutton East secondary children, a change in transport would mean a transfer to the Nuriootpa High School. I assure the honourable member that the Stonefield parents' request for transport to Truro has been given thorough and sympathetic consideration, but it cannot be approved. If these parents wish to avail themselves of transport, provided by the Education Department, to another departmental school, it will be necessary for the children to link up with the service now being provided to the Eudunda Area School.

Bus transport will be provided for the children from Stonefield to the Eudunda Area School. No action will be taken regarding the closing of the school until a future bus route has been

determined. When transport arrangements have been made, the Stonefield school will be closed.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: On June 17 I asked the Minister of Works a question about progress on the major extensions and improvements to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, whereupon the Minister undertook to get me a reply. On Tuesday of this week he said that he had the reply, and I duly asked the question again and received the reply. For this I was most grateful, but I was astounded when I went home late last night and picked up the local paper to find that much of the detail in the reply had been given to the local press by the Administrator of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Can the Premier say, first, for how long it has been the privilege of the head of one department to give out particulars about another department? I submit that this is a matter for the Public Buildings Department. Secondly, has the Government taken steps to issue news in order that the members of the Opposition may be deprived of making known the particulars they have received in reply to a question?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government has taken no steps to do this. I have no knowledge of the matter to which the honourable member refers. The honourable member did not say whether or not the information was given out before he got his reply here.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Certainly; it must have been.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: And it was published before the honourable member got his reply here?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No; it was not published. It was given out before last Friday, and I did not get a reply until the following Tuesday.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will make some inquiries. I assure the honourable member that the Government did not intend to be discourteous. It is probably some oversight in the busy programme that the Minister has, as the honourable member well knows. I will see what I can find out for him.

YUNTA SCHOOL

Mr. CASEY: Some time ago I discussed with the Minister of Education the desirability of moving a school building from Mannahill to Yunta, because the Yunta school had been classified as a Special Rural School and the school at Mannahill had been closed. As it is

in the interests of the schoolchildren and teachers at Yunta that another classroom be provided, can the Minister say whether this will be done?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am in the happy position of being able to give the honourable member what I hope will be pleasing information for him on this matter. I have ascertained that workmen from the Public Buildings Department arrived at Mannahill on Monday of this week to transfer the buildings to Yunta. It is expected that they will be pulled down by the end of this week, that the components will be loaded, and that the team of workmen will arrive at Yunta on either Friday, July 4, or Monday, July 7, to begin erection of them there.

MOUNT LOFTY KIOSK

Mr. GILES: Last week I visited the proprietor of the Mount Lofty Summit kiosk, and he showed me plans of a proposed motel-restaurant, the motel to have 42 rooms and the restaurant to be able to accommodate 250 diners. I understand that negotiations have been delayed because the proprietor is waiting for a lease from the Lands Department. As this project would be an extremely important tourist attraction and as the proprietor wishes to complete it before the next Festival of Arts, will the Minister of Lands consider whether arrangements cannot be made to enable the proprietor to obtain a reasonably long lease so that the project can be started?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member is correct in saying that plans have been submitted and are awaiting my decision. The proposal is for a combined motel-restaurant to be built beneath the Flinders monument on Mount Lofty Summit. Although I was asked to approve this project some time ago, my first reaction was that it might spoil the appearance of the area. However, that was before I made an inspection, when I was told that the highest point of the roof would be about level with the verandah of the present kiosk. They would not knock down more trees than necessary; the building would be moulded to the shape of the hill, which falls away steeply; and motor cars would be parked behind the building, near where visitors to the kiosk now park. Because of those points, I modified my original idea of the matter. I am at present discussing the matter with people whose opinions ought to be considered. I do not think I should simply rule on the matter without speaking

to leading citizens and other people whom there is good reason to bring into discussion of the proposal. I do not expect a long delay in making a decision, certainly not such as to delay progress of the work if approval is given.

BEACH EROSION

Mr. BROOMHILL: The problem of beach erosion greatly concerns all members who represent seaside districts. Although I appreciate that at present funds are made available to the university for research into erosion in co-operation with councils, at present the Glenelg beach has been damaged by storm, the Henley and Grange beaches have virtually disappeared, and the time has come for the Government to consider whether beaches are State assets or merely council assets. The Henley and Grange council recently borrowed \$10,000 to establish a mesh along the beach at West Beach, hoping that that would build up the sand in that area and expecting to be able to grass it in order to prevent the sand from blowing away. Because of the difficulties of all councils in seaside areas in financing maintenance of our beaches, will the Premier consider making substantial funds available to councils to save those beaches?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think most people acknowledge that much is yet to be learnt about the movement of sand and its effect on our shoreline. I also think it is widely recognized that building too close to the sea has prevented what is considered to be the necessary reaction between sea and sand and, consequently, the artificial barrier placed against the sea has created great difficulties. Soon after 9 o'clock this morning, when inspecting the site of the West Lakes development, I viewed from the air the entire beach front and shoreline to which the honourable member refers. I was able to see the difference between areas where man has built to the edge of the sea and areas where there is still a natural dune effect that allows the sea to give and take, according to circumstances. The matter is important and I will get a report on it as soon as I can.

BERRI POLICE STATION

Mr. ARNOLD: The Premier, in replying on August 22, 1966, to a question I had asked about the rebuilding of the Berri police station, stated:

In consultation with the Commissioner of Police, a planning programme is being formulated for works of this nature in the light

of funds likely to become available during the next three financial years, including 1968-69. The Berri project will be considered in this programme. In view of priorities already determined, it has not been possible to provide on the 1968-69 Loan Estimates for the Berri police station project.

Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether this extremely important project will be included in the 1969-70 Loan Estimates or is being considered?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to get a reply for the honourable member.

POLLING HOURS

Mr. LAWN: Can the Premier say whether the closing of polling booths earlier than 8 p.m. on election days has been discussed at any Premiers' Conference that he has attended?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Certainly, it was not discussed at the last Premiers' Conference, although something touching lightly on electoral matters may have been discussed last year, at the first Premiers' Conference I attended. I am not sure whether polling hours were discussed then, but I think the matter has been discussed at some conference (perhaps a Party meeting) that I have attended during the last year. I will find out from the minutes of the Premiers' Conference last year whether the matter was mentioned briefly.

BRIDGE MODEL

Mr. WARDLE: When the Public Works Committee inspected the proposed site of the new bridge across the Murray River near Murray Bridge recently, the Commissioner of Highways said that within a week or two of that time a model of the bridge would be displayed in the local government office at Murray Bridge. As that was about six weeks ago, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the model can be displayed at Murray Bridge soon?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will inquire immediately.

MOUNT GAMBIER EAST SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: Has the Treasurer, in the absence of the Minister of Works, a reply to the question I previously asked about constructing a swimming pool at the Mount Gambier East Primary School?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Mount Gambier East Primary School Committee has submitted a scheme, together with tenders, for the construction of a swimming pool at its school. The scheme has been technically

approved and is acceptable, apart from one minor adjustment. The quotations have also been examined and one of these is considered reasonable. As the scheme is to be undertaken on a capital subsidy basis, approval is now being sought for the Government's commitment in the scheme.

Mr. BURDON: People concerned with the school have expressed to me deep concern about the considerable delay that has taken place in getting this project under way. If it is humanly possible, will the Treasurer, in the absence of the Minister of Works, use his good offices to see that this project is commenced at the earliest possible moment?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, I will do that.

MIGRANTS

Mr. VENNING: Since the coming into office of the Hall Government there has been an increase in the number of migrants coming to this State. Can the Premier say whether this increase is being maintained?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I happen to have with me some figures on the migration flow into South Australia, and they are most gratifying. Of course, since coming into office, I have taken deliberate steps to effect a resurgence of activity, which I expected our Government would bring to South Australia, by matching with the increased activity a request for a large-scale increase in migration to this State. I took up this matter on two fronts: by approaching the Commonwealth immigration authorities in London and by approaching the Commonwealth Minister concerned in order to ensure that more migrants were sent to South Australia. This increase has been achieved, and the figures show that June was another good month for assisted migration to South Australia: there were 1,430 arrivals and this topped off a good year of recovery for 1968-69. There was a 48 per cent rise in the number of assisted migrants coming into South Australia for the year just ended. In fact, for the year ended June, 1969, 14,167 assisted migrants arrived, compared with only 9,572 in the 1967-68 financial year. Of these 14,167 assisted migrants, 11,986 were British, having come from the United Kingdom.

The much higher migrant intake and the lower unemployment now existing in South Australia were two of the key indicators of the healthier economic environment that is currently being enjoyed. Even though the percentage is significantly higher, it does not

reveal the real comparisons that are available with the period of deepest recession in South Australia in 1967-68, at which time there were not only fewer migrants coming into South Australia but also more people leaving this State for other States. That situation has now been reversed, and we have at present a large build-up factor in the South Australian population, a factor which represents an increase many times greater than the 48 per cent to which I have referred. However, I issue this warning: even now, with this greater intake of migrants, there are signs of a shortage developing in various trades, and we will have to watch the situation carefully and maintain the flow in order to supply the work force required for the rapidly resurging industries of this State.

FORESTRY PLANTINGS

Mr. CASEY: Paragraph 19 of the Governor's Speech states:

During the financial year approximately 6,500 acres of land has been planted by the Woods and Forests Department, log production from State forests approximated 230,000,000 super feet, and 3,150 acres of land suitable for afforestation purposes has been purchased or approved for purchase.

Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Forests how much land was purchased for this purpose up to the end of the last financial year?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get that information.

WALLAROO HARBOUR

Mr. HUGHES: In explaining my question, I refer to an article, appearing in the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* and headed "Regulations Delay Ship", as follows:

Depth regulations imposed at Wallaroo by the Marine and Harbors Department delayed the departure of a wheat ship and cost a shipping company almost \$2,000. The ship, *Stove Caledonia*, had topped up with 5,386 tons of bulk wheat for China. She was ready to sail at 3 p.m. on Friday, but the tide did not reach its predicted level. Wallaroo depth regulation demands 2ft. 6in. of water beneath the keel. *Stove Caledonia* was short of 6in. The ship sailed 24 hours later. Shipping authorities estimated time lost at \$1,500 to \$2,000 a day.

The article goes on to refer to other ships that have had to leave the port partly loaded because of this port restriction. I am not allowed to read all the article but I point out that it said that, because of the restrictions, one ship left the port partly loaded to avoid being tied up for a week awaiting the tide.

The keel clearance used to be 18in., subject to weather conditions, but now it is 2ft. for vessels with 28ft. draught and 2ft. 6in. for vessels with a draught greater than 28ft. Will the Minister of Lands take up with the Minister of Marine and the Department of Marine and Harbors the possible relaxing of the depth regulations at Wallaroo to enable the type of vessel to which I have referred to sail with a full cargo?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will take this matter up with my colleague.

GOODWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Preliminary work is being done at the Goodwood Primary School in preparation for repaving the school grounds. In the absence of the Minister of Works, will the Minister of Lands ascertain when tenders will be called and when the work is likely to commence?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask the Minister of Works to reply to that question.

BANKSIA PARK SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about a shelter shed at the Banksia Park Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The shelter mentioned by the honourable member is part of the solid construction infants school and is similar in design to many others in different parts of South Australia. It is the opinion of departmental officers that the enclosure of the area would spoil it and detract greatly from its usefulness. It is true that it faces north and that rain from this direction could beat into the shed. On the other hand, it is considered unlikely that children would be adversely affected by sun during hot weather because the shed is designed to make allowance for the height of the sun in summer and also to allow the sun to enter during the winter. If conditions render it unusable on odd occasions, the children can be accommodated temporarily in the adjoining activity room.

GRAIN CARGOES

Mr. CASEY: I was greatly concerned a few hours ago to learn that future cargoes of wheat to mainland China will be carried in Russian ships that are so large that they will not be calling at South Australian ports; they will be going only to the eastern and western seaboard of Australia. With the larger ships coming on the run to take wheat from Australia, South Australia will be faced with the problem that

its silos may unfortunately be full whilst silos on the eastern and western seaboard will be at least partially empty. Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, take this matter up with Cabinet, because it should be resolved as soon as possible, and will he see that a fair share of shipments of wheat to mainland China are from South Australia? Otherwise, our farmers will be in the unenviable position of wanting to deliver this year's harvest when our silos are already full.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The attention of Cabinet has been directed to this and allied problems for some time. This matter has received much attention but I cannot reply to the honourable member now. I would prefer to ask this question of the Minister of Agriculture, and I will give the honourable member a reply as soon as possible. The Minister of Agriculture may feel disposed to reply to him before the next sitting day.

PORT GILES

Mr. FERGUSON: Some time ago the Minister of Works assured me that the installation of bulk handling facilities at Port Giles would be completed by the end of May. This is a very important matter for the wheat industry of Australia in general and of South Australia in particular. In the absence of the Minister of Works, can the Premier say whether work on the project is on schedule?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Before I left for overseas earlier this year I called an urgent conference in my office with the aim of shortening the time needed to complete the Port Giles installation. The reason for the conference was that South Australia had had difficulty in getting ships of the right size to take wheat from this State. Although Port Giles was not the answer for the entire State, since an installation was being built there we wanted to finish it earlier and have at least one installation to fit into the general picture. As a matter of urgency and with the co-operation of the Treasurer and Minister of Works, we arranged to have financial allocations altered and the timetable brought forward so that it would be completed in May.

The crash programme instituted will result in the facility being completed by that time. The Government is greatly concerned about port development in South Australia, and some big question marks arise about what development there should be and at what ports it should take place. Remarks were made at some length yes-

terday about Wallaroo, and I believe that much misapprehension has been caused by all the supposed information given in regard to that area. In fact, to ensure that there is no misunderstanding of the Government's intentions in this matter, I have arranged to speak at a public meeting at Wallaroo on July 15, when I will plainly put the Government's position and the needs and desires of the Government and the population regarding port development in this State, and particularly at Wallaroo.

KADINA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. HUGHES: On May 14 the Minister of Works was good enough to tell me that expenditure of \$81,400 had been approved by Cabinet for certain replacement buildings at the Kadina Primary School. He also said that it was expected that funds would be available from the Loan works allocation for 1969-70. Some weeks later the Secretary of the Kadina Primary School Committee wrote to me as follows:

As you are aware, a lot of planning is entailed by a school committee early in the school year and any proposed work which the committee may envisage could clash with the department's plans. The committee would appreciate your advice as to the nature of the building programme involved, the siting of such a building and any other associated works arising from this work. We also wish to know when the works will commence, that is, in 1969 or 1970, and how long they will take. Your advice in the above matters would be appreciated.

I wrote to the Secretary of the school committee and outlined the nature of the buildings to be erected at Kadina. However, the one thing I could not advise him about was when the work would commence. Therefore, I said:

I will endeavour to comply with the committee's wishes and obtain from the Minister as soon as possible when the work will commence.

As I have been asked for this information by the school committee, it would be appreciated if the Minister of Lands could ask the Minister of Works to look into this matter and perhaps at some time in the future give me the probable date for the commencement of the work.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will forward the question to the Minister of Works.

HOPE VALLEY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: On previous occasions I have asked questions and spoken on the shortcomings of the Hope Valley Primary School and

urged its replacement. On June 27 I visited this school and inspected the school buildings and grounds in company with an officer of the school committee and again observed its many inadequacies. Also, since the mid-year enrolment of infant children I have received three complaints from parents of these children who previously were not aware of the conditions prevailing at this school. On October 2 last year, in reply to a question, the Minister of Education informed me that the Education Department planned its replacement at some future date, but that before the school could be closed schools would be required to be built at Highbury and Vista to serve the whole area, and that a survey was being carried out at that time to assess the need for a school at Highbury. Can the Minister indicate the result of this survey and the position that the proposed Highbury school occupies on the building programme list?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It is very evident from the honourable member's question how involved this matter is, because the replacement of a school depends on the building of other schools. I cannot give her the answer off the cuff, but I will certainly get a report and let her have it, perhaps in letter form before the House sits again in a fortnight's time.

GRANGE RAIL SERVICE

Mr. BROOMHILL: I have asked questions in recent times regarding the proposed closure of the railway line between Adelaide and Grange. I asked a question on the subject in February this year, and the Minister of Roads and Transport forwarded a reply yesterday. It is necessary for me to read briefly from his reply in order to make my present question clear. The Minister's letter states:

I refer to your question in the House of Assembly on February 12, 1969, and advise that the decision of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study to recommend the abandonment of the Grange railway line was a marginal one.

He concludes by saying:

The Grange line does not carry any freight traffic so its future use is confined to providing passenger services only. The area served by the line is restricted, and as it is relatively close to the city it is considered that it could well be served by a radial bus route system.

I point out to the Minister that as this letter was dated June 30, 1969, it could well have been that the Minister had not taken into account the recent announcement that the West Lakes scheme would be proceeding, because it is obvious that with this scheme proceeding—

and provided the Railways Department was prepared to make parking facilities available at the Grange railway station—there would be a considerable increase in the number of passengers who would use this line. I believe that 4,000 passenger journeys are made each day at present. It would seem to me that the Minister in his reply has not taken this factor into account. In view of the great hostility from Grange residents at the decision to close this line, will the Attorney-General mention this fact quite specifically to the Minister of Roads and Transport?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think it most unlikely that the Minister did not take into account the West Lakes development. However, I am quite happy to talk to him again about the whole matter.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MILLERADIO

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. VIRGO: A short time ago I received a letter that caused me to read the galley proof of what I had said last night regarding Milleradio. I note from the *Hansard* proof that I said:

I am not referring to all television firms. There are probably some reputable ones.

The firm Hills Electronics has written to me, pointing out that my statement can be construed as meaning that there probably are some reputable ones or probably there are not. I agree with Hills Electronics: the wording that I used left much to be desired. I make plain to the House (as the remainder of my speech made plain) that basically I was referring to Milleradio. In fact, some people have contacted me this morning, asking whom they ought to contact, and I have said that, although it is not in my province to recommend any firm, I have every reason to believe that Hills Electronics (I think the firm operates under the name of Hills Telefix in the television field) is as reputable a firm as operates in South Australia.

I make this explanation, because I am disturbed to know that a firm such as Hills Electronics can take exception to the words I used, particularly bearing in mind the important part it plays in respect of employment in South Australia. In fact, it is with extreme regret that I have written to that organization only this morning declining its

kind invitation to attend the opening of an extension of its plant at O'Sullivan Beach. The Premier will be opening the establishment, and I hope that he will not be taking the credit for this expansion, because the credit truly belongs to the Hills organization.

Mr. Freebairn: He'll be saying some nice things, though.

Mr. VIRGO: I expect he will, but I guarantee they will not be about the member for Edwardstown. I think the House ought to know one of the points, which was made in the letter received from Hills Electronics, and which is as follows:

It is strongly emphasized that we and all other reputable members of this industry have a distinct and clear interest in stopping malpractices, because adverse publicity such as was carried in this morning's press always tends to have a detrimental effect on the innocent and guilty alike. We have no argument against either your motives or methods in exposing this particular case, nor any other. The point we wish to make, however, is that, if publicity is given to unscrupulous elements of the industry, then it is only fair that the public is aware that there are reputable members in the industry who value both their customers and their own integrity and act to preserve both. I believe the Hills organization has so acted, and I hope that the mass communication media will give prominence to the statement I have just made equal to that which it gave to the statement I made last night.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 2. Page 301.)

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): I indicated last night that I wanted to say a few words in relation to the comments of the member for Chaffey (Mr. Arnold), who apparently is now one of our departed comrades, on the question of Chowilla. In his address, the honourable member said:

Probably the most important matter mentioned in this debate so far is the Chowilla-Dartmouth issue.

Mr. Broomhill: That's fair enough.

Mr. VIRGO: I think it is an important issue, but how important does the Government consider it?

Mr. Broomhill: That is what I have been trying to work out.

Mr. VIRGO: I have looked back at what His Excellency the Hon. Sir John Mellis Napier, Lieut. Governor, said when he addressed the Parliament on its opening in 1968. After

talking about the need for industrial development and so on, he had this to say:

In this context the two following projects are of the utmost importance. In August last year a decision of the River Murray Commission deferred further work on the Chowilla dam, and construction ceased pending examination of alternative proposals. My Government regards it as vital to the future development of South Australia that in order to ensure our water resources this project should proceed. That was in 1968. What do we find in 1969 about Chowilla when His Excellency Maj.-General Sir James William Harrison delivered his Opening Speech to the Parliament on behalf of the Government? I challenge any member of the Government to find one word in this Speech about Chowilla; that is how important it is! Yet the member for Chaffey has got the gall to stand up and say, "Probably the most important matter mentioned is Chowilla." Neither he nor his Government considered it important at all. If it was it would be in the Governor's Speech, but not one word of it is there. Why is not the member for Chaffey honest about these things? Who is playing Party politics about it—the member for Chaffey or the member for Murray, with his stupidity, writing to the press trying to make people believe that a petition he was forced to present in this House was not from the people of Murray?

Mr. Arnold: If you're going to quote me, quote correctly.

Mr. VIRGO: I have quoted correctly and I will do it again for the benefit of the honourable member, who has just come back to the Chamber. He said, "Probably the most important matter mentioned in this debate so far is the Chowilla-Dartmouth issue." Show me any reference to that in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. Arnold: I said "in this debate".

Mr. VIRGO: What are we debating? We are debating the Governor's Speech.

Mr. Arnold: I was referring to the Leader of the Opposition's remarks.

Mr. VIRGO: I suggest the honourable member is as honest as he is stupid, saying he is not debating the Governor's Speech. What the deuce is he debating? If he is not debating that then you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or the Speaker should have sat him down.

Mr. Broomhill: What about the member for Murray?

Mr. VIRGO: He is just trying to make political capital, as he did at the last State election.

Mr. Wardle: Who started it?

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member's Premier has told him to shut up: he should do what his master's voice has said. The member for Chaffey also said last evening that he had not promised Chowilla, and invited us to check his words. I did just that and I found out that the member for Chaffey once again was wrong.

Mr. Arnold: Where did I say that? I didn't say it.

Mr. VIRGO: I suggest that before he makes these wild allegations the member for Chaffey should have full knowledge of what is printed in the local press in his own area. It might be all right for the Speaker to say that the words on a tape recorder that was recording his address at a meeting were not the words he used, but he did that immediately afterwards. I do not think that carries much weight. However, it is pointless for the member for Chaffey some 18 months later to say, "I didn't use those words; the *Murray Pioneer* must have made them up." Obviously, I have a bit more confidence in the integrity of the *Murray Pioneer* than the member for Chaffey has, and I can only assume from his comments that he is repudiating what the Premier said.

Mr. Clark: Who could blame him?

Mr. VIRGO: I am not blaming him for doing it; in fact, it is very refreshing that a member realizes that his Premier and leader has taken him for a ride. Are we to construe from the comments of the member for Chaffey last evening that he repudiates the policy speech delivered by the then Leader of the Opposition (now Premier) as reported in the *Advertiser* of February 14? Is this not the policy on which he was elected? I remind the member for Chaffey that this is what the *Advertiser* reports the Premier (and I have never heard the Premier dispute this) as saying:

This is what we shall do—get on with the Chowilla scheme.

That is what members opposite were elected on, yet apparently the member for Chaffey now repudiates it. An advertisement also appeared in the *Murray Pioneer*, as it appeared in other papers throughout the length and breadth of the State, referring to eight ways to get South Australia moving again, and No. 7 was by improving water supplies by building the Chowilla dam. That advertisement was authorized by R. Y. Wilson, who I believe is the same R. Y. Wilson who is Secretary of the Liberal and Country League. The member for Chaffey is repudiating his Premier's policy

speech, and we want to find out if he has the guts to stand up to his convictions and come over on the other side of the House when the vote is taken. Another reference to this appears in the *Advertiser* of March 1, 1968, (the day before polling day) in the place provided in the columns the *Advertiser* makes available to the major Parties and to the minor ones, too, because I notice the Democratic Labor Party has a column, as have the Communist Party, the Social Credit League and even the L.C.L. The L.C.L. column states:

The L.C.L. election policy is based on eight positive ways to promote South Australian development and get back to the prosperity we enjoyed up to March, 1965, when Labor took office . . . Assuring water supplies by pressing on with the Chowilla project and expanding the State's pipeline systems.

Not one word of this is in the Governor's Speech. This was stated 12 months ago and there are only two reasons why it would not be in the Governor's Speech now: first, that it has been accomplished, and secondly, it has lost its importance. It has not been accomplished. I think it is time that members opposite took stock of themselves. If they did they would immediately realize that they have all been led along by the nose by the Premier, who has in turn been led along by the nose by Sir Henry Bolte, and today South Australia is the satellite of the State of Victoria. On November 29, 1968, Sir Thomas Playford described the suggestions of alternatives to Chowilla as silly delusions.

Mr. Burdon: He hasn't changed his mind, either.

Mr. VIRGO: I hope not. Although we have not heard anything from him in quite a while, I hope that soon we shall again hear him express himself as eloquently on this subject as he has in the past, when everyone agreed with what he said. The electors in Chaffey know that what he said was right. Let the member for Chaffey go up there and try to sell to those electors the rubbish he tried to sell us last evening. He had to refer to the Renmark Irrigation Trust. (He prefers to use verbal shorthand and call it the "R.I.T.", but we know what he is talking about.) Let us see what the Renmark Irrigation Trust thinks about Dartmouth or Chowilla. It says:

The Renmark Irrigation Trust on behalf of its ratepayers gives its full support to the proposal to construct the dam at Chowilla—not at Dartmouth but at Chowilla. That is what Mr. Heritage, the Chairman of the trust, says. So, obviously, the member for Chaffey

is not expressing the views of the electors whom he is supposed to represent in this House.

Mr. Rodda: And he does.

Mr. VIRGO: He is not representing them at all. When he talks as he did last night such utter rubbish, the electors of Chaffey ought to be given an opportunity to say something about it.

Mr. Rodda: But you are not on the selection panel.

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member ought to give the electors of Victoria an opportunity of saying whether they want a "blunder" Secretary or an ordinary back-bench member to represent them. Let me also refer to a comment of the member for Chaffey:

"Going to the people" seems to be the theme song of members opposite. In many ways they act like spoilt children because, whenever they lose, they want another try.

Mr. Langley: We did not lose, either.

Mr. VIRGO: That is the point—we did not lose.

Mr. Venning: You did lose.

Mr. VIRGO: The little cockie from Rocky can say what he likes but, if he can show that 52 per cent out of 100 per cent is a minority, then I suggest that as soon as I am finished he pursue this very point, because he is the next speaker. I hope he can prove to the public that a 52 per cent vote is not a majority, for he would be a genius. He is wasting his time in this House if he can. If he can, the new mathematics now being taught in the schools should be thrown out immediately and we should put in the Wizard of Oz: let him teach the children that 52 per cent is not a majority. There is another aspect of this comment by the member for Chaffey that should be considered. When a Party goes to the people, it states a policy and it is upon that policy that the election takes place—not on something that occurs afterwards but on the policy enunciated prior to the election. For the benefit of the member for Chaffey and of any other members who may need it, let me say that the Party that is elected with a majority can and does claim a mandate for the policy that has been enunciated.

How can the member for Chaffey claim a mandate for Dartmouth? If he has not a mandate for it, the members on this side of the House and the public as a whole have an undeniable right to express their opinion on such a major issue. To say that members on this side of the House are "acting like spoilt children" when they are asking for an election on this matter is yet another clear indication

that the members opposite know they have not the support of the people, that they do not possess the confidence of the people. They know that, if there was an election tomorrow or in a fortnight's or a month's time, they would be annihilated. It is for this reason that members on the Government side will not, under any conditions, go to the people. I can make a fairly reasonable forecast that members opposite will not be game enough to go to the people on the first Saturday in March, 1971; they will delay it and use the provisions of the Constitution to try to extend their own term of office. In fact, if they could extend it, as the Government did in 1933, to a five-year term, they would do that, too. They have no courage.

Mr. Ryan: Whenever they do it, it will be their last.

Mr. VIRGO: I agree with that.

Mr. Rodda: You are heading for a drought; you will die of thirst.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not know whether we are heading for a drought, but we are heading for honesty, which is something that the member for Victoria and his colleagues seem to have lost sight of.

Mr. Rodda: Not at all.

Mr. VIRGO: There are such things as being honest with oneself. I would not like to be in the position of any member opposite, who has to live with himself and face up to and look at himself each morning in the mirror and say, "I am the man who promised to do something and then did not do it; I did something completely contrary to what I said I would do." Thank heavens I do not have to face that position! However, I am sorry for members opposite because they do.

Mr. Wardle: The honourable member is a paragon of virtue!

Mr. VIRGO: No, I am not. The member for Murray can draw a halo around his head but he will join the pleasant band of members of the State Parliament and other Parliaments who have one term of office, and that is it. The only hope for the member for Murray is the gerrymander that his Party has submitted to the Electoral Commission. I am confident that that commission is too honest and has far too much integrity to be fooled by the submissions of the Liberal and Country League. I want members opposite to get one thing into their thick nuts—that, if the plan for Chowilla is shelved because of their

actions, it is the Liberal Party in Government that will carry the responsibility for this State's not having a dam.

Mr. Rodda: Rubbish!

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member can say "rubbish" as long as he likes, but the responsibility for the non-building of the Chowilla dam rests entirely with the Liberal Government.

Mr. Rodda: Who delayed it?

Mr. Ryan: The L.C.L. Government.

Mr. VIRGO: It is unfortunate that members opposite obviously have not taken the trouble to read the reports that have been brought down to them.

Mr. Rodda: Your Premier agreed to a deferment.

Mr. VIRGO: Apparently, much money is wasted in this Parliament in issuing reports that members opposite never read. I suggest that, between now and the time when the debate on Chowilla is held, members opposite study the matter properly and the facts behind it so that they will be able to offer intelligent contributions to that debate.

Mr. Ryan: That will be a change for a Lib!

Mr. VIRGO: Exactly: I now turn to one or two matters connected with the Railways Department. Members opposite will be pleased to know that I shall leave them alone from now on as far as Chowilla is concerned. There are two references in the Governor's Speech to the railways, one being to the effect that they are showing a far better return than was anticipated. I am highly delighted at that state of affairs. I borrowed from the Clerk of the House the quarterly return of the South Australian Railways Commissioner, laid on the table by the Attorney-General on behalf of the Minister of Roads and Transport on June 24. Strange as it may seem, the information in that report of the approximate earnings and working expenses does not completely justify the claim made in the Governor's Speech.

However, I realize that it is somewhat tricky and even dangerous to take a section of figures without knowing the impact that is likely to occur in the excluded period, so the forecast in the Speech may be correct. I sincerely hope it will be because, unlike Government members, I have tremendous faith in the South Australian Railways as a transport system in this State.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr. VIRGO: I am pleased to hear the cockie from Rocky saying "Hear, hear", because since his Government has been in office it has closed down railway line after railway line.

Mr. Venning: Only those that are uneconomical.

Mr. VIRGO: This Government, to make them uneconomical, did not run trains on them: no railway service will return money if that is done. On January 21, 1915, (probably near the honourable member's birthday)—

Mr. Venning: About three months before.

Mr. VIRGO: —the railway line from Marino to Willunga was opened. Few people lived in that area: just a few cockies. This railway service continued to operate until April 28, 1969. By that time many of the farming community had moved out and thousands of houses had been built in the area. What happened? The railway service was discontinued. The Minister of Roads and Transport, supported by Government members in this House, said that the workers should not be given a railway service.

Mr. Broomhill: What about the member for the district?

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member has done nothing about it. The Government has handed all the transport business in this area to private enterprise. This is the Government's policy, and I suppose we cannot justifiably complain, because we deserve to suffer the policy of the Government we elect.

Mr. Broomhill: Was it elected by a majority?

Mr. VIRGO: I will not speak about that: the present Government occupies the Treasury benches whether or not it was elected by a majority, and at least 42 per cent of the people said that they wanted the railway closed and private enterprise to take over. It is pointless for the cockie from Rocky to say that we have a good railway system and should support it. He is being hypocritical.

If Government members studied (as we did) the report of the State Planning Office and considered the expected population of this area, they would realize that this railway service was closed at a time when it could start to pay. If the service were modernized with up-to-date rolling stock and a good fast service provided there would be no need now to argue whether we should build the Noarlunga Freeway to serve the people in the area, because the railways could provide this service. I

wonder how many members read the 1967-68 Railways Commissioner's report. I hope that the member for Light is at present resting his eyes, because he would be interested in the point I am about to make.

Mr. Broomhill: He has been busy with all his duties.

Mr. Freebairn: I am listening politely.

Mr. VIRGO: Many times the Railways Commissioner has drawn attention to the state of affairs within the railways service, and in this report he again repeats the need to continue to provide adequate railway services for the community. However, successive Governments have required the Railways Department not only to provide a service but also to make a profit and, unfortunately, it cannot do both. I agree with the Railways Commissioner when he states that in the United Kingdom the advisability of permitting the Railways to provide a viable service and to accept the socially necessary ones as a community obligation has been recognized. This principle should be recognized here.

Unlike the member for Rocky River, I maintain that we have to accept non-payable lines as a community obligation. If he considered that question, he would realize immediately that the outlying farming areas (which he has the unique distinction of representing) would not have been developed had it not been for the service offered to the original settlers and their successors by the South Australian Railways Department.

Mr. Jennings: Private enterprise would not do it, because there was no profit in it.

Mr. VIRGO: Private enterprise will not do anything without profit. Government members will accept a socialized industry (the member for Rocky River supported it by his "Hear, hear") and will use it to provide an unprofitable service, but once the service becomes profitable it is handed over to private enterprise so that the profits can go out of the State.

Mr. Venning: Who recently increased railway freights in these areas by 33 per cent?

Mr. VIRGO: Who did it? Tell me.

Mr. Venning: The A.L.P. Government.

Mr. VIRGO: I am delighted to hear that. Is that the only thing the Labor Government increased? If the member for Rocky River is worried about increased costs he should consider the record of his Government during the last 15 years, because scarcely an item has been left undisturbed.

Mr. Venning: You played into the hands of road transport.

Mr. VIRGO: I have heard many humorous statements in my time, but that is a good one. It was private transport, with a little whipping up, that did its best to oust members of the former Labor Government. If we played into their hands, which the honourable member suggests, they would have done the opposite. I suggest that the member for Rocky River join the member for Light and have a siesta.

I will now deal with another matter affecting the railways generally that has some bearing on a question you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, asked on Tuesday. It refers to the tragic accident at Violet Town, Victoria. I think you referred, Sir, to the findings of the coroner (Mr. H. W. Pascoe, S.M.) after his inquest into the death of the nine people on February 7. I think I have a duty to inform members that, if a similar accident had occurred in South Australia, the deathroll would probably have been at least 25 per cent higher. I say that because of the difference between the equipment used in the two States.

We have read in the various reports and in the newspaper report of July 1 that the fireman and the guard were negligent in that they were inattentive to the safety device. A small device must be pressed every 90 seconds: otherwise, the whistle blows and the brakes come on. In South Australia, a similar device is used, but it operates on a 120-second time lag, not a 90-second time lag. This report states that the train travelled six miles after the appliance started to operate, so presumably a train in South Australia would have travelled eight miles, and the result would have been much worse.

I do not consider this to be a good safety device. The only safety device that should be insisted upon is the single trip system, which operates on the basis that, if a train passes a signal that is at "stop" or passes a red light, the air brakes are tripped on automatically. When the use of this device has been suggested many times over a period of many years, the reply has always been, "We haven't the money to fit it." However, the Victorian Railways Department has had to find \$1,000,000 to replace a train, and I do not know how much they will have to pay in damages in respect of the unfortunate people who lost their lives and the other people who were seriously injured. It is a matter not of money but of safety first. Item 1 in the coaching book of the South Australian Railways is,

"Safety first at all times." That must be the motto, because many lives are associated with the carrying of passengers.

I think from the tenor of your question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you wanted to find out whether the South Australian Railways Department would act to prevent an accident in this State caused by a driver's dying while in control of a locomotive. Unlike the coroner I do not attach any blame to the driver of the Victorian train. I do not think it is the driver's job to go to the railway doctor and say, "I am not fit to carry on. I may have a smash." That is why there are railway doctors. A person has to pass a medical examination to join the Railways Department. A few years ago, when girls were being appointed, the girls would not go in to the doctor on their own.

The South Australian Railways Department has already taken fairly drastic action, and I have no quarrel with that so far as accident prevention is concerned. However, I have a serious quarrel with it about the consequences. The department now subjects main-line drivers to regular and fairly severe medical examinations. I applaud the Commissioner for taking this step, but I do not applaud him for the fact that, when a driver, who may have given 20 years or 30 years of valuable service to the Commissioner and to the public, reaches the stage in his late 50's or early 60's where his health is not good enough for him to continue, the Railways Department doctor does not pass him and the department then finds him another job, such as a shunt driver, cleaner, or storeman. The catch is that, immediately the driver is taken from his main-line job, which he took years to work up to, he receives the wage applicable to the new job to which he is assigned. The Railways Department shows its appreciation by reducing his wages!

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It's a deterrent to his reporting his condition.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. In the 20 years or 30 years that this man has been a main-line driver, he has accrued long service leave at the rate applicable to that position. However, the minute he is demoted in his declining years he loses all that entitlement and receives long service leave payments only on the basis of the salary he is receiving on retirement; if that is only two-thirds of what he was previously receiving, then it is just bad luck for him. I believe that matter should be considered urgently. Indeed, I shall be pressing

the Government to investigate thoroughly the whole of this position, particularly as it affects the more stringent health requirements regarding main-line engine drivers (although I hope the consideration will not be confined to these people), in order to ensure that a man serving in a Government department does not suffer in relation to his long service leave or, in fact, does not suffer in the latter part of his career, merely because his health is declining. I believe that such employees ought to remain on the rate applying before any demotion is likely to occur, and I can cite instances in private enterprise where this applies. Society ought to be prepared to stand this expense in appreciation of the services that these men have rendered.

I believe also that the safety of trains should be considered urgently. The present system is safe only to the extent of the manual operation, whereas the trip system is safe irrespective of man. The trip system to which I am referring is not something that has never been tried: it currently operates on the London underground as well as on many other railway systems in the world. It has been proved to be successful and foolproof, and I hope the Minister concerned will note these things so that they will be considered fully and properly.

I was pleased to see in the Governor's Speech that the Railways Department was about to introduce centralized train control for the desert. I suppose the members for Victoria and Albert will both have something to say about this matter as it affects their areas, and I include also the member for Murray, because his area is affected, too; but it does not stop there. This is the only line connecting Adelaide and Melbourne. I am led to believe that numerous delays are caused at present by the rather antiquated provisions applying on this line. In fact, I think that in one or two locations it is only recently that the switching system has been altered. Previously, the porter used to have to pedal his bicycle like mad up to one end of the yard, turn the switch and then when the train came along, jump on his bicycle and pedal like mad down to the other end.

Mr. Jennings: He should have been twins.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. I think that has now been taken care of. The introduction of centralized train control will mean much for the faster travel of trains, and I hope this will apply to the Adelaide-Melbourne train because, despite the improvements made over the years,

to the best of my knowledge the train travelling time from Adelaide to Melbourne is the same now as it was about 25 or 30 years ago.

Mr. Jennings: It's a bit more comfortable.

Mr. VIRGO: I agree, but it could be much more comfortable than it is. I have an inherent belief that, if the train service were upgraded to the standard that one might expect, it would carry many more passengers than it is carrying today; in fact, there would be not one train running a day but two or perhaps three. Unfortunately, the services offered on this train are reminiscent of those offered in the 17th century. Although different people have different views, I do not believe that the building of club cars as announced by the Minister of Roads and Transport will provide the answer: I believe that a train passenger should be treated similarly to the way in which an airways passenger is treated. I think there should be people present in each car for this purpose, whether they be porters, conductors, or hostesses as they are called in aeroplanes, and I believe that a much improved service ought to be offered to the public.

Unfortunately, however, the service provided by the Railways Commissioner on the Overland is, to say the least, meagre. I believe there should be a small cubicle from which the conductor can provide passengers, who so desire it, with liquid refreshments, as applies in an aeroplane, and conductors ought to be able to provide passengers with a proper breakfast (not a continental breakfast as currently applies). Further, a vast improvement is needed in the facilities at the Adelaide Railway Station so that, for instance, when a person alights from a train, perhaps being unlucky enough to be in the last carriage, he does not have a mile walk to a car, being required also to hump cases up a ramp or steps. This applies, too, as the member for Semaphore said, when a person is leaving Adelaide. I hope that all these matters will be considered and the appropriate action taken. However, I assure the House that, if this is not the case, these matters will be raised again and again.

Mr. Nankivell: When you go away tonight are you flying or travelling by train?

Mr. VIRGO: I do not think that interjection is relevant to the debate.

The SPEAKER: It is out of order, too.

Mr. VIRGO: It is, Sir, and I thank you for reminding the member for Albert of that. I refer now to sick leave in the South Australian Railways. Unfortunately, all people get sick;

I have been watching the Premier over the last couple of days and I have wondered whether he will recover. I hope he will recover, because he gets cranky when he is unwell. In 1942, after considerable union pressure, the State Government granted one week's paid sick leave a year to employees on weekly hire in the Railways Department and in 44 other Government departments. At the same time, for reasons best known to the Government of that day, it granted two weeks' sick leave to all officers of the Railways Department and the Public Service. In the intervening period it has never been able to logically explain this discrimination—why a junior boy or girl starting at 15 or 16 years of age should be entitled to two weeks' sick leave whilst a man who has served the department faithfully for 40 years should be worth only one week's sick leave. This discrimination should be ended, and ended quickly. There ought to be a vast improvement in the very meagre amount of sick leave currently available. I know people will argue, "Of course, they can accumulate sick leave for 26 years." However, this argument is valid only if a man is fit enough to accumulate it in this way. Consequently, this matter certainly requires urgent attention.

I turn now to the rail service currently being provided for the public. I was rather alarmed by a reply I received from the Railways Commissioner a few weeks ago: he told me that, because of lack of rolling stock, it would not be possible to provide the services that the Railways Department itself considered desirable. This is a serious position, and I would have expected, in the light of this information, that the Governor's Speech would say how the Government intended to overcome this situation. I would have expected His Excellency's Speech to say that the Government intended to make funds available so that the Railways Department could provide the services it considered necessary. However, there was not a word! I am led to only one conclusion: having closed down the Willunga, Angaston and Wallaroo lines—

Mr. Casey: And the service from Port Pirie to Peterborough.

Mr. VIRGO: —I can only assume that the Minister is bent on destroying one of the greatest assets this State possesses. I hope that, when the Government's three-year term has finally ended, there will still be enough remnants left of one of the greatest Socialist industries this country possesses to enable it to be revived and to resume its rightful place in our society.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): It is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to say a few words on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In doing so I congratulate the member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) and the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) on the very able way in which they carried out their privilege of moving and seconding the motion. I should like to congratulate them on the time they spent in perusing details and producing in this House the fruits of their work. When they were speaking I was reminded of the two former members for Gumeracha and Onkaparinga who served this House, their districts and the State in a very noble way. I refer to Sir Thomas Playford and Mr. Shannon. I am sure (and I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker) that it is only a matter of time before the mover and seconder of this motion will very successfully take the positions of those they have followed.

I also compliment other colleagues who have contributed to this debate. The Government has outlined specifically its achievements and its future programme. Although the previous speaker, who has left the Chamber, had much to say about the Governor's Speech, there were many things he did not realize. However, he will keep.

I, too, congratulate Sir James Harrison on his appointment as Governor of this State and I sincerely hope and trust that his term as Governor will be very happy not only for himself but also for his good wife. As we speak of our Governor we think, too, of the Governor whom we farewelled only a short time ago, and we sincerely hope and trust that his sojourn in the apple isle will be very enjoyable: I refer to the Governor of Tasmania (Sir Edric Bastyan).

In his Speech the Governor referred to the passing of Senator Keith Laught and mentioned other departed members of Parliament. To the families of Senator Laught and of other departed members of Parliament I express my appreciation for their services to this State.

Mr. Speaker, this occasion reminds me that we are embarking on the second year and the third session of this Parliament. I express my appreciation to the Premier and to members of Cabinet for their untiring devotion to duty. They had a long row to hoe before they got "even stevens", but those gentlemen, despite this heavy load that they had to carry, found time to assist the back-benchers in this House, particularly the new members. In assessing this period of Government, it is clear that our

Premier has been successful in fulfilling his election promises of 1968. He said that his first task would be to arrest the drift in the finances of the State and to endeavour to re-establish confidence in industry in South Australia. Never at any stage did the Premier offer "pies in the sky" in his election campaign.

Mr. Broomhill: He never said anything about taxation, either.

Mr. VENNING: I know that you at least, Mr. Speaker, will agree that although some of the measures taken have not been as acceptable as we would have wished, this Government has achieved what our Premier said we would do: namely, produce a balanced Budget.

Mr. Langley: And build Chowilla!

Mr. VENNING: In my remarks last year when speaking in the Address in Reply debate I congratulated the honourable member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) on his appointment as Treasurer. I went on to say then that I thought he should have been knighted for his willingness to tackle a financial situation that many would not have touched with a long stick. This thought I still hold, and I express my appreciation of the Treasurer's untiring efforts in very difficult circumstances. It seems rather significant, Mr. Speaker, that when we get rid of a Labor Government we seem to get rid of droughts, and this has been the situation in this State. It is rather phenomenal, really. I suppose the good Lord looked down on this country of ours when the previous Government was in office here and saw how it was using the good things of this life, and probably that is why we had a drought.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Have you got a hot line up there?

Mr. VENNING: Yes, I have been divinely guided. This past season has produced a cereal harvest of plenty. Feed since the drought of 1967 has been plentiful for stock, and lambing percentages in South Australia this year have been reported at a very high level.

Mr. Broomhill: Did you have a good year?

Mr. VENNING: Yes, we had an excellent year, and we are very appreciative of it. The delivery of wheat in South Australia during the past season was an all-time record, not as records are established today, by eclipsing the previous one by a hair's breadth, but in this case by a near-record margin. In this season there was a delivery of 69,080,000 bushels in bulk and 10,000,000 bushels in bags, making a grand total delivery of 79,080,000

bushels. The previous record delivery, established in the 1966-67 season, was 51,000,000 bushels, so this year's delivery is an increase of almost 60 per cent over the previous record.

As is well known, Mr. Speaker, the increase in production and delivery was brought about by two circumstances. First, the season I am speaking of followed a severe drought. Genuine wheatgrowers and wool producers alike had bare fields and reduced numbers of sheep, and to preserve their country from drifting and to alleviate their financial deficiency (and sheep being too dear to a degree at this time to buy) a very large area was sown down principally to wheat but to a lesser degree barley and oats. Excellent seasonal conditions throughout the State, particularly in the fringe country areas, coupled with the increased acreage, were responsible for this record delivery.

Mr. Langley: And the good Lord!

Mr. VENNING: Thank you. I would like to express my appreciation to the Minister of Agriculture for his assistance and for the expeditious manner in which he introduced the amendment to the Bulk Handling of Grain Act Amendment Bill last year to enable the co-operative (might I say, Mr. Speaker, at the request of the industry itself) to restrict deliveries during the season and on any subsequent occasions.

Mr. Casey: We can all take some credit for that.

Mr. VENNING: Yes. On behalf of the industry, I express appreciation to all members for their co-operation in this regard.

Mr. Rodda: Is this the way you are supposed to have misled the people?

Mr. VENNING: I will deal with the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) later; he will keep, for sure. I say once again that that was an occasion on which we needed immediate action, for growers were becoming most concerned with the situation and it was necessary for this legislation to be prepared immediately and passed by this House. On behalf of the industry, in which I am very proud to play a very important part, I can say that we appreciated the co-operation given by every member of this House in getting the alteration to the Act to enable us to regulate deliveries and to put the legislation on the Statute Book not only for last season but for any subsequent occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree when I say that the wheat industry is to be commended for the moves it has put forward in an endeavour to contain

production within the industry and to a degree for obtaining an expected first advance of \$1.10 a bushel. The Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry has been most sympathetic to the approach by the industry in these matters, and on behalf of the wheatgrowers of South Australia I extend thanks for his help in what could have been a most difficult situation. It is well known that the Australian Wheat Board has allocated a delivery quota to Australian wheatgrowers of 325,000,000 bushels, and of this amount South Australia has been given a quota of 45,000,000. Just how each State will calculate the individual grower's delivery quota is a matter that is being left to the States to decide.

As you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, our Minister of Agriculture has approved of the appointment of a quota committee, as suggested by the United Farmers and Graziers organization, to handle the allocation of quotas in South Australia. The basis on which quotas are to be calculated in this State will be determined by the average of the last five years' delivery figures of growers, less a percentage expected to be about 10 per cent. A portion of this percentage deduction from the five-year average will be consumed in getting the State's average delivery, which is 47,000,000 bushels for this period, down to the quota of 45,000,000 bushels. The balance of the percentage will be used as a pool for the purpose of allocations to growers who have been seriously affected by drought. Many areas of the State, such as the Mallee area in particular, have had two or three droughts in the five-year period, and so it has been considered that the growers from these areas should be given some additional quota figure in connection with their deliveries. This has applied not only to growers in drought areas but also to some growers who have become involved in buying land. The committee will look at their circumstances and see if it is possible to help them.

I think that overall the plan is very fair indeed in that it gives to all growers an opportunity to participate in some way in the delivery of grain during these difficult times. I believe that the committee set up in this State to allocate quotas to growers will have a full-time job. Many applications are coming in and the committee will have to separate the justifiable cases from those not so urgent. The quota committee will have representatives from the Agriculture Department, the Australian Wheat Board and South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, plus

about eight growers from districts throughout the State. A three-man committee with greater powers than the quota committee will be available to which growers can appeal should they not be satisfied with what the quota committee allocates to them.

Mr. Casey: I understand there will be a lawyer on the three-man committee. What is the purpose of that?

Mr. VENNING: I do not know for sure what will be the personnel of that committee but I am certain that the main committee, because of its representation, will be capable of handling the situation well indeed. As eight grower members will be on the committee, it will have a fair loading from the point of view of the man on the land. Later this year it will be necessary to bring into the House legislation to tidy up the situation regarding quotas. I hope that when the legislation comes before the House it will receive the co-operation of all members opposite so that there will be no delay in its passing. Mr. Les Price (Senior Vice-President of the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation) was reported in the growers' newspapers only recently as saying that anyone who spoke against the quota plan or made any derogatory comments about it was doing the wheat industry a serious disservice. I agree entirely with what Mr. Price said. All sorts of alternative plans of what can be done have been brought forward, and I believe the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation has had a good look at all plans submitted by growers throughout the Commonwealth.

Mr. Casey: I didn't think they submitted any plans.

Mr. VENNING: They discussed this at various conferences throughout Australia and met last year and again in March of this year in Perth to see what further action could be taken. I am glad to say that the plan before us originated to some degree in this State. In Perth, in March, some of the States were not completely in line, but slowly and surely, with the help of the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation, all the States eventually came into line, and we now have the plan that is before us.

True, in South Australia we have taken a five-year average less 10 per cent, whereas other States have adopted a different system of working out their quota, but this does not matter. The States have been allocated their quota and it is up to the committees within those States to determine how those quotas are arrived at. I understand some States

work on a three-year quota and others on a six-year quota but this does not matter as long as they get down to a basis of distributing to the growers in those States what they have to deliver to bring them up to the quota.

Since I have been a member of the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation I have been fortunate to receive regularly growers' newspapers from all over Australia and, consequently, I know fairly well the growers' reaction in each State. Therefore, I can say confidently that, in the main, growers are conscious of the situation in the wheat industry and greatly appreciate what the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation has been able to come up with in their interests. They are happy with the negotiations that have taken place with the Minister for Primary Industry. The States have only to assent to the legislation and the growers, who are confident they can deliver their quota next harvest, can receive a \$1.10 first advance.

One thing about the plan which pleases me is that if a grower does not produce his quota of wheat and deliver it in one year he is permitted the next year to deliver over and above his previous quota to make up the deficiency for the previous year. That is what will be written into the legislation. Let us take the case of a grower who had a quota of 10,000 bushels and wanted to play it safe, not wanting a heap of grain stored on his farm. If he worked out that at eight bags an acre he needed so many acres to produce 10,000 bushels and if drought conditions set in and he was able to produce only 5,000 bushels, in the following year, provided the quotas were left as they had been, that grower could deliver his quota of 10,000 bushels plus the previous year's deficiency of 5,000 bushels, making a total delivery in that year of 15,000 bushels. It is expected that anyone who grows more than his quota of wheat will be permitted to deliver into the silo system when space becomes available, and that will be only when all growers have delivered their quotas. Although space may become available at some stage and growers will then be permitted to deliver to this storage, they will not receive any further payment on this wheat; it will become a part of their quota for next year and they will receive their first advance on that wheat next year.

Mr. Casey: Let us hope we can get rid of some of our wheat out of the silos by then.

Mr. VENNING: I believe the House will be interested to hear of the situation anticipated

by our bulk handling company at the commencement of the coming harvest. It is well-known that the Australian Wheat Board anticipates a carry-over of 250,000,000 bushels of wheat in Australia at the commencement of the harvest, and once again this State has been given a quota of carry-over of 45,000,000 bushels, being made up of about 35,000,000 bushels of bulk plus about 10,000,000 bushels in bags.

This has been laid down by the Australian Wheat Board. With the normal traditional sales of wheat, and with this State's share of the China trade, it is expected that, with shipments of grain between now and the harvest, the quota of the bulk wheat carry-over for South Australia will be down to 35,000,000 bushels in storage. Much must happen between now and then for this figure to be as low as 35,000,000 bushels, but we are hopeful. Those who are interested in shipping from South Australia will know that we have had some ships only recently at Wallaroo and Port Pirie, but considerable shipping must be allocated to this State in order that the State's quota carry-over may be down to the 35,000,000 bushels in bulk plus the 10,000,000 bushels in bags.

So with the carry-over of about 35,000,000 bushels in bulk and the quota delivery to South Australia of 45,000,000 bushels, the amount of anticipated storage space required to accommodate all wheat at the conclusion of the harvest deliveries is for 80,000,000 bushels. Taking into account the storages yet to be completed and the permanent, temporary and emergency sheds, South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling will at the commencement of the harvest, or thereabouts, have storage space for 82,125,000 bushels; so on paper the co-operative will have in excess of the estimated carry-over and quota delivery storage space for 2,150,000 bushels of wheat. That is on paper. Of course, it is one thing to work things out on paper and another thing to work things out in reality. If it was possible to remove silos from one part of the State to another, we could have surplus storage space; but this is not possible. For a short time during the harvest period we could again have our problems, provided the year progresses as we hope it will.

I believe the quota of 45,000,000 bushels for South Australia is a sizeable amount of wheat and we will need reasonable seasonal conditions to produce this amount of grain. Because of the situation in the wheat industry,

there has been and will be an increase in the acreage sown to barley this year. It is to be hoped that the Australian Barley Board will be able to exceed its past season's creditable performance in making early sales of this grain. The growers were most appreciative of the Barley Board's efforts this last season, in that it got busy early in the year making barley sales, something it had not previously done to the extent we would have wished to see. During the past year it made early sales and arranged the shipping. As a result, early shipments of barley from South Australia made a fair amount of storage space available to the wheatgrowers for the storage of their wheat. It is appreciated how the Australian Barley Board took the initiative last year, a year that was difficult for the grain industry, in attending to these early sales and shipments.

It is to be hoped that again this coming season the board will be able to get out and make early sales. It is not easy to do this. Barley, with all the barley classifications, is a little different from wheat. I know the Barley Board has stated this previously, that if it goes overseas to make early sales it is not to know what varieties of barley will be predominant in the delivery, but it has been rather significant that the early prices of barley have been considerably higher than the amount of money that has been made by the later sales. Consequently, it leaves some leeway for the Barley Board to negotiate, with the classifications it has not sold earlier, at higher prices.

There would be nobody in this House, Mr. Speaker, more conscious than yourself of all the comments recently made by men in the various facets of our industry about the lack of sufficient deep sea ports in our State. This has been highlighted as the reason for the lack of shipping from time to time for South Australia, and in particular during this past season. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) said just now that the other States were getting priority over this State in shipping. It is well known that because of our geographical position our freight rates are higher. When the Australian Wheat Board negotiated with China its last deal, it had to write into the agreement that only 30 per cent of that wheat was to be taken from Western Australia. Therefore, it could see that this State needed some protection; otherwise, the wheat for China would all have been taken from either the Eastern States or Western Australia.

Mr. Casey: An international shipping line might help.

Mr. VENNING: I do not know about that at this stage, but the honourable member may be able to contribute later something to the debate on how we can aid the primary producer in the movement of his grain from this State. Any contribution that any member can offer will be appreciated, not only by the wheat-grower but also by the Australian Wheat Board.

Mr. Ferguson: And other industries, too.

Mr. VENNING: Yes. I am pleased to know that my Government has made the effort to have Port Giles in operation early next year and that the depth of water there will permit the loading and topping up of vessels of at least 40,000 tons capacity. I am also pleased to know a seismic survey is nearing completion at two of our major ports but in my remarks I refer principally to Wallaroo. I hope the results are such that this port, being so centrally situated, connected to the rail, and having two large superphosphate works, will be developed to present-day and future requirements. I am particularly concerned with the welfare of this important port, first, because of the significant part it played in shipping our grain when it was permitted to do so and, secondly, it can be used admirably as a topping-up port for Port Pirie and would prove to be the appropriate port for development in conjunction with, if necessary, rail movement of grain for shipping from any part of the State. I cannot emphasize too much the need for our progressive Government to give early consideration and take the necessary action to provide sufficient deep sea ports in our State.

Yesterday afternoon and last evening the member for Wallaroo had much to say about the port of Wallaroo. For some time, and particularly early in the season, this honourable member had much to say about me in relation to an announcement that Port Pirie would receive, early in that season, preferential treatment for shipping. It is well known, and I said it at the time, that although this State had a carry-over of about 5,500,000 to 6,000,000 bushels of wheat, the Port Pirie Division had more than one-third of this carry-over, and in order to bring that division into line with the rest of the State it would have to be allotted one or two ships for the grain. The member for Wallaroo rang the local members of the Australian Wheat Board belly-aching about Port Pirie receiving preferential treatment. Unfortunately, a 12,000-ton ship was due at Port Pirie but for some reason it

disappeared from the scene. The result was that about 12,000 tons of grain that this ship would have moved from Port Pirie was delivered to Wallaroo by the growers from Crystal Brook and the Port Pirie Division.

Had the honourable member not complained I believe that this ship would have come in and the wheat would have been taken away, and he would not have had the trouble at Wallaroo that he complained about. The result was that growers filled Port Pirie quickly, because only 1,000,000 bushels could be stored there, and they then delivered their wheat to Wallaroo, which soon filled. Growers in that area had to cart to Ardrossan, although they did not want to do this. Had the member for Wallaroo thought for a moment about the overall situation this incident would not have happened, and I believe that by his action he did his growers and his members in that area a dis-service. Last night he took me to task over the report for which his Government was responsible. I do not know how I came to interest myself in this report, whether I was divinely led once again or not, but in the course of my duties as Zone Director for that area I decided that I should try to get a copy of it.

Various reasons have been suggested for the Labor Government asking for this report. The construction of Port Giles had been agreed to by the previous Government, but because of the riotous living of the Labor Government with the State's finances perhaps it had to bide its time. The Labor Government appointed a three-man committee to visit the various ports, and under its terms of reference it had to ascertain whether it was necessary to have additional bulk handling facilities at terminals in this State. When I looked at the document I was amazed that such a document should have been compiled. It showed that the committee heard evidence at the southern end of the peninsula, went to Eyre Peninsula and heard evidence about another deep sea port, but heard no evidence at Wallaroo or Ardrossan. The committee recommended that Port Giles should proceed and that there should be three "super" terminals in this State, at Port Adelaide (Eastern), Ardrossan (Central), and Port Lincoln (Western).

The report recommended that Ardrossan should be commenced first, because there had been a fair amount of storage built at the terminal there. This recommendation amazed me, because I considered that the availability of water in a harbour should determine whether a "super" terminal would be built,

and not necessarily the storage that had been built by my company on the land. Therefore, I was amazed at the attitude of the member for Wallaroo last evening. I represent this area as a Zone Director and I have worked arduously in its interests, and I am amazed that the honourable member could not recognize the fact that I work in the interests of these growers. The honourable member made some caustic remarks about this report and how I came to obtain a copy from the Minister. I am sure that if he had been sufficiently interested in the situation he could have approached the Labor Minister, who would have treated him in the same way as my Minister treated me, and made the report available.

During the last harvest the most suitable port in the State was not used to handle wheat; the only time Wallaroo was used was to top-up one or two barley ships. I was disappointed that this important port was not used more during this period. As has been said often in the last two or three days, Wallaroo did accommodate the largest vessel ever to take grain from this State. Whilst the people of Wallaroo were inclined to say that the ship came to Wallaroo because of the significance of that port, that was not necessarily so. The *Pontos* came to Wallaroo because of the quality of the wheat in the Wallaroo Division. The boat was supposed to go to Newcastle but, because other vessels were tied up there, it had to be diverted to Wallaroo and, consequently, it was able to take on the quantity of grain that it otherwise would have taken at Newcastle.

It is particularly pleasing to note that, even now, Wallaroo is capable of handling modern vessels of 29,000 tons capacity. I was extremely perturbed at the statements by the member for Wallaroo about the movement of grain from the Port Pirie Division earlier in this season. I was reminded of the statements made by our own General Manager of the Australian Wheat Board (Mr. Cliff Semmler), when the announcement was made about the deal with China. Mr. Semmler said in the press that South Australia would have to get some preferential treatment in these sales and that some relief would have to be given to the situation in this State.

I was astounded at comments made in the other States in which Mr. Semmler was taken to task. I stand behind his comments and consider him to be a dedicated servant of the growers of this State. He is known to many

growers and considers it his duty to go to the wheat areas from time to time. He has addressed our Agricultural Bureau meetings frequently, telling the growers of the situation in their industry. I compliment Mr. Semmler, who is extremely concerned about the welfare of the wheatgrower of this State and also about the commodity and the manner in which it is marketed. Sometimes he is concerned about the way in which we are compelled to market our grain, and often that is not the way in which we should like to market it. Time does not permit me to give details about this problem, and perhaps other members may not be greatly interested in it.

I consider that the situation regarding ports in this State is urgent, because of the competition that will come from New South Wales and Western Australia. New South Wales has spent much money, not only on port facilities but also on improving the hourly loading rate. At Kwinana the organization is spending about \$20,000,000 to provide a port to ship grain at a faster loading rate and it is deepening the port to 50ft. or 60ft. This will make the position for South Australia difficult, because of our geographical situation. I have explained how difficult it is to persuade buyers to come to South Australia for their grain. Our Government should urgently consider providing additional deep sea ports, centrally situated. I realize that Port Giles will be operating next year.

I think it was the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) who in his Address in Reply speech remarked on the non-occurrence of major bush fires in South Australia this year and during a year in which, with much undergrowth, there could have been disastrous results. Members of the community are to be commended for their awareness of the situation and for their co-operation in observing the slogan "No Bush Fires for South Australia". I suggest to the authorities responsible for the distribution of such warning notices that a repeat of this action could prove effective again in future.

Dealing with primary industry, I am very concerned about the marketing of our livestock: the hit-and-miss method which has been in operation for so long has robbed growers of many millions of dollars. At our Adelaide abattoirs values of cattle can fluctuate by dollars a head at the same market, but for no apparent reason sheep prices and returns are similar. The sooner a more positive

method of ascertaining weight and quality is determined, with a correct return to the producer, the better it will be for this particular section of our farming community.

I am particularly pleased that the Electricity Trust of South Australia is continuing to supervise extensions of electricity throughout our State. Although the member for Hindmarsh referred on Tuesday to Sir Thomas Playford's taking over the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, thereby converting the enterprise from that of private to a Government undertaking, it has been very significant that this so-formed Government enterprise has had to revert to the letting of contracts to private enterprise to achieve these extensions.

In looking at the very important section of the State that I represent, and at its problems, I do not think anything bugs me more than the slowness and long drawn-out method of country road construction. In my district, it is taking generations to construct and seal comparatively short sections of road, and I have previously cited in the House some of these instances. With the increasing span of human life there is, I believe, a possibility that some of my people will see completed roads that were commenced in the early Parliamentary days of my predecessor, Mr. James Heaslip. I am further concerned with what is happening on what must be considered one of the major railway lines in the State, namely, the Port Pirie to Adelaide section. Fierce competition for passenger trade and parcel freight is being permitted in favour of road transport services. Only as recently as last weekend I learned unofficially that mails to and from Crystal Brook were being taken off the South Australian Railways and would be given to a road service contractor.

This line is a very important one to our State, and we should be doing everything possible to foster its patronage whether it relates to people, parcels or mail. The line in question has been under the constant surveillance of this House, in that comments have been made about its standardization. I trust that the passing-the-buck attitude towards standardizing the rail system of this State will soon cease and that we will have some positive action in this regard. The finalizing of this decision in the affirmative is most essential to the development of South Australia.

In expressing my final good wishes to our Premier, members of Cabinet and other members of this House in the fields of their activity, I wish to have something to say, Mr.

Speaker, about you. A few weeks ago you relinquished a position you had held from its formation, that of Secretary of the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation. You played a very significant part in the formation of this organization. You have been a driving force, Sir, in framing the policy put forward by the wheatgrowers of Australia through this organization. Very soon, Sir, you will be relinquishing the position of General Secretary of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia, and I should like you to know that the primary producers of Australia, particularly those of your home State, appreciate very sincerely the part you have played for many years in lifting the lot of the farmer, his wife and his family to the standard of living that is being enjoyed by so many today.

I trust that, because of your life of service and achievements for the man on the land and the State, the powers that be will see fit to honour you and that they will do it in time, whilst you are yet able to appreciate that honour. To Mr. Grant Andrews, your successor, Mr. Speaker, may I offer the good wishes of the primary producers of this State and, in particular, of the "cockies from Rocky". I trust that, under the watchful eye of a father who has not yet had a son of his own, Grant Andrews will be freely given the value of your life's experience. I support the motion.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I rise at this rather peculiar hour to commence my remarks on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I regret that, because I was called to the telephone, I was unable to hear all the remarks of the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. In fact, I think he was a fairly good example of a member who follows the policy that it pays to get up on one's feet in this place and talk about something with which one is fairly well acquainted. However, I understand from my colleagues that the honourable member made one reference that I find difficult to understand: he took the credit for divine guidance of the affairs of this State.

It appears to me (and I say this with all due respect) that, with the present divided state of the House, if there is any guidance at all that has to be given in this place I think it would be given by you, Mr. Speaker, and I should be very much surprised if you claimed that that guidance, no matter how good, could ever be classed as divine. I am not reflecting on you, Mr. Speaker, when I say this, but I do think that the honourable member was

adopting a rather arrogant attitude. It appeared to many members that he was thinking that the Liberal and Country League was like the ancient people of Israel—that it was particularly guided by the Almighty. I do not want to be irreligious but, frankly, in view of some of the actions of members opposite, I find this hard to believe.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think he looked up to Heaven for guidance?

Mr. CLARK: If he did so, all I can say is that I know of other members who may need guidance even more than he does. This will be, I think, the 18th Address in Reply debate in which I have had the opportunity to speak, although I do not think I have ever started so late on a Thursday afternoon as this. I have listened to most of the debate and, so far as I can make out up to now, it promises to be possibly the dreariest on record. The tedium was begun, I would say, by the mover and seconder, and it has been continued without relief by other Government members, although occasionally we have had relief from this side. I am not being arrogant when I say that, Mr. Speaker: it is true.

I offer my congratulations to all those to whom we usually offer congratulations in this debate, and I also join with others in sincerely offering condolences to the relatives of former members who have passed away. I do not think it is wise at this stage of the debate for me to take a great deal of time repeating what has been said by others. I most sincerely congratulate His Excellency the Governor on his appointment as Governor of this State, and I most humbly offer my congratulations to him on the way he delivered his Opening Speech at the start of this session. He did his best to make a colourless document interesting, and it was not his fault that people were nodding off and dozing all around the Chamber. I studied the Opening Speech carefully, something that I have always made a habit of doing. I found practically nothing new in the Speech, practically nothing at all, in fact; and unfortunately this particular Speech took an extraordinarily long time to say the very little that it had to say. It was a colourless document, Mr. Speaker, reflecting, I would suggest, the colourless Government that wrote it.

I should have liked very much to congratulate the mover and seconder of this motion, for it is only polite to do so, but I am afraid that it is not humanly possible for me to do that on this occasion. I suppose I could offer

congratulations to the member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles), or sympathy (one or the other), because after all it was most obvious that he had put much work into his speech, and the fact that it was a wasted effort possibly was not altogether his fault. It seemed to me that the honourable member (as he was told, I think rather nicely, by the member for Hindmarsh) had one thing to learn, and that was to make his speech without reading so much. In fact, I could not help but think that he might just as well have made a recording and sat down and listened to it himself. I have a feeling that if he had done this and had had the opportunity of listening to the pious panegyric of platitudinous praise that he put forward he would have become nauseated by some of it and left the Chamber, sickened by the sound of his own voice. This does not happen very often, but I think it would have happened in this case.

Mr. Edwards: Have you tried taking one of your own?

Mr. CLARK: I suggest that if the member for Eyre wants me to listen to him he should make a clear and concise statement that I can understand. He is inclined to mumble, and I find it difficult to catch what he says. I know that is my loss. I do not mind one little bit if he interjects, for I rather like helpful remarks, but I do want to be able to hear just what he says. Let me make a few references to matters raised by the member for Gumeracha. On electoral reform he said:

Early in 1964 the Liberal Party under Sir Thomas Playford attempted the job and failed.

That is just not true; it was not an attempt to give electoral reform at all (if the honourable member checks into history he will find this). It was an attempt to set up a bigger and better gerrymander and it failed. It appeared fairly obvious that the member for Gumeracha was not very happy about the new electoral set-up and did not like it much at all. If that is the case, all I can say is that he has a good many others who will agree with him. I was rather amazed at the naive statements made by the honourable member, of which the following is an example:

The city dweller is an important feature of our economy.

Suddenly the honourable member has made this discovery. I am glad he noticed it, although the rest of his speech did not give much evidence of his noticing the words he had said. After listening to him, who can blame him for not paying attention to what

he says? A little bit was said by the honourable member about education and, because of my former background, this interested me. After almost hysterical praise of the present Minister (and I may say that this view is not shared by all by any means), the honourable member went on to say, very wisely again:

To progress in today's society it is essential for an individual to have an adequate education.

Of course, that is a sentiment with which we all agree, but surely it is a sentiment that we also all know. I think it has always been important for people to have an adequate education. I should like to know what is the honourable member's definition of "adequate", for I fancy it is different from mine. New schools were kindly listed by the honourable member. It appeared fairly obvious that if he had not done research then a good many Government departments had done it for him, but he forgot to say that the schools and additions he mentioned were practically all planned by the Government that preceded the Government under which we live and suffer today. I do not know whether or not this was a convenient omission. He had a tilt at a couple of things he might have been wise to leave alone. He had a tilt at educational methods, saying:

The "look-say" method of reading does not help pupils to spell as effectively as did the older method of dividing words into syllables.

That may well be so, but I assure the honourable member it certainly teaches children how to read much more quickly indeed. If the old method of teaching spelling has been dropped (and I hope it has not been), I am very sorry. I have some criticism of the honourable member for what he said about the "so-called" new mathematics course. I think the honourable member should realize that the introduction of the new mathematics course into our schools has been an outstanding success. I know this from the case of my own younger son who is in the Leaving class at high school. I know the enormous difference for him in the teaching of mathematics by this method. It has one disadvantage—or, perhaps, it is an advantage. In the case of my other children, I often came home from the House late at night and found a homework book left on my desk for me to try to help them do some maths. In those days I could usually help. For the parents the new mathematics is a dead loss, because we do not understand it. Unless we have gone to the trouble of having tuition

in it (which is now available to parents, too) it is difficult for us to give much help. Also, if our children are of average intelligence, our help in maths. will seldom be called for.

I heartily agree with the member for Gumeracha when he says he does not fancy Eastern Standard Time very much. Neither do I, and neither do most people. The chief advantage was our coming into line with the Eastern States but, with the rising importance industrially of Western Australia, it would take us much farther away from that State. I do not want to be unkind, but I think the best I can say about the speech of the mover of the motion is what I have already said—that he received 100 per cent co-operation from all the departments in preparing his speech; and I have no doubt he also received some assistance from the Under Secretaries.

At this juncture, I take the opportunity to refer to the Under Secretaries. We have had some difficulty in finding out just what their duties are. We have been told this afternoon. I see the Premier is smiling broadly—I do not blame him; it amuses even him. However, he told us. In view of what happened yesterday afternoon and evening, whether or not Under Secretaries have been appointed as (I am trying to think of a word that is not rude) stirrers in this Parliament, it was obvious yesterday afternoon and last night when the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) was speaking that both the Under Secretaries were shouting their heads off and at times virtually defying the Speaker. If the Premier is to pick two gentlemen to be Under Secretaries, it is peculiar that he should pick two gentlemen who carry on like that. Yesterday, I felt sorry for the gentleman in the Chair—and I seldom do that. I thought their behaviour was disgusting. If that is the sort of behaviour we are to have in the future from Under Secretaries, it will not be good for Parliament. I am not criticizing the appointment of Under Secretaries (they will be useful in the future for any Government) but I am criticizing these Under Secretaries who, after all, should have dignity, somewhat akin to that of a Minister—that is, if a Minister has dignity. I am criticizing particularly their behaviour yesterday.

I should like to say something now about the Minister of Roads and Transport. He rather got under my skin about the bus service for Elizabeth. The press had been doing its best to get a statement from him about it and I have been trying for years to get something done about it. The Minister

was not anxious to make a statement. I made a statement, completely non-political, suggesting that the best thing to be done in the interests of the people there was to provide a bus service. The Minister's reply was pure politics and nothing else. He was generous enough eventually to make a reply giving the people of Elizabeth some measure of a bus service, but they are still waiting to see what it will be. This was akin to his tactics over the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation

Study plan, and it seems to me that the Minister of Roads and Transport will be running this State before long. I, for one, do not fancy him as a man fit and acceptable to do that. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.56 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 22, at 2 p.m.