

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

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

MURRAY BRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Re-establishment of Murray Bridge High School.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTIONS**CONSUMER CREDIT**

Mr. CORCORAN: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to give effect to the recommendations that have been made or the conclusions that have been drawn in the Rogerson report concerning the law on consumer credit and moneylending?

The Hon. **ROBIN MILLHOUSE:** I guess the honourable member has now had the opportunity to look at the report, but I should be surprised if he had had a chance to read it right through, because it is a most voluminous one. It contains several recommendations on many topics, but the substance of the report was not really discussed in Brisbane last week by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General: the real question there was the way in which the report should be made public. My recommendation was that the Standing Committee release the report, because it was asked for originally during the term of office of my predecessor by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General of the Adelaide University Law School. It is a report addressed to the standing committee. However, for reasons that appeared in the press release my recommendation was not accepted and it was left to individual Attorneys to make the report public. I said I would take the first opportunity to do so and I did that yesterday by tabling it in the House. I hope that all members will study it. I intend to make recommendations about several matters that can be isolated from the whole, but the honourable member has probably seen that underlying the conceptual basis of the report (that is the way the authors put it) is a recommendation for the abandonment of our present hire-purchase procedures in favour of what is termed consumer-credit sales and the consumer loan, the two-party and three-party transactions. This is a very far-reaching change indeed. It is one on which the Attorneys con-

sidered there should be some uniformity of approach if any change were to be made. That matter and, in fact, all the recommendations are on the agenda for the next meeting of the standing committee, which is scheduled for Adelaide in December this year. I do not expect that any one State will want to go ahead on that between now and then: this is a matter for uniformity.

However, other matters, such as door-to-door sales, perhaps misleading advertising, and secondhand car transactions, are capable of treatment by the individual States and it is on matters of that kind that I intend to make recommendations to Cabinet in due course. At this stage I do not want to be taken as endorsing any particular recommendation in the report. The recommendations are very controversial. The report was circulated, by arrangement with the standing committee, privately as it were, during the time between the meeting in Hobart in March and the last meeting to those bodies who were particularly interested in the subject matter of the report and who had helped in its compilation by giving information, and so on. There have been responses from many of these bodies, and those responses are by no means favourable to the changes proposed, so we will have to await carefully the reactions and recommendations before we make a decision. The general conceptual basis of the report will be the subject of further discussion by the Attorneys in an effort—

Mr. Broomhill: Where can we get the report?

The Hon. **ROBIN MILLHOUSE:** It was tabled yesterday. The honourable member is often behind the times.

Mr. Ryan: It hasn't been printed yet.

The Hon. **ROBIN MILLHOUSE:** It has been printed. The conceptual basis will be the subject of further discussion at the next meeting, to see whether there should be a uniform approach.

Mr. Corcoran: Will certain parts be given effect to this session?

The Hon. **ROBIN MILLHOUSE:** I have mentioned the matters on which we could, perhaps, go ahead if we decided to do so. Whether there will be time in this session, I do not know: we already have an extremely heavy legislative programme. I am worried about the ability of our Parliamentary Draftsmen to get through the work that we have given them so far and it may not be possible for that physical reason to deal with it this session, but certainly sight will not be lost of the matter.

Mr. RYAN: The Rogerson committee report is far-reaching and, if implemented, will have a big effect on production generally. On July 2 the Leader of the Opposition raised this matter with the Attorney-General, requesting that, if the report was available, it be supplied immediately to all members. The Attorney stated that the document was confidential and that the decision taken at the meeting of Attorneys-General was that the report should not be made available to the public. He also said:

In view of the arrangement made at the Attorneys' meeting, I should not be happy to make available to every member a copy of the report, because I think it would be breaching the arrangement, but I should be prepared to supply the Leader with a copy at this stage. However, I hope that within a fortnight after the Brisbane meeting the decision will have been made to make the report public and I shall then be happy to make it available to every member.

A report in the *Advertiser* of last Thursday, July 17, emanating from the discussion in Brisbane, states:

The South Australian Attorney-General announced in Brisbane on Monday his intention to table the report in the South Australian Parliament next Tuesday.

On Friday, July 18, in a column of the *Advertiser* headed "Today", this appeared:

The Adelaide Law School report on consumer credit, about which we published a story yesterday, was officially in the secret category. But until a week ago anyone could walk into the Government Printer's and buy a copy for \$3.

Can the Attorney explain why this document, which we had been told was secret and not available to members of this Parliament but would be tabled in the Parliament on July 22, was available to the public in general? Further, can he say whether this document will be tabled as a Parliamentary Paper and when it will be available for members, on their files?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am afraid the member for Port Pirie must have been asleep yesterday, because I tabled it then.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I apologize humbly to the member for Port Pirie. I am sure he would not want to be mixed up with the member for Port Adelaide. I meant to refer to the member for Port Adelaide. In fact, I tabled the report yesterday.

Mr. Ryan: We haven't it on the file, and I am not paying \$3 for it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member should not blame me for that.

It was tabled in this House yesterday and, therefore, it is available to any member who wants it. It is available to the public from the Government Printer for \$3.

Mr. Corcoran: It was available a month ago.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Deputy Leader, the member for Millicent, thinks he has caught me because the report was available from the Government Printer a month ago.

Mr. Corcoran: That's what the member for Port Adelaide meant.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a conversation. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am glad of the opportunity to explain what happened. I thought I had made fairly clear that the decision taken at the Hobart meeting of Attorneys-General was that the report be not released publicly until at least the Brisbane meeting, which was held last week. Therefore, between March and July the report, by agreement among the Attorneys, was not to be made available publicly, but it was given a limited circulation among those who were particularly interested. I explained that to the Leader the other day and said that I should be pleased to let him have a copy of it. I did give him a copy and, obviously, he used it for his address in Tasmania, together with some other material that I made available to him, at his request, from my department.

Between the time of the meeting in Hobart in March and the Brisbane meeting, the report that I had taken to Hobart in typescript form was printed. It was printed, by arrangement among the Attorneys, by our Government Printer and that job was completed about four weeks ago. By a mistake in the Government Printing Office after the report was printed, instead of keeping all the copies from sale, in the usual course of events in the Government Printing Office it was put on sale over the counter. I became aware of this when, as a matter of fact, the Parliamentary Librarian telephoned me and said that he had been sent a copy. Immediately I became aware of this, I sent an urgent request to the Government Printer not to put the report on sale, saying that this was a mistake and contrary to the directions that had been given and contrary, of course, to the agreement that had been made in Hobart by all the Attorneys. He therefore immediately (within a matter of minutes, I am told, because some urgency was expressed by me in the request to him) took it off the counter, and he informed

me three copies only had been sold in that time, one of which was to the *Advertiser*. It was that copy which the *Advertiser* used last week to make it public.

This was a most regrettable mistake, but it was a mistake, and there it is. We put it right as soon as we heard about it. That is the way in which the copies were sold. But only three copies were sold in this way, so no real harm was done. So far as making it available to every member is concerned, this can be done. Any member who wants a copy can have it. I have done what I thought was required, by tabling the report here in the House, and this makes it a document to which every member has access.

The SPEAKER: As Speaker of the House of Assembly, I draw attention to the fact that this report has been tabled. Honourable members are entitled to get all the information they seek, whenever it is deemed possible. To solve this problem I think it would be in order, now that the report has been tabled, for the honourable Attorney to move that it be printed.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Sir, the document has been printed.

The SPEAKER: You have not ordered it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: All right. Well, I will move that it be printed. In so moving, and with very great deference to you, I point out that this is a mere formality, because the document has already, in fact, been printed, but I move that it be printed.

The SPEAKER: I draw the Attorney's attention to the fact that unless a paper has been ordered to be printed it is not available to honourable members. Now that the honourable Attorney has moved that the report be printed, is the motion seconded?

Mr. RYAN: Yes, Sir.

Motion carried.

Mr. CORCORAN: I understood the Attorney, when replying to the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan), to say that he had given a printed copy of the report to the Leader of the Opposition. I do not think he said when that had been done, but it was done, possibly, a week or so ago, at least before the report was tabled in this House. The Attorney went on to say that the Leader of the Opposition had used the report in an address that he had given in Hobart. I was rather concerned to hear this, because I did not believe that the Leader of the Opposition would do that. Because he was not here to defend himself I checked on the matter. I point out that the invitation to give the Turner Memorial Lecture at the University of

Tasmania was issued on December 23, 1968, and that on February 24 last the Leader informed the university authorities that he would be willing to give the lecture on July 11 of this year and that the subject would be *Illusion of Protection*. He did not reveal, in any part of his lecture, anything connected with or remotely concerning the Rogerson committee report, nor did he say anything about the report in any press statement that he made in Tasmania. Therefore, on the Leader's behalf, I categorically deny the Attorney's statement that the Leader used the report in connection with an address made at the University of Tasmania.

Further, I am prepared to table a copy of the lecture given by the Leader, and I ask leave to do that. Thirdly, on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, I demand a withdrawal of the statement by the Attorney and I also demand an apology.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable member for Millicent ask leave of the House to table the document?

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: Does the Attorney-General desire to reply to the further part of the question?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. I am glad to give any withdrawal that the honourable member asks, but when I mentioned—

Mr. Corcoran: And an apology.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, but there is none required. I did not make those remarks in any spirit of criticism whatever. There is no reason whatever why the Leader should not have used the material if he wanted to do so.

Mr. Corcoran: You said he used the material, and you said it in such a way as to imply that he should not have.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If I said it in such a way, I am sorry, but I did not mean to imply that. I do not know why the Deputy Leader is getting upset. The Leader did not do anything he should not have done. He asked in this House that a copy of the report be given to all members and I said that that was not proper, because of an arrangement among the Attorneys. I knew that one of my colleagues had given a copy to the Leader of the Opposition in this State. The report had been circulated privately to several people. There was no reason why it should not have been used by the Leader.

Mr. Corcoran: Privately?

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think I can allow this. It is getting into a debate.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am trying to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: The question is provocative of debate and I cannot allow this exchange across the Chamber.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am not replying to any interjection by the honourable member. I will not even look at him, if you would like that. The Leader also asked my officers for information in the department which would help him with the speech, and this was given.

Mr. Corcoran: That had nothing to do with the Rogerson report.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Whether it did or did not does not matter: it was on the subject of consumer protection and about things that had happened during his term of office. Obviously, from the reports in the press about the Turner Memorial Lecture, the Leader made use of the material supplied to him, but there was no reason why he should not have done that. In mentioning the matter I did not mean to imply (nor do I think I did imply) any criticism of the Leader. I was happy to supply any material that he wanted for the lecture. I may say that I shall be pleased to read the lecture, because reports I have had from members of the legal profession in Tasmania who were in Brisbane last week are that the Leader gave an interesting lecture. I think there is no reason for the Deputy Leader to get upset, because no offence was meant and I hope that none was given.

Later:

The SPEAKER: Order! I refer to the document entitled *Illusion of Protection*, tabled by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition by leave of the House this afternoon. On reflection, I believe that it is rather inappropriate that a private document (and this is a private document), excellent though it may be, should be tabled in the House except in pursuance of Standing Orders: that is, papers presented pursuant to Statute or by command, or accounts and papers ordered to be laid before the House. I therefore rule that it is beyond the competence of the House in the circumstances to have the aforesaid document tabled, because I believe it would create a precedent that would conflict with Parliamentary principles, and I certainly would not like my ruling to be taken as a future precedent for private documents to be tabled. I can see that if it were (and I think all honourable members would agree with me) there would be no end to it. Therefore, I must rule that the document cannot be tabled.

POTATOES

Mr. McANANEY: As the Agriculture Department must inspect all potatoes imported into South Australia, will the Minister of Lands ask his colleague what tonnages were imported from (a) Victoria, (b) Western Australia and (c) other sources between July 1, 1968, and June 30, 1969?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will refer that question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. EVANS: It has been brought to my notice that many potatoes are being imported from Western Australia and, as the Chairman of the Potato Board has given an assurance that potatoes will be imported on a board-to-board basis only, will the Minister of Lands obtain from the Minister of Agriculture details of the tonnage of potatoes imported from Western Australia each week or each month during the period July 1, 1968, to June 30, 1969, and, if possible, the locations at which the potatoes were off-loaded in this State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will refer that question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. EVANS: It has been brought to my notice by some potato growers in the Hills area that processed potatoes are being imported into Australia from the United States and Canada and that in actual fact they have been dumped on the Australian market. I believe that, in 1967-68, 1,500,000 lb. of these processed potatoes, valued at \$156,000, was imported into Australia, and that, in 1968-69, 2,500,000 lb., to a value of about \$240,000, was imported. As there is to be a Tariff Board inquiry in Melbourne on August 11 and 12 and possibly August 13 this year, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the South Australian department, through the Minister, is to make any representation at this hearing of the board with the object of perhaps imposing a tariff on these imported potatoes?

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

WALLAROO HARBOUR

Mr. HUGHES: On July 15 the Premier, when addressing a public meeting in the Wallaroo Town Hall, told the meeting that on the night before his visit the survey vessel had completed the seismic survey of the Wallaroo harbour. Can the Minister of Marine say whether that seismic survey was carried out on what is known as channel A/B or on the channel which is in use at present, channel C?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I know that it was carried out on two channels but, as I cannot say whether it was carried out on three channels, I will have the matter checked as quickly as possible and give the information to the honourable member. I assure him that it was not confined to the present channel and that other aspects were examined. I should add for the information of the honourable member, as I informed him earlier when this work was to be undertaken, that, now that the survey has physically been completed, the data collected has been flown to Sydney for processing in the computer there. This will take about a month to process and it will then be evaluated before the department can assess the position.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Earlier this month I referred to the Southern Aurora train disaster in Victoria on February 7 and also mentioned to the Minister that there had been a coronial inquiry into that disaster and that the coroner had made certain recommendations to ensure that engine drivers were in good health while driving trains. I asked whether the Minister of Roads and Transport would ascertain what steps were being taken in South Australia to ensure that engine drivers were in good health when driving trains. Has the Attorney-General a reply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have an answer, which has been supplied by Mr. Hill, as follows:

Periodical medical examinations are carried out in the South Australian Railways in accordance with section VI of regulation 140. The grades subject to periodical medical examination are as follows: enginemmen, firemen, rail car drivers, shunters, assistant shunters, road motor vehicle drivers, tractor drivers, tractor shunters, signalmen, guards, and rail car porters. Before a man can be appointed to one of the above grades, he must be medically examined to determine his physical fitness for the position. Under section VI, an employee in one of the above grades must be medically examined during the year in which he attains the age of 45 years, or within 10 years of the date of promotion, whichever is the sooner, and thereafter at intervals of five years.

In actual practice these employees are examined every five years until the age of 50; three yearly until the age of 59, and then annually until retirement. Vision, colour sense, and hearing tests are carried out and must be within the standard laid down in section VIII of regulation 140. In addition, a very thorough physical examination is carried out. Periodical medical examinations are carried out by the Railways Medical Officer, who is employed fulltime within the service.

The SPEAKER: I notice the Attorney-General's referring to the Minister as Mr. Hill. It is really transgressing the Standing Orders, and I would ask the Attorney-General in future to refer to the Minister as the Minister of Roads and Transport.

RAILWAY RENTS

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: On June 24, I asked a question of the Attorney-General about what is really rent for railway cottages. (In *Hansard* it is referred to as Housing Trust rents. That is my fault, and I apologize for this. I was supplied with a proof and did not seek to change it but should have done so.) Has the Attorney-General obtained a reply to this question?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague the Minister of Roads and Transport has given me an answer to this question, as follows:

Mr. Duncan is an employee of the Railways Department and resides in departmental cottage No. 386 at Islington. Prior to the recent increase, the rent payable was \$5.76 a week. The current rent, as assessed by the South Australian Housing Trust, is \$8.45. Other cottages in the same locality have been similarly affected. Cottage No. 386 was erected by the South Australian Housing Trust in 1951, and was subsequently acquired by the Railways Commissioner. Following upon a recent Cabinet decision, employees are being notified in the *Weekly Notice* that the Railways Commissioner will investigate submissions made in writing by employees in respect of rental increases.

GLADSTONE MEDICAL FACILITIES

Mr. VENNING: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about hospitalization at Gladstone?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The present position is that the Gladstone District Hospital Board is to submit to the Chief Secretary proposals for the construction of a hospital on a new site. The board is also to initiate a drive to raise funds to meet its proportion of the cost of the work involved. When received, the board's proposals will receive early consideration.

LIZARDS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Minister of Lands may remember that he wrote to me on March 4 regarding an earlier question relating to the protection of fauna, particularly lizards of various kinds. In his reply, the Minister said that he thought regulations would have to be made that would govern the sale and keeping of these reptiles. I

have noticed in one shop at least in Rundle Street plasticized sleepy lizards still for sale in quantity, and no doubt they are for sale elsewhere throughout the State. As it is most important that these lizards should be protected as soon as possible, can the Minister say what has been done about the matter and whether it has been submitted to Cabinet to consider?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have had some discussion about this with the Minister of Agriculture, under whose charge the Fauna Conservation Act comes. In view of a problem of definition under the Act, I am not sure what action would have to be taken at this stage to give effect to what the honourable member wants. However, the matter is being considered, and I will get a further statement from my colleague. As the honourable member is going away next week, I will try to have it by tomorrow.

BURRA HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: During last year the Burra High School council approached me about the desirability of placing an additional fire hydrant at the school. When the hydrant was installed at the commencement of last summer, insufficient pressure was found in the main to make the hydrant effective. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has stated that it intends to clean and cement-line these mains in the future. With the close proximity of temporary classrooms at this school (and I might add that the high and primary schools are situated in the same building), there is a high degree of fire risk. Can the Minister of Works ascertain whether this work can possibly be carried out before the coming summer?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will call for a report on the matter.

PORT PIRIE OIL BERTH

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about the oil tanker berth at Port Pirie?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Safety precautions undertaken at the present temporary tanker berth in Port Pirie are as follows: Tankers are berthed head down the river so that in an emergency they can be got away more easily. During a tanker's stay in port, a tug is kept at stand-by. The berth is completely fenced off from the rest of the port and, whilst a tanker is in the berth, the gate is manned by a watchman. A watchman is also stationed on board the vessel. A direct telephone line to the local fire station is

installed at the approach to the berth, inside the fence. A departmental inspector is always on board, when the pumping hoses are either coupled up or uncoupled or when another vessel is due to pass the tanker, to ensure that pumping ceases during this passage. Hose boxes are opened, their contents examined and left open at the ready during the stay of the tanker in port.

Fire-fighting equipment and hoses are laid out on board the ship in readiness for an emergency. No smoking is allowed within the fence line, on the berth or on board ship and this embargo is enforced by the watchman to whom I have already referred. The watchman at the gate takes away all matches and similar articles from anyone going on to the berth. Steel hawsers are hung over the ship's side to assist in towing away the vessel in case of an emergency. All floodlighting is switched on and kept on during the hours of darkness whilst a tanker is at the berth. Flame-proof light fittings are installed at the berth. The fire mains adjacent to the berth were modified prior to its commissioning some years ago so that they would provide an adequate supply of water in case of an emergency. I consider that every precaution that can be taken is being taken.

MARBLE HILL ROAD

Mr. GILES: Recently I asked the Attorney-General to inquire of the Minister of Roads and Transport whether a safety fence could be erected on sections of Main Road No. 92. Has he a reply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is not proposed to erect any sections of guard railing on the Montacute to Marble Hill Main Road No. 92 in the 1969-70 financial year. Programmes for future years have not yet been determined. Main Road No. 92 will be included for consideration when this is done.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE

Mr. BROOMHILL: Is the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, now able to give me some information regarding assurances I sought on flooding that may occur as a result of the south-western suburbs drainage scheme?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Urban development of low-lying areas such as in some parts of West Torrens would highlight any inadequacy of natural drainage and, unless adequate drainage facilities are provided within the area, some flooding problems will be

encountered regardless of how free or unrestricted the outlet from the Patawalonga may be. The Mayor's alleged claim that flooding has recently become worse could readily be related to such factors. It is not practicable or economical to provide a drainage scheme that will ensure complete protection from flooding. The protection that will be provided by the south-western suburbs drainage scheme is based on accepted world-wide standards which have been developed from experience, and the chances of flooding for all practical purposes is negligible.

FERRIES

Mr. ARNOLD: It has been pointed out to me that ferry operators on the Murray River are faced with a problem because of the increasing size of vehicles on the road today. These ferries have a gross load limit of, I think, about 44 tons or 48 tons, and because of the large carrying capacity of many vehicles today there should be a sign erected at the head of the ramps leading to ferries indicating to the drivers of these large vehicles that if their gross tonnage exceeds half the capacity of the ferry they should inform the ferry operator before proceeding on to the ferry. Once one of these large vehicles is on the ferry the only way it can be got off is for the ferry to cross the river so that the vehicle can be driven off on the other side. As this is a problem to ferry operators, will the Attorney-General take the matter up with the Minister of Roads and Transport so that he can consider it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be pleased to do that.

MEAT MARKETING

Mr. CASEY: Will the Minister of Lands obtain from the Minister of Agriculture information relating to the committee of inquiry that the Minister of Agriculture set up some time ago into the marketing of meat in South Australia? Specifically, will he ascertain when this committee will be completing its report and other information relating to its composition and terms of reference?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

HORMONE SPRAYS

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about the report of the committee investigating the use of hormone sprays?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member asked a question about the danger of hormone spraying on certain types

of fruit crop and, in reply, the Minister of Agriculture states:

A meeting held in March this year and attended by representatives of chemical firms, aerial spraying contractors, primary producers, and interested Commonwealth and State Government departments, discussed the whole question of control of chemical spraying. At that meeting there was general support for legislation to control the use of chemicals in aerial and ground spraying, and this matter is now in the hands of the Parliamentary Draftsman. I intend to allow interested parties to have the opportunity to comment upon any draft legislation before it is considered by Parliament.

POLLING HOURS

Mr. LAWN: On July 3, I asked the Premier whether any consideration had been given to reducing the polling hours on election day. Has he a reply?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The hours of voting was not discussed at the Premiers' Conference last year. The question of reduction of the voting age from 21 to 18 years was raised by the then Premier of Tasmania, but the hours of polling was not mentioned by him. Also, it was not raised at this year's conference.

ELECTRICITY COMMITTEE

Mr. CORCORAN: On June 19, I asked the Minister of Works to table a report of a committee set up by the Electricity Trust to consider aesthetic standards. Has the Minister that information?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I have prepared a fairly lengthy reply to the question asked by the honourable member in order to explain the complete position. Much research has been carried out in many countries into the methods used for the distribution of electricity. Particularly has this been so in the United Kingdom, where a committee was set up by Parliament to examine the possibilities of improving the appearance of all aspects of electricity distribution. The United Kingdom committee issued a report containing many valuable suggestions and it dealt with the question of undergrounding electricity cables. The information from this committee on undergrounding stressed the many technical difficulties and the extremely high cost involved in this type of electricity distribution. After a careful study of this report and other information available to the Electricity Trust on underground distribution costs, it was evident that funds available, and likely to be available to the trust for many years, would be totally

insufficient to finance this type of distribution, in addition to which underground distribution would necessitate a considerable increase in charges for electricity.

Having considered reports on overseas practices, the trust was convinced that something could be done to improve the appearance of some of our power lines and substation structures. It was, therefore, decided in June, 1967, to have a committee advise on steps to be taken from time to time to improve the appearance of power lines and other installations, having regard to environment, safety, engineering requirements, and other relevant matters.

The committee appointed comprised Mr. J. R. Dridan (Chairman), Mr. J. C. Goodchild, Mr. W. C. D. Veale, and Mr. R. W. Sanders. Mr. Dridan is a professional engineer with many years of experience in administering a large public utility, the Engineering and Water Supply Department. He is also Deputy Chairman of the Electricity Trust and Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust. Mr. Goodchild is the well-known artist. Mr. Veale is a professional engineer with many years of administrative experience as Town Clerk of Adelaide. Mr. Sanders is the Electricity Trust's Chief Engineer. These gentlemen make up a committee well qualified to advise the trust on the work for which it was appointed.

It is not intended that the committee should hold an investigation and submit a report, but it should make suggestions to the trust for improvements to power lines, etc., as the result of its inspections of the trust's distribution system. Since the committee was appointed, and as a result of its suggestions, the trust has had two line gangs working on a number of experimental proposals to improve the appearance of overhead mains in suburban streets. The sum of \$40,000 has been expended already on this type of work, which is being continued. In many cases throughout the distribution system, trust poles are used to carry telephone wires. The Deputy Postmaster-General for the State is co-operating with the Aesthetics Committee and the trust in tidying up the mutually used distribution system. The committee has also paid particular attention to substation construction. In many cases these stations have to be provided in built-up areas. It is the trust's desire to make them fit in with the local environment and to be as inconspicuous as possible. The committee's suggestions have been particularly successful in this aspect of trust work. If the honourable

member will see me privately I will show him photographs of this work, and I am sure that he will agree that it has been most successful.

FAUNA CONSERVATION

Mr. JENNINGS: Some time ago I received a petition from students of the Nailsworth Boys Technical High School regarding the preservation of fauna in this State. I believe the petition followed an article in the press about the slaughter of kangaroos, and the boys showed commendable initiative in arranging this petition. As the House was not in session at the time I handed it to the Minister of Lands, asking him to pass it on to the Minister of Agriculture, and he did this. As the Minister of Lands has now received a reply from the Minister of Agriculture concerning this petition, will he give it to the House?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture has supplied me with a pamphlet of notes concerning the Fauna Conservation Act, 1964-1965, and these pamphlets are readily available. If the honourable member wishes to obtain them they will be available for any students who want to follow up this matter. The students' petition was given to the Minister. The relevant part stated that it protested at the wanton and irresponsible destruction of our native fauna for commercial or so-called sporting purposes and it requested that the existing South Australian conservation laws be now strictly enforced and that amendments be made to laws found to be inadequate. The Minister states, in the pamphlet to which I have referred, that kangaroos are fully protected and may only be destroyed where permission is granted by a permit from the Agricultural Department. Where kangaroos are increasing in number and are causing damage to pasture or crops, the department will grant permits, after an investigation has been made by departmental officers. The report from the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation (Mr. Olsen) states:

It would probably be of considerable interest to the students that the number of red kangaroos has increased considerably since the arrival of Europeans, because of provision of watering points in the outback. It appears logical to utilize fauna where it is necessary to destroy it for genuine reasons and hence the present policy of restricted utilization of kangaroo skins and meat. During the past 12 months, the department has considerably reduced the number of permits granted, as it is the aim of the department to increase the number of kangaroos in the wild. Probably the long-term conservation of kangaroos and other native fauna is largely dependent upon provision of reserves for fauna and during the

past few years, there has been a great increase in the dedication of land for national parks and fauna reserves within the State. The department would appreciate reports of actual offences which students see occurring. It is normally necessary to have definite information such as a specific offence by a particular person at a particular time and date. Where students are able to obtain this information, they are requested to notify the local departmental inspector or, where he is not available, the local police officer.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the erection of warning signals at railway crossings?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Finance for the construction and installation of automatic flashing lights at railway crossings is provided by the Highways Department. Finance within reasonable limits is readily available for the installation of flashing lights at railway crossings in accordance with established priorities.

SAWDUST

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yesterday, the Minister of Lands was good enough to let me know that a question I asked some weeks ago regarding sawdust on butcher shop floors had now been replied to by the Minister of Agriculture. However, there was so much pressure during Question Time yesterday I had no time to ask my question, so I now ask the Minister of Lands to give me the information.

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

If the newspaper report referred to by the honourable member indicated that I intended "to bring down a regulation prohibiting the use of sawdust on the floors of butchers' shops", it was entirely incorrect. I have no jurisdiction in this matter, which concerns the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board and the health authorities. The Chairman of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board informed me that, following discussions between inspectors of the board and officers of the Public Health Department, the board circularized all re-trade establishments in the metropolitan abattoirs area informing them that, in terms of regulation 122 and 137 made by the board pursuant to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act, the use of sawdust on the floors of butchers' shops and other premises within its area where meats are prepared or stored for sale would be prohibited.

This action was taken because the board was informed that sawdust harboured bacteria and constituted a hazard to public health. The Department of Primary Industry has, for a number of years, prohibited the use of saw-

dust in establishments where meat is prepared or handled in any way for export; and the regulations under which the board has now acted have been in force for some time. I have now been informed that, after a conference with representatives of the South Australian Division of the Meat and Allied Trades Federation, the board decided to defer implementation of the prohibition until October 1, 1969, during which time tests will be undertaken on alternative materials.

SOUTH-EAST RAIL SERVICE

Mr. RODDA: Because of an anomaly existing at present, many people in the South-East, although they are mindful of the service provided by the railways, are precluded from making full use of that service. I am told by a constituent that people may have parcels sent to wayside stations on the day train but that parcels other than perishable ones will not be carried on the day train to attended stations. Apart from the fact that there are only three night trains a week to the South-East, people wishing to make full use of this railway service cannot do so in respect of attended stations. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to have this deficiency examined with a view to rectifying it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As I am sure my colleague will want to have it rectified, I will take it up with him.

PORT AUGUSTA BRIDGE

Mr. RICHES: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to a question I previously asked about the governing of speeds and load limits on the Great Western bridge at Port Augusta?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is considered that the present limitations applied to the existing bridge regarding loads and speeds are adequate provided these are complied with. A number of prosecutions has been made in connection with this matter. However, Highways Department resources will not enable the check to be maintained on a 24-hour basis. The Highways Department is aware of the possible serious consequences of the limitations not being complied with, and steps have been taken to seek the assistance of the police at Port Augusta in this matter.

STURT HIGHWAY

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I previously asked about a proposed by-pass

road off the Sturt Highway just north of Nuriootpa?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: A new road by-passing the towns of Greenock and Nuriootpa, and superseding the present unsatisfactory section of National Route 20 along the Greenock-Nuriootpa Main Road No. 62, is scheduled for construction during 1972-73. Investigations at the planning stage are almost complete, and the route should be known to the district councils concerned later this year.

DIRTY WATER

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently many complaints have been made about the water supply in several suburbs. Over some time I have received several complaints from the Hyde Park area that I have passed on to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, always receiving courteous service. Usually flushing has been carried out, resulting sometimes in an improvement for a short time, but the supplies have then deteriorated again. These complaints seem to have arisen again, many people saying that the water is muddy, that it soils their clothes and in some cases is undrinkable. I think the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said his dog would not look at it. As clean water is essential in homes and industry, has the Minister of Works or his department any method to improve the water supply soon in some way other than by flushing the pipes, which does not seem to have the desired effect?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: It is true that for the last number of years, at this time of the year particularly, this distasteful occurrence happens in our water mains. We have discolouration of water which is brought about in many cases by increased water flow into the reservoirs as a result of rain, and the drain-off being too rapid to allow dirt to settle. This is also aggravated by repairs to mains in many districts. It is a fact that many housewives (my wife included) have complained about this occurrence, and rightly so. I have stated twice recently that when this occurs if the person concerned immediately contacts the Engineering and Water Supply Department the matter will be investigated at once to see whether the trouble can be alleviated. I point out that this occurrence has been common in this State for a number of years and it is to be regretted. The honourable member asks whether there is some other way to get over the problem. The only other way to get over the problem, apart from continually improving the mains and keeping the reservoirs as full as possible, is

of course to treat more water. The water in the metropolitan area of this State is harder than that in some other States. However, this is not the problem in this case: it is a problem of discolouration. To treat this completely would involve an extremely expensive system which would add considerably to the present water charge in this State. This matter has been investigated by the department and at the moment some further investigations have been authorized. I cannot promise more than that at the moment. If we were to go in for a complete system of treatment it would be extremely costly. When the results of present investigations have gone to a further stage, I may be in a position to advise the honourable member further.

STUDENT TEACHERS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Recently the Minister of Education made a statement about the allotment of student teachers at the teachers colleges to either arts or science sections in order to make up some of the deficit we have now in the trained teachers available for science sections of the secondary schools. As I believe the Minister has a statement she would like to give to the House on the matter, will she give it now?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Members can take their pick whether this is a Dorothy Dixier or a Zara Holt, but I prefer to say it is a Joyce Steele. I believe the statement I made yesterday was of considerable interest not only to members but also to the public. For this reason I think it would be a good idea to amplify what I said yesterday about the steps we will take with the next year's intake of student teachers in the teachers colleges to try to correct the imbalance between arts and science students in view of the worldwide and State shortage of science teachers at secondary level. In our planning of intake of students to teachers colleges there has always been a recognized allotment or quota to particular courses. These allotments are in terms of our needs for particular kinds of teachers; for instance, in the coming year, our allotment for primary intake is 490, and infants 230. These figures are based on intensive planning and predicting our needs for as far as 15 years ahead. There is nothing rigid about these allotments or quotas but, to fill some quotas, students have, in the past, after consultation, not been granted their first choice of courses. I point out that they are allowed a choice of courses. For instance, students to train as art teachers have been in plentiful

supply in recent years and many of these have been asked to switch to the girls' craft and other courses. In connection with secondary teachers, we have allotments for art teachers, craft teachers, teachers of physical education, commercial teachers, music teachers, agriculture teachers as well as for general secondary teachers.

All we are hoping to do is to divide the secondary general teachers into two groups, namely, secondary arts teachers and secondary science teachers. We have always had a quota for secondary general teachers and the division into arts and science is merely a refinement to meet the schools' needs for more science teachers. The House can rest assured that all suitable and well qualified applicants for secondary teaching will be admitted to teachers colleges. However, in our recruiting campaign we are endeavouring to attract a greater number of students with science qualifications. Teachers college staffs, in discussing students' degree and diploma courses, will again point out the need for including some mathematics and science in them even when the degrees are arts degrees.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

Mr. BURDON: Has the Premier obtained from the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about the Mount Gambier Hospital and geriatric centre?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Provision is to be sought in the Loan Estimates for 1969-70 for funds to enable geriatric accommodation to be prepared at the Mount Gambier Hospital. The proposal involves alterations to the fourth floor of the main hospital block to accommodate medical cases, thus freeing further beds on the first floor for elderly patients requiring more prolonged medical and nursing care.

ARDROSSAN ROAD

Mr. FERGUSON: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the reconstruction and sealing of the road between Moonta and Ardrossan is being considered and, if it is, when it is intended to commence the work and whether it will be undertaken by the Highways Department or local government?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to do so.

WHYALLA COURT

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Can the Attorney-General say whether we are any nearer to the appointment of a resident magis-

trate at Whyalla to deal with judicial matters in the three northern cities?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I hope we are nearer a solution to our general problem of judicial officers in our courts, and of course that includes the area to which the honourable member has referred. I think that His Excellency's Speech referred to intermediate courts accommodation and legislation. I hope very much that I should be able to introduce into the House this session a Bill on the subject of intermediate courts, and of course this will relieve the situation throughout the State.

BONDING

Mr. VENNING: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked in this House some little time ago regarding the bonding system in this State for medical students?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Seven cadets are still doing the medical course at the University of Adelaide. Three of these are expected to complete the course at the end of 1969 and undertake the compulsory year as a Resident Medical Officer during 1970. With regard to the success or otherwise of this particular cadetship scheme, at this stage I can only repeat the information provided for the honourable member on August 9, 1968:

It is a little early yet to judge the success or otherwise of the scheme as only one cadet has yet completed his course and been allocated to a country area. However, judging by the applications received for the cadetships offered, it would appear that the scheme has been well received and will serve a very useful purpose in providing medical practitioner services in country areas where a need for additional doctors exists.

SILO LAND

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Marine say whether, if South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited desired to extend its terminal facilities at Port Pirie, land would be available to it for this purpose?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will have to consider this matter, although I believe that in certain circumstances land could be made available. However, I will examine the matter for the honourable member.

CIGARETTES

Mr. LAWN: On July 2, I asked the Attorney-General a question concerning the advertising of cigarettes. Has he further information on this matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This was a question that the honourable member asked

me about the advertising of Hallmark cigarettes, not generally, I think. I had inquiries made about this matter, with some difficulty, I may say, as I am a non-smoker. The answer I have for the honourable member is as follows:

I understand that Hallmark cigarettes are obtainable from the distributors but are not stocked by some retailers simply because there is very little demand for them.

Mr. Lawn: That's a lie.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I checked with a hairdresser who sells cigarettes, and this is what I was told. The reply goes on to say that it is uneconomic for a retailer to keep supplies of cigarettes that he cannot sell.

MURRAY BRIDGE ROAD BRIDGE

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Attorney-General any information from the Minister of Roads and Transport concerning the model of the proposed bridge across the Murray River near Murray Bridge?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Arrangements have been made to display a model (showing proposals for a by-pass road at Murray Bridge and a new bridge over the Murray River at Swanport) at the office of the District Council of Mobilong within the next fortnight. The model will be on display for about a month.

GOAT HAIR

Mr. JENNINGS: I address my question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, and the only reason I need to explain it is that the Minister of Lands disclosed earlier today that the Minister of Agriculture was going away next week. Therefore, I ask the Minister of Lands whether he will take up with his colleague a question that I asked him a considerable time ago about the commercial use of goat hair.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Unfortunately, my expression must have been at fault because I have been misunderstood: the gentleman who is going away next week, I understand, is the member for Whyalla, who asked the earlier question. I do not know what the Minister of Agriculture is doing or whether he is going away next week. As the honourable member's question was asked before the recent adjournment, I will take it up urgently with my colleague.

WHEAT

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Minister of Lands has been good enough to tell me that he now has an answer to a question I asked on July

2 relating to wheat. Perhaps I should repeat my earlier question, which was as follows:

The Minister of Agriculture has made several public statements lately in which he has stated that the wheat industry has asked for and has accepted the principle of quotas. Can the Minister say, first, who are the wheat industry representatives and, secondly, whether he is satisfied that the wheatgrowers of South Australia are supporting in principle the idea of a quota delivery scheme?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture has supplied me with an answer which is a trifle lengthy, and in view of its importance it is rather difficult to summarize it.

The SPEAKER: The Minister can ask leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: You do not suggest that I read it at all?

The SPEAKER: Well, at this stage I would prefer that you did not, although that is a matter for the House and not for me. I have a fairly lengthy list of questions here and the time is rolling on. I do not like to curb honourable members in asking questions, and I think that if the answer is lengthy the Minister could get leave to insert it in *Hansard* and members could read it tomorrow.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Very well, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to have the answer inserted in *Hansard* without its being read.

Leave granted.

WHEAT QUOTAS

As I understand it, the first part of the honourable member's question relates to those sectors of the wheat industry which supported the delivery quota scheme, and not to representatives of the wheat industry on the advisory committee which has been set up to deal with delivery quotas. In reply to his inquiries, I inform him that the plan which was formulated at the conference of the Australian Wheat-growers Federation held in Perth on March 11 resulted from negotiations between the Minister for Primary Industry and the Wheat Federation regarding the first advance for wheat. The federation was adamant that the first payment should be maintained at \$1.10 a bushel. The Commonwealth Government was not prepared to recommend that payment on an undisclosed quantity of wheat.

The Commonwealth Government has fixed a figure of \$440,000,000 for the total amount available for first payment on the 1969-70 deliveries. The Wheat Federation unanimously decided in Perth that the first payment should be maintained at \$1.10 and fixed a figure of 344,000,000 bushels, which is a five-year average of Australian wheat deliveries plus an additional 6,000,000 bushels and 7,000,000 to Queensland and New South Wales respectively for prime hard wheat readily saleable. The

scheme was unanimously accepted by a subsequent conference of 168 delegates representing some 80 branches throughout the whole wheat belt of South Australia.

I am advised that during the following two months the plan was discussed at branch and zone level throughout the State, and that rank and file growers in every instance have given full support in principle to it. The United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated has publicly welcomed the scheme, and has pledged its co-operation in the implementation of the plan. As to the need for control of deliveries, I point out that deliveries of wheat to the Australian Wheat Board this season amounted to 510,000,000 bushels. There was a carry-over from the 1967-68 harvest of 51,000,000 bushels. Of this total of 561,000,000 bushels, the board estimates it can sell 320,000,000 bushels. On this basis, the carry-over prior to next harvest would be 240,000,000 bushels. It is expected that 26,000,000 acres will be sown to wheat this year and, given an average season, deliveries to the Australian Wheat Board could reach 430,000,000 bushels, leaving the board with 670,000,000 bushels to dispose of in 1971.

In South Australia, there was a carry-over of 6,000,000 bushels at the beginning of the 1968-69 harvest, and it is estimated at this stage that at the beginning of the coming harvest the carry-over will be approximately 50,000,000 bushels, with a reasonable prospect of South Australia's quota of 45,000,000 bushels being achieved for 1969-70 delivery. The figures I have quoted will serve to indicate the serious situation which is likely to face the Australian wheat industry in the immediate future unless some temporary action is taken.

The South Australian Government does not favour acreage or production restrictions, but is prepared to co-operate with the industry by introducing the necessary legislation into Parliament to make the scheme workable. The alternative in the present circumstances would appear to be a first payment of \$440,000,000 over "X" amount of delivered wheat for the whole Commonwealth, and an individual producer-financed home storage programme, for an indefinite period, depending on sales of export wheat.

ROADSIDE SALES

Mr. BROOMHILL: My question, to the Minister of Labour and Industry, follows questions that I have asked in previous sessions in relation to roadside sales. I refer mainly to those sales where children are left out in the open on the side of the road selling fruit. Over the weekend, while driving a short distance from my home, I noticed that two children of primary-school age were out in teeming rain, with no cover at all, sitting alongside bags of fruit, and I would think that this is the sort of situation that we ought to be doing all we can to discourage. Will the Minister again look at this question and see whether

there is some action he can take to prevent this sort of thing?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I shall be glad to look at the question again for the honourable member, but I am not sure what can be done in this area. When this matter was previously investigated it was found that many stalls were being serviced by members of the proprietor's family, and this posed a problem. However, although I cannot at this moment think of an easy solution to this problem I will, at the honourable member's suggestion, look into it once again.

PINE PLANTINGS

Mr. GILES: Throughout the Adelaide Hills area many primary producers grow their own radiata pine seedlings from seeds. As one of my constituents has complained that it was difficult to buy seeds, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Forests to investigate the possibility of the Woods and Forests Department selling pine seeds to anyone wishing to buy them?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not think there would be much difficulty about people gathering seeds if they wished to, but it is not as easy as it sounds. The Woods and Forests Department has fairly elaborate apparatus for getting the seeds from cones, and I think its normal practice is to sell seedlings, which are probably of a better quality than most people would be able to raise, at a reasonable price. However, I will refer the question to my colleague.

KADINA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the rebuilding programme at the Kadina Primary School?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: It is expected that work will commence on August 4, 1969, on the erection of the new buildings at the Kadina Primary School, and that these buildings will be completed in November, 1969.

PINNAROO ROAD

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, is anxious to give me a reply to a question I asked on July 3 concerning improvement works on Main Road No. 12, the road from Moorlands to Pinnaroo.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am anxious to do so because I am sure the honourable member will be particularly interested in the information contained in the reply.

Work proposed for the Tailern Bend to Pinnaroo Main Road No. 5 for the current financial year is as follows:

Moorlands-Peake section: The reconstruction of this section will be completed to Peake and it is expected that sealing will be completed before Christmas.

Peake-Geranium section: Reconstruction will commence shortly and it is expected that this will be completed before June, 1970.

Lameroo-Yaparra section: The District Council of Lameroo will commence work on about three miles of road east of Lameroo. A search is in progress at present to locate suitable pavement materials, and it is expected that the work will be completed during the next sealing season.

Resealing: Several sections are being kept under observation and may warrant some maintenance resealing this year. However, a final assessment will not be made until after winter when the reseal programme will be finalized.

PARAPLEGICS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked yesterday about parking for paraplegics in the streets of Adelaide?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I promised, I brought down a copy of a letter I received in reply to my representations to the City Council that reads as follows:

You may be aware that on March 31, the council resolved as follows:

That

- (1) There be no extension of on-street parking concessions for physically handicapped or disabled persons; and
- (2) As a trial, two parking spaces be made available for use by incapacitated motorists in each of the five corporation car parks, namely, Wyatt Street, the Central Market, Topham Street, Light Square and Grenfell Street (by arrangement with the lessee), on an annual application basis; the priority for permits to be established by the Medical Officer of Health; there being no more than 30 permits being issued for occasional use; occasional use to be determined by the issue of quarterly cards to be punched on each usage, not to exceed an aggregate of 13 usages a quarter. For this purpose the parking fee shall be no charge for the first two hours and thereafter payment of the normal fees as if then first parked.

The council is very much aware of the problems encountered by disabled people and if their sympathies ruled, every facility would be granted to them. It is aware, however, that it is its responsibility to ensure that the available space is rationed with the object of giving the best possible result to normal central city activities.

We have tried to overcome some of the problems outlined in the accompanying reports.

£1

We are aware that this still does not meet the problems of those who work in the city and require parking but we have indicated to those who have approached us on the subject that if it is possible to extend some privilege in individual cases, without undue interference to other users, we would be prepared to consider it.

That is the end of the quote of the letter written to Mr. Bray, Secretary for Local Government, in reply to the query he had sent on my behalf. Obviously, the council has control of these areas and it is not within the province of the State Government to interfere with the council's decision. However, the council is aware of my representations, and I draw the honourable member's attention to the part of the reply that states:

... we have indicated to those who have approached us on the subject that if it is possible to extend some privilege in individual cases, without undue interference to other users, we would be prepared to consider it.

On that basis I suggest that, if the honourable member knows an individual who may have approached her on this matter, she advise that person to approach the City Council, or have someone to do so on his behalf, and ask for special consideration.

WHYALLA LAND

Mr. ARNOLD: Yesterday, the member for Whyalla said that industrial land at Whyalla was costing about \$10,000 an acre and that similar land at Elizabeth was costing about \$3,800. Can the Minister of Lands say what costs are involved concerning the land that is available at Whyalla for industrial use?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I intend to deal with this matter in more detail later, because I do not have all the information available now. However, the costs involved in the subdivision referred to will, in some cases, exceed the return to the department, although in other cases it will not reach the return to the department. Any suggestion that the Lands Department is making a healthy profit is one that I strongly deny. The cost of subdividing this land is considerable, because of what the department is doing to provide facilities to the blocks that are sold. It cannot be suggested that exorbitant profits are made. In addition, during the time of the last Labor Government land was sold in Whyalla by the Housing Trust at about double the figure that was quoted yesterday by the member for Whyalla. It seems to me that this is not a relevant complaint.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Were these sales at about \$20,000?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think the average for one transaction was about \$20,000 an acre in 1966. It was suggested by the member for Whyalla that this was worthless pastoral land, but this is like saying that Brougham Place will not grow good wheat. It is valuable land, because it is in a progressive and growing city, and the private sales of land in Whyalla certainly exceed, in many cases, the figure of \$10,000 an acre that was quoted in the press and by the member for Whyalla. I assure the honourable member that there is no undue profit. Greater details of how the costs are arrived at will be given, although the figures are necessarily approximate. The information will show that the Lands Department is doing a service that I should have thought the commission would be pleased about. As a matter of fact, I had already set in train a proposal to discuss this matter with the commission. Although the commission has invited me to Whyalla I cannot go at present, but I understand that members of the commission are coming to Adelaide next week.

FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. RICHES: Has the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs a reply to my question about fire protection at the Davenport Reserve?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Investigations are being undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to assess the feasibility of installing a stand-by water pump on the main where it enters the reserve, to provide additional pressure in times of a fire emergency. If this can be achieved the matter will again be taken up with the Fire Brigades Board, with a view to having Davenport Reserve brought into the Port Augusta fire district.

GOODWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about paving at the Goodwood Primary School?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: A site survey has been made of the grounds of the Goodwood Primary School to obtain details for the design of the proposed paving work. The survey details are now being plotted and these details will soon be available to enable design documents to be prepared for tender call. In view of the heavy work load of other similar type projects, the current programming for paving at the Goodwood Primary School is for tenders to be called towards the end of this calendar year. On this basis, work should

commence early in the new year. Action was taken earlier this year to carry out patching of the paved area as a temporary measure.

CITRUS INDUSTRY

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to the question I asked some time ago about the citrus industry in this State?

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

Information supplied by the Citrus Organization Committee shows that growers who have rejoined the 1969-70 pool since April 12, 1969, outnumber those who have withdrawn during that period. The support for the 1969-70 pool at April 11, 1968, was 86.6 per cent (expressed as a percentage of total production) and the figure at June 10, 1969, was 86 per cent. Since June 10 one other large producer has rejoined, and the percentage at present is only a fraction less than was the case at this stage last year. The committee states that the bulk of the withdrawals in the first instance came from the Kingston-Moorook and the Cadell districts. I point out that the committee is a statutory body, a majority of the members of which are the elected representatives of producers. With reference to the honourable member's inquiry regarding action by the Government "to see that these people are brought back into it" it is presumed that the word "it" means the 1969-70 industry pool; and my policy is to act within the powers conferred upon me by the provisions of the Act, with which the honourable member, as a former Minister of Agriculture, would undoubtedly be well acquainted.

MINERAL SCIENCE CENTRE

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Premier inform the House what progress, if any, has been made in the establishment of an Australian Mineral Science Centre in South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am pleased to have that question, because the Government places great importance on the possible establishment of the Australian Mineral Science Centre in South Australia. Some weeks ago I spoke to an assembly in the Hotel Australia, comprising representatives of the petroleum industry and people involved in exploration around Australia, about the Government's intention in regard to the centre. Since that time, the active committee that is supporting the centre's establishment has seen fit to travel around Australia and elicit support from the industry itself. That committee comprises Sir Alwyn Barker, Professor Badger, Mr. Parkin, who is the Deputy Director of Mines, Professor Rudd, and Mr. A. M. Simpson. They are the members of this active committee which is

fully seized of the importance to South Australia of the mineral industry. This State has been, of course, an important training ground for many mining leaders in Australia.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Traditionally.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, traditionally it has been such. We believe an opportunity now exists for this State again to show the way in mineral development. Not only would this assist our own search and development programme within the State but it would also provide a training ground and favourable environment for those requiring post-graduate or further study in mineral science within this State. At the moment, the land which has been selected for the purpose is being examined and, in relation to the other facilities existing in the city, it is in an excellent area. For this reason we believe that South Australia's reputation will be upheld and that the mining industry will support and make contributions towards the setting up of this centre.

HOPE VALLEY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on July 3 about the proposed closing of the Hope Valley School and its replacement by schools to be built at Highbury and Vista?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: True, conditions at the Hope Valley Primary School leave a good deal to be desired. As the honourable member may know, a new school was opened some years ago at Modbury South as the first stage in a plan which would eventually lead to the abandonment of the Hope Valley School. Before this plan can be brought to fruition, new schools at both Highbury and Vista will be necessary. Recently, a most comprehensive survey of the educational needs of the area covered by these schools was submitted to this office by the District Inspector of Schools. This position is well known and steps are in hand to meet the eventualities, but the building of these schools must be seen in relation to other schools in areas where the need is greater.

It would please the Education Department no less than the parents of children attending the Hope Valley School if it were possible to replace the latter school at an early date. While no exact forecast can be given, it would seem that considerable time will elapse before it will be possible to abandon the Hope Valley school altogether.

ROAD TAX

Mr. EDWARDS: About a month ago I asked a question concerning the road tax problem. Dozens of carriers work for organizations, such as the Western Hauliers' Association, not only on Eyre Peninsula but in other parts of the State. Working for, say, a month, the individual carrier then sends his return in to the bigger organizations which, in turn, will take a month to check the details. The carrier is then paid, and by this time two months may well have passed. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to consider giving the carriers concerned at least two months' grace so that their returns may be checked out, and so that they may obtain their money? The carriers concerned are supposed to pay on the 14th of each month, and if they have not submitted a report how are they going to pay their road tax charges?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will take up the matter with the Minister.

COST OF LIVING

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In today's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Rise in Prices", we read the following:

The steady climb in the cost of living continued during the June quarter with an 0.8 per cent increase in the consumer price index. This means a loss of 54c in the value of the earnings of the average Australian wage earner. Perth had the biggest rise with 85 cents, followed by Adelaide (57 cents), and Sydney (56 cents).

Will the Treasurer say what proportion of this price was the result of the rise in Housing Trust rents and in departmental residence rents?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I could not answer that in precise terms at the moment. I will obtain the information for the honourable member, and I suggest that he asks the question again tomorrow.

Mr. LAWN: On the front page of this morning's *Australian*, in an article headed "Cost of Food Forces up Index", appeared the following two paragraphs:

The percentage rise in the all-groups index in the capital cities was: Sydney 0.9, Melbourne 0.6, Brisbane 0.5, Adelaide 0.9, Perth 1.4, Hobart 0.5, Canberra 0.4.

In terms of the minimum wage, the rise in living costs in each city was: Sydney 36c, Melbourne 24c, Brisbane 20c, Adelaide 36c, Perth 54c, Hobart 20c, and Canberra 16c.

In both cases South Australia was the equal second highest State. Actually, wages in South Australia are lower than those in the Eastern

States as they have been all my life, because we have usually enjoyed a lower consumer price index. Will the Treasurer, as Minister in charge of prices, ask the Prices Commissioner why there should be such a substantial increase in prices in South Australia? Also, will he ascertain whether the Prices Commissioner thinks greater control is necessary?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In asking his question the honourable member has largely answered a question previously asked by the member for Hindmarsh, who suggested that the rise in living costs in South Australia was caused by increased rents. The honourable member has referred to another press reference about an increase, I think if I heard correctly, relating to the cost of food. Both items may have had some effect. The honourable member also said that wages were somewhat lower in South Australia than they were in some other States. That used to be true but I do not think it is so significantly true now.

Mr. Lawn: It is, except for doctors' fees.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not want to be led away from the main purpose of the question. The honourable member must recall that the rises he quoted are percentage rises on the previous level. They are not absolute rises in terms of an all-Australian figure, but percentage rises on a previous level. I do not know what was the previous cost of living.

Mr. Lawn: One instance is a percentage increase on the previous level, but the second paragraph does not refer to that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I point out that they are increases on a previously established base, and therefore do not represent an increase in absolute terms.

Mr. Lawn: Yes they do: look at the second paragraph.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I did not see the press report.

Mr. Lawn: Ask the Prices Commissioner to look into it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will not debate the matter: I will make the inquiry for which the honourable member asks. I merely made that comment in replying to the question, because I believed it was relevant; if it was not, then I stand to be corrected.

NORTHERN ROADS

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General obtained a report from the Minister of Roads and Transport in reply to a question I recently asked about northern roads?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The completion of the road between Murray Town and Booleroo Centre is dependent on progress being made with the excavation and crushing at Magnus Hill. This latter work is being carried out by contract, and output during 1968-69 was not sufficient to enable the placing of base material and sealing prior to winter of this year. No difficulties can be foreseen that will prevent completion during 1969-70.

FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I recently asked about a report that finance would be made available for research in connection with the fishing industry?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member asked about scallop fishing. I have received a reply from the Minister of Agriculture which I have shortened a little, because of time, and I will give the report to the honourable member so that he may read the rest of the details. The Minister of Agriculture reports as follows:

The Director of the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department believes that scallops are present in some locations in South Australia sufficient to support a small fishery for these delectable molluscs. The scallops found so far are not as large in size as those on Victorian and Tasmanian beds, but there is a limited fishery potential for scallops for local consumption.

The department is making arrangements to provide more information on dredging, and for this purpose a film will be used. The report concludes as follows:

· Moneys to be provided from the Commonwealth matching fund for research work in the different States are subject to the States setting up a trust fund in their own States so that moneys collected in licence fees and registrations from the fishing industry within their own State can be matched with funds from Commonwealth sources. No such fund has yet been established in South Australia, but provision has been made for the establishment of such a fund in the draft fisheries Bill which I expect to submit shortly for consideration by Parliament.

HILLS FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: My question concerns a section of the Hills Freeway which the local residents are now calling the "golden mile", even though it is slightly more than a mile. I should like to know the number of lights that will be installed between the crest of Crafrers hill and the Stirling under-pass bridge alongside Pomona Road and the roads that form the approaches to the freeway in this

area. I also wish to know the cost of installation of the poles or underground cables and of the lighting. In other words, can the Attorney-General obtain from his colleague the total estimated cost of this lighting programme?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will certainly try.

MOORLANDS CORNER

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yesterday I asked the Attorney-General a question about signposting of the Moorlands corner on Main Road No. 8 on the main road between Adelaide and Melbourne. I have since received a letter from the Bordertown Chamber of Commerce providing me with a suggested plan for lighting and asking me to take up with the Minister the possibility of providing lighting at this corner so that the way the roads deviate could be clearly seen by anyone approaching the corner from any direction. Therefore, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether, in view of the fact that 240-volt power is available, it would be possible to light the junction at Moorlands corner similarly to the way in which the Meningie corner outside Tailem Bend is lit?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask the Minister.

TEACHERS' ALLOWANCES

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: In the *Government Gazette* of July 17 appears a notice concerning a regulation under the Education Act, 1915-1966, as follows:

The Education Regulations, 1962, made on April 26, 1962, and published in the *Government Gazette* on April 27, 1962, at page 1035, as varied from time to time, are further varied by deleting Regulation 13 of Part XXI and inserting in lieu thereof the following regulation:

"Allowances: 13. Subject to these regulations, the allowances payable to students at teachers colleges shall be those determined by the Minister from time to time."

And the honourable the Minister of Education is to give the necessary directions herein accordingly.

Can the Minister of Education say whether this statement means that in future the determination of these allowances, when they are varied, will not be published in the *Government Gazette* in this way and, if they will not be, how they will be published? Does this move mean that the Minister will consider making further determinations of these allowances in accordance with alterations in the cost of living?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I think the honourable member realizes probably that the

determination of allowances is to be the responsibility of the Minister of Education. Variations may be made on the recommendation of the Director-General of Education or alternatively by a committee to be appointed by the Minister, whichever is considered to be the most appropriate course. However, if this is the case the recommendation will certainly be made by a small committee of people who know the position. The cost of living would definitely be one factor taken into account in any future review because the cost of living was one of the factors considered in the recent review.

I should prefer to think about the honourable member's other question. Although I have not considered it, I think that action would be taken similar to the action taken on this occasion because, if it were intended to review this matter at regular intervals, the relevant information would perhaps be given in the form it was given on this occasion. I will look at the matter and try to reply to the honourable member by tomorrow, for I realize he is going away next week.

EGGS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On July 2, I asked the Minister of Lands to refer to the Minister of Agriculture a question about the stamping of eggs. I pointed out that the New South Wales Egg Marketing Board had not stamped eggs for about 15 years and that the Rowland commission in Great Britain had recently recommended the abandonment of stamping. Has the Minister of Lands a reply to that question?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board reports that a special subcommittee from C.E.M.A.A. has been appointed to examine the desirability of standardizing grade weights and identification marks of eggs. This committee met at Brisbane on Tuesday, June 24, and after some discussion carried the following resolution:

This committee recommends that the subject of the achievement of Commonwealth-wide uniformity in grade weights and identification of eggs, and any necessary legislative means of enforcement of same, be pursued, with a view to obtaining regulations, with respect to the control of eggs, which will be acceptable to all States.

It is interesting to note that four State Boards, namely, those of Victoria, Western Australia, Tasmania and South Australia, have regulations which require that eggs offered for sale must be graded and identified, that is, each egg to be marked appropriately. Each of these

boards expressed the opinion that the regulations were operating to the advantage of the producer. The New South Wales board is awaiting a decision of the court concerning a challenge made against the validity of certain of its regulations, and at present is not prepared to give consideration to any proposed amendments to its existing regulations. At present the South Queensland Egg Marketing Board is without the legislative protection of other States. The South Australian Egg Board is satisfied that the policy of identification of eggs, and the method of marking, has greatly assisted the maintenance of quality of eggs supplied to the consumer, and it is highly improbable that the board would abandon its present policy.

GRAIN CARGOES

Mr. CASEY: The Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, will recall that I recently asked a question showing concern regarding the grain cargoes being exported from South Australia. I asked him whether he would take up with Cabinet the problems that face South Australia in the future regarding these big bulk grain carriers coming into Australia and going to the eastern and western seaboard but leaving out South Australia. Further, I received information the other day that South Australia had missed out on many grain shipments to the United Kingdom for this very reason that big ships on this run between the U.K. and Australia had not been calling at South Australian ports as they have normally done. Has the Minister a reply to this question?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have received the following information from the South Australian Manager of the Australian Wheat Board:

So far as it is in the board's hands to determine the State of shipment for sales that have been made, allocations are being made to each State on an equitable basis. With regard to China, a substantial volume of shipments has already been allocated to South Australia and this is likely to continue for the balance of this year. We have no knowledge of Russian ships being utilized to carry Australian wheat to China.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It was reported in the press on June 25 that the Treasurer, I think as Minister of Housing, had said that for houses of a certain age owned by the Housing Trust the rent would not exceed \$8 a week. Can the Minister say what age he meant?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am at a loss to know just what the honourable member means. I should like him to refer to me a copy of the statement that is the basis of his question, because I am not aware that I spoke about houses owned by the Housing Trust in terms of age at any time. If the honourable member refers the press article to me, I will try to clarify the situation.

YORKEY CROSSING

Mr. RICHES: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to a question I asked concerning the linking of Yorkey Crossing—

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 22. Page 395.)

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): In order to refresh the memories of some honourable members, I should like to take two or three minutes going over some of the points that I touched on last evening. I had complimented the former Minister of Education on his masterly contribution to this Address in Reply debate. However, I am told by some of my colleagues who have made some study of the former Minister's speech that some of the points he raised were not valid. I know that some members on my side are doing some detailed study of his speech and that they will systematically correct the several exaggerations that he made.

On looking at the pull I noticed (and indeed I noticed this last night but it is rather more evident today) that despite the magnificent contribution that he made in his address he did toss up one or two loose balls. For instance, he said:

However, when I think of the way a Liberal Government entered into an openhanded contract for the F111 aircraft and spent millions of dollars without hesitation, and when I think how we literally had to beg the Commonwealth Minister for \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 for children's education, it makes me sick.

We see in that extract from the speech that a Socialist Parliamentarian cannot get his sense of values properly; he would sacrifice our national

defence for expenditure on just one of the fields of Government responsibility.

Mr. McKee: What have the F111's got to do with this debate?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am not making a speech about F111's as F111's: I am just drawing the attention of the House to the lack of responsibility that Socialist members have towards national defence, and this is why, of course, the Liberal and Country Party coalition has such an enormous majority in the Commonwealth Parliament in Canberra. One of the reasons Mr. Corcoran did not get the Leadership of the Labor Party was that as a professional soldier he was too much identified with his country's defence to suit the barons that control the policies of Australian Labor Party members of Parliament.

I want to get back to what I was saying about the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes). I believe that my colleague, the member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson), is going to systematically take the member for Wallaroo to task and that he is preparing and will give a very fine speech that will read rather well in the local press in the Wallaroo-Kadina area as well as on Yorke Peninsula. I refer to the speech of the member for Wallaroo on July 2, and for the benefit of Opposition members who are following my speech, it is on page 276 of *Hansard*, as follows:

No progress was made in the industrial life of this State as a result of the Premier's overseas visit. I do not object to the Premier (or any Premier) travelling overseas on a mission, but I do object to his saying that, as a result of his trip, there would be much industrial expansion, particularly when that has not occurred.

Does the honourable member really think that all results on an overseas mission made by the head of the South Australian Government should bear fruit immediately? Does he not think that it is reasonable for the normal processes of the Industrial Development Branch to work, and does he not think it reasonable that some of the fruits of the Premier's overseas mission will become evident as time goes by? I should think that any conscientious A.L.P. member would feel nothing but shame about his Party's record of industrial promotion in South Australia.

Mr. Langley: We improved it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not think the member for Wallaroo is as naive as all that: if he is I feel sorry for him. The only thing that motivated the honourable member was the

thought of some temporary political gain, and I am sure that the general public of South Australia will not be deceived by the sort of remark made by the member for Wallaroo.

Mr. Langley: What percentage did he get last time?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I was not going to repeat some of the remarks I made about the weakness of the A.L.P. leadership but, now that the member for Unley has encouraged me to do so, I allude to the great debate on the Dartmouth *versus* Chowilla dam controversy in which the Leader of the Labor Party was hopelessly outclassed. When speaking last evening, I forgot to make one point. One disadvantage on my side of politics is that, in general, we do not like to read our speeches word for word and, therefore, now and again we forget to cast before members opposite one of our pearls. One pearl I forgot to cast last evening was about a reminiscence of mine.

A good friend of mine, a member of the A.L.P., is on the Central Executive of the Young Labor Movement: I think he may be the president of that group in South Australia but I am not sure of his position. I cultivate his friendship, because I think I can help his thinking in many ways, and he told me that people in the Young Labor Group (or contingent or whatever they call themselves) were disappointed in the Leader's performance in that great debate and that they considered they had been let down. Those remarks should satisfy the member for Unley, because I know that he was also disappointed in the Leader's performance in that great debate.

Mr. Langley: I was not.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not want to waste time on the member for Unley, but I wish to consider the speech of the member for Wallaroo. For the benefit of members opposite who are following closely, I turn now to page 281, the right-hand column, of *Hansard*, and quote what the member for Wallaroo said, as follows:

Considerable Government assistance was made available by the Labor Government to firms establishing or expanding in South Australia.

I hope members opposite will listen more carefully to the remainder of the quotation, which is as follows:

This assistance took the following forms: Government guaranteed loans for firms from recognized financial institutions; factories built by the South Australian Housing Trust for either sale or leasing; technical assistance;

water, sewerage and electricity at competitive rates with other States, lower electricity tariffs being made available to large industrial users; and low-cost housing made available through the Housing Trust to employees.

The member for Wallaroo takes unto himself and to his Party the credit for all these things, but they were introduced to South Australia during the period of the previous Liberal and Country League Government: they were given to South Australia by the former L.C.L. Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) and none of them was introduced to South Australia by either the Walsh or the Dunstan Administration. When the member for Unley makes his speech in this debate (and he will make one because he is a loyal South Australian and loyal to the Crown) he can explain away what the member for Wallaroo said.

Mr. Langley: You had to get the support of the Labor Party or none of those things would have gone through, and you know it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I cannot recall off-hand when the A.L.P. has made contributions to industrial expansion of its own volition: it cannot, because it is dedicated to oppose private enterprise.

Mr. Ryan: Now we know why you are Under Secretary for the State.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Let the member for Unley explain this away when his turn comes to address himself to the motion. Also, the member for Wallaroo—

Mr. Ryan: Did he get under your skin a bit?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I suppose he did: he could not help it because he spoke for more than three hours.

Mr. Venning: And said nothing.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is impossible to sit here without wilting under the blast and without being a little distressed.

Mr. Ryan: How do you know—you are not always here?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I turn now to the speech of the member for Wallaroo recorded on page 289 of *Hansard*, but before doing so I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, will remember that you had to draw the honourable member's attention to Standing Order 155, which relates to prolixity in debate. Members heard from the highest authority in this Chamber a criticism of the member for Wallaroo for speaking too long.

Mr. Clark: And this could happen to you any second.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member is not going to be guilty to the same extent.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Far from it, Mr. Speaker; that is the last sin in which I would indulge. I refer now to what the member for Wallaroo said about the activities of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. You, Mr. Speaker, would know, as would every member (and certainly those on this side) that this is one of the most responsible marketing authorities in South Australia. A foolish man is he who would criticize the administration and organization of the co-operative yet, in his simplicity, the member for Wallaroo said, when speaking about the provision of a port at Ardrossan instead of a deep sea port at Wallaroo:

The Government should treat the matter seriously. If the co-operative is manipulating figures so as to have additional silos built at Ardrossan, a full inquiry into the co-operative should be held.

How game politically is a member who can even impute dishonesty in relation to the affairs of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited? I consider that the member for Wallaroo was merely trying to play Party politics to take the political heat off himself in Wallaroo. That honourable member has now come back into the Chamber. He knows that the political skids are under him, because the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), one of the powers behind the scenes in the Labor Party, told the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) that the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) and a third member whose district I forget (it could well have been Barossa) were expendable: in other words, when the electoral redistribution goes through, districts will not be found for those members. The third member was the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark), not the member for Barossa.

Mr. Hughes: He didn't say that at all.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It was the member for Wallaroo, the member for Gawler,—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: I ask that this remark be withdrawn by the honourable member unless he produces evidence to the effect of what he has said. That is a matter under the control of the electoral commission.

The SPEAKER: Order! Objection having been taken by the member for Wallaroo, who asks for a withdrawal, I ask the member for Light to withdraw the statement.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, I withdraw the statement. I have no wish to offend the honourable member.

Mr. Clark: But you've got it in.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am not speaking about those members personally.

Mr. Hughes: Not half!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I want to deal now with the speech made by the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo). One only has to think of the enormous amount of publicity that the press gave to his speech and the small amount of publicity that the Leader got to realize where the strength lies in the Australian Labor Party. I understand that the member for Edwardstown is now representing the great A.L.P. team at the Federal Conference. I commend the member for Edwardstown for his speech. He made a constructive contribution. In particular, I know that he has a particular interest in the Railways Department and he offered constructive suggestions for increasing rail transport safety and for increasing the quality of the service provided by the South Australian Railways. He suggested that it would be good if the railways could provide the sort of service to passengers that the airlines in Australia can offer. He spoke at length about a private television repair company operating in South Australia, and I thought some of his remarks were a trifle extravagant. I think he realized that, because, as reported at page 315 of *Hansard*, he stated:

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

He was not saying that there were some reputable ones but that there probably were some reputable ones. The Attorney-General was good enough to get a report on the activities of the particular company that the honourable member had mentioned and he gave that report to the House yesterday.

Mr. Ryan: At your request. You didn't have enough decency to wait.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Why should I wait for a member of the Opposition who asked a question with some urgency yet has now gone to a conference in another State on some obscure Party problems there, when he should be here in the State Legislature doing the job for which the taxpayer pays him? The taxpayer is not paying the member for Edwardstown to be in another State attending some Socialist conference.

Mr. Langley: Don't some of your members go to conferences in other States?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am not aware of any members on this side going to conferences in other states when the House is in session, though Ministers go to other States or overseas on Government business. The member for Edwardstown is in another State on purely Party affairs.

Mr. Langley: His work is being done.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: How can his work be done when the Attorney-General could not get anyone on the Opposition side to ask his question?

The SPEAKER: Order! This is getting beyond the question of ordinary debate: It is getting into a conversation between members across the Chamber. I ask the honourable member to get into the debate on the question before the House, not into conversations.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said last evening, I had not planned to speak at length in this debate. I had intended to refer only to a few of the points made by two members opposite. I remember clearly that you encouraged the cut and thrust of debate. I have been trying to carry out your philosophy as well as I can, because I know that you enjoy a little cut and thrust.

The SPEAKER: Order! I should be delighted to give the honourable member a few lessons on the cut and thrust of debate. However, conversations across the Chamber are absolutely divorced from the principles of debate.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I want to conclude by referring to remarks made by the member for Edwardstown when he tried to discredit the stand of the member for Murray (Mr. Wardle) and the member for Chaffey (Mr. Arnold) on the Dartmouth-Chowilla dam controversy. True, members on this side supported the Chowilla dam before the election, but we did not have available to us the technical information that members on the other side had. The truth of the matter is that members on the other side of the House were grossly dishonest when they went to the people at the last election, because they did not tell the people the truth about the technical report concerning the Dartmouth and Chowilla dams. Having gone with the Premier to some public meetings at towns on the Murray River, I have no doubt that the people, at least in those districts, are now well aware of the issues surrounding the Chowilla dam.

Mr. Ryan: Are you willing to have a vote on it?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: We are willing to go to a vote on it and we are willing to make it an

election issue when we go to the people, because we are sure that the people of South Australia will know how to handle the duplicity of the Australian Labor Party. I think a large proportion of the South Australian people are satisfied now on the Dartmouth-Chowilla issue, having seen the Leader of the Opposition hopelessly outclassed in a public television debate.

It is interesting that the first of the series of meetings that the Premier addressed on the Murray River was extremely well attended, whereas the crowds progressively declined until only a small handful attended the last meeting that he addressed, which was at Mannum. That shows clearly that the people in the Murray River districts have accepted the facts as presented by the Premier and that what was a controversy on the Dartmouth-Chowilla dam has now become almost a settled issue. If the Leader is wise, I suggest, in his own interests and in the interests of his Party, that he should not say much more about the Chowilla dam. I have refrained from reading my speech in full, as do members on the other side—

Mr. Hughes: That's a lie, and you know it.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Nankivell): Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: We lose the benefit when members such as the member for Wallaroo, who reads his speeches word for word—

Mr. HUGHES: I take exception to that. That is not true, as you yourself would know, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, and I ask that that remark be withdrawn. I do not know what is the matter with this lunatic today.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unfortunately, I missed the precise words used by the member for Light. If he said anything unparliamentary, I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am afraid that—

Mr. HUGHES: I raised the point of order, not the honourable member. I wish to give the details. The honourable member accused me, and he told a lie to this House, saying that I read all my speeches. That is a complete lie, as you yourself would know, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Exception has been taken to the remarks of the member for Light, and I ask him if he will withdraw his remarks.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. The member for Wallaroo called me a lunatic a moment ago, but I did not take exception to that. However, if there is anything that I have said, to which the member for Wallaroo objects, I am reasonably

happy to withdraw it. I shall remember that he called me a lunatic, and I most certainly will not pull any punches in future.

Mr. Hughes: I will not pull any with you either, inside or outside the House.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I know how uncomfortable the member for Wallaroo was at the public meeting held recently at Wallaroo at which a large crowd of farmers was present to hear the Premier discuss the issues surrounding—

Mr. Hughes: Tell the House who forced him to go to Wallaroo!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Premier went of his own volition to tell the farmers in the area the facts about the proposals for a deep sea port at Ardrossan as against those for one at Wallaroo. One of the interesting things that transpired that evening was that there was evidence of a certain conflict between the waterside workers who load wheat at Wallaroo and members of the Australian Workers Union who load wheat at Ardrossan. There is some rivalry between members of these two unions. I understand the waterside workers' organization is supporting the member for Wallaroo, and I think the Australian Workers Union group is supporting some other faction within the Australian Labor Party movement. This is one of the factors that has been disturbing the member for Wallaroo.

I should like to contribute one last thought in this debate, and I hope that no member opposite will take offence. The last big meeting of farmers that I attended as a Parliamentarian in a Labor member's district was held a couple of years ago at Murray Bridge, where many farmers turned out to tell the former member for Murray what they thought of his administration of the agriculture portfolio. At the subsequent election, that member was thrown out, and I suggest that after the next election in the Wallaroo District the present incumbent will be thrown out of office also. I am pleased, indeed, again to compliment the distinguished mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, the member for Gumeracha, and the equally distinguished seconder of the motion, the member for Onkaparinga. As new members of the House, they are making magnificent contributions to the debates in this place, and I know that they will go on and have long and distinguished Parliamentary careers. I am pleased to support the motion.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): It is rather difficult for me to continue in this debate, having had to listen to what the member for

Light has said during the last half an hour or so.

Mr. Ryan: What did he say?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ferguson): Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier.

Mr. BURDON: I am consoled by the fact that my colleague will assist me if necessary. First, I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I also wish to offer my condolences to the relatives of deceased former members. As the member for Mount Gambier, I was pleased when our new Governor, Sir James Harrison, and Lady Harrison, saw fit to make their first country visit, after coming to South Australia, in the District of Mount Gambier.

Mr. Jennings: Did you give him "hospital" treatment?

Mr. BURDON: I will leave that to the member concerned. It was a great pleasure to have His Excellency and Lady Harrison visit my district. I regret that, because of illness, they have had to cancel the trip to Whyalla which they were to have made within the next few days. The first steps taken in South Australia to do something positive about attracting industry to South Australia were taken early in the life of the Walsh Government, which came into office in 1965, when it set up the Industrial Development Branch of the Premier's Department. The function of this branch was expanded when the present Leader of the Opposition, who followed Mr. Frank Walsh as Premier, appointed Mr. Donald Currie as Director of Industrial Development in August, 1967. However, the people of South Australia know of the shameful way in which Mr. Currie was dismissed by the Hall Government at a cost to the State of \$30,000.

Mr. Ryan: No, the Stott-Hall Government!

Mr. BURDON: I agree that it is a coalition Government.

Mr. Ryan: It's not a Government in its own right.

Mr. BURDON: To prove how valuable Mr. Currie's services were in the little time that he had to serve the State, I point out that he was a fluent speaker of Japanese and that on a visit to Japan he was able to secure a particular prospect for this State. However, we find the Premier saying that Mr. Currie did not have the qualifications for this office. Yet, after visiting Japan, the Premier said that this industry was a definite prospect. To

me this represents an achievement on Mr. Currie's part as he has obtained a definite prospect for the State, as the Premier is proud to claim. Therefore, it appears to me, as it will appear to the people of South Australia, that Mr. Currie did have the qualifications to carry out the job, and the actions of the present Government in dismissing him were not justified.

I believe the Commonwealth Government has a responsibility to assist the States to promote industrial development in regional areas. This should be a joint responsibility of the States and the Commonwealth, which should enter into a partnership to define selected areas in which the States desire regional development. I understand that the development section in Victoria has selected certain regions. South Australia should also select regions where industrial development can take place or where opportunities can be provided for it to take place. The Commonwealth Government should assist in various ways, financially, through taxation measures and so on. In this connection, I believe that the Industrial Development Branch in this State must get back to the idea of the Labor Government that it is necessary to conduct scientific and technical investigations into a proposal to develop a particular industry in a particular area. Only by conducting a complete feasibility study can progress be made in this field.

What was put forward by the previous Labor Government and is now put forward by the Leader of the Opposition has much more to commend it than has the present negative policy of the Hall-Stott Government. I believe the Government has turned back the clock and is not going ahead. Before the last State election, the then Opposition, in its outbursts and pamphlets, said it would get the State moving, and it put forward several points as to how it would do this. One pamphlet, which was distributed in the District of Gouger by the present Premier, boldly stated that if the Liberal and Country League was elected it would build Chowilla. However, I will deal with that matter later.

With many people, I believe it is wrong that so much industrial development should take place around the metropolitan area, whether in Brisbane, Melbourne, Sydney, Adelaide or Perth. Throughout Australia today great development is taking place in cities, and some positive move should be made so that certain country areas can be selected for industrial development. We know

that much capital is needed to provide facilities such as water, sewerage, electricity, transport services, and so on in the metropolitan area. How much extra would it cost to provide those facilities in country areas? It may be argued that it is cheaper to provide them in the city. However, in the long run, I believe it would be economical and advantageous to the State generally to move some facilities to country areas. By doing this a base for the expansion of such regions is established. Regional areas must be selected and action taken so that larger country areas can be built up.

I was pleased to see the positive steps taken by the Labor Government to establish regional centres for education. The present Government has followed this up by appointing regional officers in the cities of Whyalla and Mount Gambier to cover the south-eastern and western areas of the State. I believe this was a move in the right direction. It is completely unnecessary for me to repeat one word of what the previous Minister of Education (Hon. R. R. Loveday) said in the House last evening. It has been acknowledged privately by certain members opposite that this was one of the best speeches on education delivered in the House, and I congratulate the honourable member on it. He did not deal with politics at any stage, dealing only with education as it affected South Australia.

Mr. Broomhill: Compare his speech with that of the member for Light.

Mr. BURDON: I regret to say that it would be impossible to make such a comparison; there would be less difference between chalk and cheese. The member for Whyalla was able to make a speech that held the attention of members on both sides of the House, this in itself being an acknowledgment of the excellence of his remarks. What have we seen in the field of education since the change of Government? There has been virtually a revolution by student teachers over a reduction in allowances made by the Government. We have heard of a threatened strike of school-teachers, and we have seen the reduction in the building rate of schools within the State. The present Government claims that 19 schools were completed this financial year, but that is really testimony of what took place under the Labor Government between 1965 and 1968, because if those schools had not been started in that period they would not have been finished in 1968. Therefore, this is a compliment paid by the Government to the present Opposition.

However, from what I can gather, the number of projects that has been before the Public Works Committee in the last few months represents an all-time low.

I have given one or two instances of what has taken place under the present Government. We had the Minister of Education a few weeks ago claiming that everything was all right, that there was nothing wrong with education in this State; but only a few weeks ago, at the Findon High School, only one teacher was available for a Matriculation class of 80 students.

Mr. Broomhill: The other teachers have left to get better paid jobs.

Mr. BURDON: In the stop press in the *News* today, under the heading "Protest over Teacher Training", the following article appeared:

The South Australian Institute of Teachers today strongly protested against a quota system for teacher-training, announced recently by the Education Minister, Mrs. Steele. The president, Mr. W. A. White, said institute appreciated decision to provide incentives for married women to train as teachers by placing them on an equal footing with other students. But the institute was opposed to a quota system being applied to teacher-training.

Mr. Clark: This statement was not made without thought having been given to it, either.

Mr. BURDON: No, the Institute of Teachers has fully considered the implication behind this proposed quota system, and it has issued that statement after carefully considering the full impact of the system on students. I think enough has been said by the member for Whyalla to give members opposite a clear picture of the administration of the Education Department between 1965 and 1968. I regret that it will not be possible for this Government, when it goes out of office, to look back on its record in education in the same way as we can look at the record of the Labor Government in education and in all other fields of administration in this State.

I should like to place one or two other matters before Parliament and before the Education authorities. I believe there is a need further to extend the facilities for secondary and tertiary education outside the metropolitan area. Teacher-training colleges should be established in country centres; maximum facilities for tertiary education should be made available to people in country areas; plans should be made to establish a country university; and existing technical colleges could be used for some part of university training.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. BURDON: Technical colleges were upgraded from technical schools to technical colleges during the time of the Labor Government. I believe we could further assist tertiary education in this State by making greater use of these technical colleges. To be fair, I must admit that probably one of the largest technical colleges in this State is situated in Mount Gambier. About 3,000 people attend this technical college, which does a very good job for Mount Gambier and the Lower South-East area. A new primary school has recently been completed in Mount Gambier, and it is expected that within the next month or so 1,000 students from the old Mount Gambier High School will move into one of the most modern high schools in South Australia for the last term of this year.

I understand that the accommodation at this new high school will be heavily taxed from the commencement of the next school year. Although the Education Department has taken steps to acquire other property, I should like the department and the Government to keep in mind the necessity for additional educational buildings at Mount Gambier. About 650 students attend the technical high school and about 1,000 students attend the high school and, while the Education Department has acquired other land on both sides of the city for other secondary schools, I have reason to believe that the officers of the department would have in mind the necessity to prepare for additional secondary educational facilities in that city. I would appreciate—and I know that Mount Gambier generally would appreciate—suitable plans being made in this matter. I have complete faith in the officers of the Education Department in this connection.

I believe that there has been a move by the Government in this matter. The member for Murray (Mr. Wardle) will no doubt appreciate that he, too, is to get a new high school soon. I believe this is essential, and I am delighted to know that such fine quality schools are being erected in the country, because education is one of our greatest insurances.

Mr. McKEE: Mr. Speaker, I again draw attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. BURDON: Water resources in the South-East of the State were the subject of a symposium in Adelaide that I attended a few weeks ago. As most members would realize, water in the South-East is the most common and taken-for-granted mineral. I believe that every effort must be made to use these waters

to the best advantage, by which I mean using them in the South-East itself. About 600,000 acre feet is estimated to be available for recharging the underground aquifer (and there are 271,328 gallons in an acre foot) covering the area of the South-East from north of Keith, but this is subject to the rain that falls in the region in any one year.

Mr. Giles: What do you think should happen to the water that goes out to sea?

Mr. BURDON: It is estimated that about 200,000 acre feet of water flows out to sea annually.

Mr. Giles: What do you think should happen to it?

Mr. BURDON: I am waiting to see what the Government is going to do about it. I know that the member for Albert suggested that it should be channelled to the Coorong. I do not know whether this is a good suggestion but, if something can be done to store the water for future use or to use it to recharge the aquifer, it should be done. I hope that some concrete development will result from the investigations that are now taking place. When the Labor Government was in power steps were taken to ensure that something positive was done to establish the area of the underground reservoir, the rate of discharge, how the water could be used most economically, what industries could be taken to the South-East, and what use could be made of the water.

Mr. Giles: Do you believe that it should be pumped to Adelaide?

Mr. BURDON: I do not.

Mr. Corcoran: The Government does, though.

Mr. BURDON: I believe that every investigation should be made and every means possible taken to ensure that the water is usefully used where it is: it would be useful in the South-East. This is one of the chief arguments for developing regional areas, and I am sure that the member for Victoria will agree that we have an asset on which we should capitalize to the full before the water is taken to another area. If, by investigation, it is proved that the water can be used without depleting the underground water supply and there is a surplus, then consideration can be given to using it elsewhere. I was not only surprised but also concerned at the Premier's statement a few weeks ago made when he was asked whether the water would be pumped from the South-East to Adelaide. He said that this Government would not do so.

Mr. Rodda: I don't think he implied any—

Mr. BURDON: This statement to me means that another Government in three or perhaps 10 years could contemplate doing it. This was confirmed by the member for Albert.

Mr. Nankivell: I will make my speech soon.

Mr. BURDON: I do not doubt that for one moment, because the member for Albert has made a study of the underground water supply in this State and, having for some time been a member of a committee of which he was also a member, I know that he has a wide knowledge of these matters. I think he would be concerned if anything were done to prejudice the underground water supply in the South-East.

Mr. Nankivell: My word!

Mr. BURDON: I am sure that he shares my concern that steps may be taken that will jeopardize the water supply in the South-East before a complete investigation is made or complete knowledge obtained of what can be done.

Mr. Nankivell: I agree.

Mr. BURDON: We agree on one point, and I thank the honourable member for that. The water resources of this State, the driest State in the driest continent, must be guarded jealously. I will not stand idly by and watch any Government install equipment willy nilly to pump water from the South-East before a complete investigation is made, and I am sure that I have the overwhelming support of the South-East people in this regard. Mr. Gerny, Investigating Engineer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and Chairman of the Government committee appointed to study South-East water, stated at the recent symposium held in Adelaide that a long and difficult investigation was needed and that the knowledge and experience gained in the conservation and use of surface water must be equally applied to underground supplies. He said that excessive exploitation in one area, as was developing at Keppoch and Padthaway, could lead to what he called "regional disaster", having in mind what had happened north of Adelaide.

Another matter that concerns me and other country people was a recent announcement by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, through the Minister of Works, that water charges were to be increased. This is only one of many charges imposed by this Government in its short term of office: the list of these increases has become fairly long in a short time. The Government's action means that the people of South Australia will get 14

per cent less water for any given rate. That is a substantial reduction, and I have an example of how it will operate. At 9½ per cent and a charge of 30c for 1,000 gallons, the annual charge for rebate water was \$30.40 on an assessed annual value of \$320. A quantity of 101,000 gallons of water was allowed before excess is charged.

Mr. Rodda: Who worked out the 14 per cent?

Mr. BURDON: It does not require much working out, and I will work it out for the honourable member in a few seconds afterwards. The 14 per cent reduction will take the consumer down to 87,000 gallons. Of course, the figures are approximate. This means that many people will have to pay an excess water charge. City people will also be affected, because anyone in the city who is using 80,000 gallons before incurring excess charges will now incur excess charges after using 69,000 gallons. This shows clearly what the increase means.

About 20 per cent of the people of this city and of the city of Mount Gambier pay excess water charges and a greater percentage will now be involved in these costs. The member for Victoria will find that these increases will affect Naracoorte, Penola, Millicent, and all other places in the State. Further, an analysis of the figures shows that a sewerage rate of 10 per cent of the annual assessed value means that a person in Mount Gambier whose property has an assessed value of \$320 will pay a sewerage rate of \$32 a year. Similarly, a person whose property has an assessed value of \$400 will pay \$40 a year for sewerage. The sewerage charge is a flat 10 per cent there.

The city sewerage rate has been increased from 6½ per cent to 6¾ per cent this year. These figures show a considerable margin between country people, and city people in regard to sewerage charges. If we compare the 10 per cent charge with the 6¾ per cent charge, we see that country people will pay much more, and I ask the Government to consider that anomaly. I am particularly concerned about two aspects of the effect on country people of these charges. The first aspect is the reduction in the quantity of rebate water that the country people will receive and the second is the high charge levied against country people for sewerage services compared with the charge levied in the metropolitan area.

Some other figures are interesting. It is estimated that country consumers use an annual average of 121,000 gallons of water provided by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, whereas the annual average in the city is 96,000 gallons a year. We must also remember that many big business houses in the city do not use much water, and this brings me to the point of how the Government will do anything about the proposed inquiry. It is obvious that, if the Government reduces the amount of rebate water available to people who do not use much water anyway, people in the country and in outlying parts of the metropolitan area will pay considerably increased charges.

Every outlying metropolitan district through which water is reticulated will be affected. I do not think that the Government will say, "We will give you this service and reduce the charges for it, losing a further \$2,000,000." I seriously doubt that the Government will adopt an alternative method, because someone will have to pay. The 5 per cent increase in the price of rebate water and the 14 per cent reduction in the quantity of rebate water available for any given rate will affect about 35 per cent of the consumers, instead of about 20 per cent as at present. I leave this to the people of South Australia and to the Government. This is only one more in the long list of charges imposed by this Government.

Mr. Broomhill: It will affect industry, too.

Mr. BURDON: If it affects consumers of water, it will affect industry, increasing costs and charges. Also affected will be South Australia's ability to compete with Eastern States markets.

Mr. Broomhill: The recent cost of living increase in South Australia was the second highest in Australia.

Mr. BURDON: I believe that is so. That increase can be related directly to the policies of and the charges imposed by this Government since it assumed office.

Mr. Broomhill: And to its attitude towards price control.

Mr. BURDON: Many items have been decontrolled, and that has contributed to the increased cost of living in this State. There is no denying that the Attorney-General has campaigned, for as long as I have been here, for the removal of price control in South Australia, and I daresay that he has played a leading part in persuading the Government to decontrol certain items. In fact, I think price control in South Australia today is

virtually non-existent, but I do not think that is appreciated by most people.

Mr. Broomhill: I bet the Attorney-General gets a lot of pleasure out of what has happened.

Mr. BURDON: As he has been an opponent of price control, it is conceivable that he does. Referring again to the Chowilla dam, I remind every member of the Government of what the Premier, as the member for Gouger (and I am pleased to see that he is back in the House), said in 1967, namely, that an L.C.L. Government would safeguard the water supply by insisting that the Chowilla dam be built without delay, and that it would do this by presenting a much stronger financial and technical case to all parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement. We know what has taken place in that regard in South Australia since the member for Gouger became the Premier of this State. Chowilla dam is a matter in which I think the Speaker of the House is vitally interested, and I think it is in your hands, Mr. Speaker, to determine whether South Australia will do anything about the dam or whether it will bow to the dictates of the Commonwealth Government and the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales.

Mr. Broomhill: And the Premier of South Australia.

Mr. BURDON: I believe the Premier of this State has sold South Australia down the drain, lock, stock and barrel, concerning Chowilla.

Mr. Broomhill: Down the river!

Mr. Nankivell: You sold us down the river.

Mr. BURDON: The Premier has sold us to the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales and to the Commonwealth Government, simply because there is a Commonwealth election next November and certain Liberal and Country Party members have districts along the Murray River in New South Wales and Victoria which are vitally affected in this regard. Those members do not wish to see water passing their back doors into South Australia; they want to get their cut out of it, and they are prepared to see South Australia have saline water draining back into the Murray River. After the water passes their doorstep, they do not care who uses it. I hope this will not affect the lucerne paddocks of the member for Stirling, whose property could be vitally affected by the increased salt content of the river in his area. We all know what took place in this regard in South Australia last year. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will try to see that South Australia achieves what

500 Parliamentarians and four Governments, including the South Australian Government, sought to achieve when the original agreement to construct Chowilla was entered into.

Mr. Broomhill: And what the public here wants!

Mr. BURDON: Chowilla would serve the Murray River districts and the whole of the Lower North, including gulf cities, as well as the metropolitan area, and this would involve 85 per cent of the people in South Australia. No-one can tell me that South Australia will be helped by having water that is 1,000 miles, or six weeks, away. Having water virtually on their doorsteps will assist all the South Australian fruitgrowers and others who have properties along the Murray River. Further, no-one will convince me that in a year of low supply Victoria and New South Wales will permit water to enter South Australia for the benefit of our fruitgrowers. I believe that the Governments of those States will want water for themselves at the expense of South Australia, and this will only add to South Australia's problems, particularly in a year of low water supply such as the one we experienced in 1967-68. I recall the concern of the Attorney-General regarding what the Labor Government would do about pumping water from Mannum to Adelaide. However, I believe that in 1967 Adelaide was the only capital city that did not have water restrictions.

Mr. McAnaney: Good old Sir Thomas!

Mr. BURDON: I am not saying anything against Sir Thomas Playford. But the Party of the member for Stirling did not last long when Sir Thomas left. The Liberal Party was for a long time ruled by an iron hand, but it is extremely disjointed now. Many contrary statements have been made in the last few months by various Ministers; in fact, one Minister often does not know what the other Minister is doing.

Mr. Clark: All of them are wrong.

Mr. BURDON: To date, none of them has been proved right. In fact, we saw the Attorney-General here this afternoon involved in something of a spectacle, first, not being able to find a document, and then apologizing by saying that the *Advertiser* had obtained a copy. Apparently the newspaper received this information although members of Parliament were being denied it.

Mr. Clark: He's well intentioned.

Mr. BURDON: We will give him the benefit of the doubt but this was lax administration by the Attorney-General. Recently members of the Government have tried to defend the actions of the present Government, but I do

not think they have done so successfully. Some time ago the member for Murray (Mr. Wardle) presented to the House a petition from his constituents asking that the Chowilla dam be built. I should say this would have given the honourable member a pretty fair idea of the attitude of people in the river districts. I have no doubt about the attitude towards Chowilla of the Speaker and of the former Premier of the State (Sir Thomas Playford). Sir Thomas believes that Chowilla is essential. I have no doubt he is extremely disappointed with the performance of the present Government, particularly in relation to its attitude towards Chowilla. Had he been Premier when this action was taken, he would have put up a mighty big fight and contested it all the way.

Mr. McAnaney: We only had Don Dunstan, and he didn't fight; he gave it away.

Mr. Clark: What did you fellows do?

Mr. BURDON: Prior to 1968 members opposite intended to take out picks and shovels and everything else to build Chowilla.

Mr. McAnaney: You organized "willy nilly".

Mr. BURDON: "Willy nilly" took over because nothing happened.

Mr. McAnaney: You've ruined his reputation.

Mr. BURDON: There is no need for me to repeat what everyone knows really happened. We know what Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth have done and what they have said to the Premier. We know what was said about what could happen at the pending Commonwealth election to certain members of the Liberal and Country Parties representing districts along the Murray as far as Albury. I need not repeat this because it is common knowledge throughout South Australia. Yesterday, on behalf of 4,536 people, I presented a petition, opposing the possible fluoridation of the Blue Lake water supply. I understand that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is proceeding at present to fluoridate the metropolitan water supplies, and this will take place over the next few months. I expect the Government will then turn its attention to certain country areas. Apart from the petition I have already presented on this matter, I expect to bring in another also opposing the fluoridation of the Blue Lake water supply. The Minister will understand that the Blue Lake water supply affects people living in the Millicent and Mount Gambier Districts, and, on behalf of those people, I ask him to consider the petition presented.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I wouldn't press it for Mount Gambier.

Mr. BURDON: I am sure that, if a country town does not want its water supply fluoridated, the Minister will take that into account. Recently I received the following letter from the Minister in reply to a question I asked in the House on behalf of the Mount Gambier Chamber of Commerce:

Further to the question which you asked in the House on July 1, 1969, regarding fluoridation, I provide the following report on that matter: Fluoridation of water supplies does not produce corrosion or decay in water reticulation systems or adversely affect hot water services. Considerable experience both in Australia and overseas has shown that the addition of the optimum quantity of the fluoride ion to water supplies has never caused an increase in the corrosive properties of the water so treated. As with many substances, the chemicals used in fluoridation can be corrosive when in strong concentrations but the quantity added to the water supply to produce the well known dental benefits is so relatively small that no corrosive properties are induced. The normally accepted minimum fluoride ion concentration necessary to effect reduction in dental caries is 1 part a million.

In the case of metropolitan Adelaide, the natural fluoride level in the water supply is approximately .3 parts a million, thus necessitating the addition of .7 parts a million to achieve optimal dosage. At Mount Gambier, the water supply is partially from the Blue Lake and partially from bores.

I would think that the quantity of water from bores serving Mount Gambier would be minimal. There are bores in outlying areas, but the Blue Lake Water District supplies water to 99.9 per cent of the population of Mount Gambier. The Minister went on to say:

Regular analysis of samples over many years has shown that the average natural fluoride ion concentration in the water supply is approximately 0.3 parts per million. However, some bore water does at times have a natural fluoride content of up to approximately 1.2 parts per million, which is within the accepted dosage range.

I had some water analysed at Mount McIntyre in about 1949, and the average content was, I believe, about 1.4 parts per million; and that was from a bore at about 21 feet. The letter goes on:

No unusual or extraordinary effects have been noted in the reticulation system carrying this water or in appliances attached thereto. Neither have any reports been received indicating that this water supply has detrimental effects in any way at all to consumers.

While I accept the Minister's letter in relation to this, recent information that we have received is contrary to the views of the Minister's department. I am not going to weary the House with a large dose of the evidence that is available, but I believe it is necessary

F1

at this stage briefly to put forward some of that evidence. Personally, I do not approve of mass medication of our water supplies. However, what I now wish to deal with is the question of the views of the Minister and the Government regarding the non-corrosive actions of fluoride. We have only recently received information regarding the corrosion of pipes and equipment through the fluoridation of public water supplies. I have a document in front of me which deals with this subject and from which I wish to quote. However, I think it is relevant at this stage to refer to the excellent speech that was delivered by the former Minister of Works (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) on September 18 last year. The honourable member said:

When I left Australia in 1961 to go overseas, I was in favour of fluoridation of the water supply. However, in Canada, the United States of America, and England, where fluoride was being used in the water supply, I learned of all the trouble that those countries were having with it and of all the fears aroused by it. I came back opposed to fluoridation.

I have not armed myself with papers from which to quote figures from European sources, but the same thing has applied in Europe as has applied in America. From this document that I referred to earlier, we find that late in 1965 the Forbes (N.S.W.) water supply was fluoridated. About a year later the following letter was received by the editor of *Aqua Pura* and published in the issue of January, 1967:

Although the fluoridation plant has been working for only 12 months, we are already feeling the effects in our business, as we have had a considerable number of washing machines brought into our shop damaged by corrosion. We have been repairing washing machines and electric hot water systems for the past 17 years. We have never had so much trouble as during the past few months. It is curious to note that some of the washing machines are practically new. The only difference has been the addition of fluoride to the water supply. The number of machines sent in for repair is increasing. We ourselves have installed a rainwater tank for use in our own machines and radiators of our fleet of service vehicles. Also, 75 per cent of the water-cooled commercial refrigeration plants in this town have leaked this year.

Yours faithfully,

Pardy's Refrigeration and Electrix.

In the February, 1967, issue of *Aqua Pura* there was a letter from another firm in Forbes that runs a fleet of buses there. That letter states:

During the past 12 months we have found it necessary to have the radiators in our buses dismantled and cleaned of corrosion on two occasions at considerable expense. Previous to this we only needed to have this job done

each three or four years. The condition the buses operate under has not altered during this time, and we have always used the town water supply in our bus radiators. The only difference that I can attribute to these continual blockages is the addition of sodium fluoride to the town water in November, 1965.

Yours faithfully,
K. Bowman, Forbes, N.S.W.

In the *Today Tonight* programme on channel 2 on September 10, 1968, it was announced that the Rolls-Royce Company had warned the owners of their cars not to put fluoridated water in the radiators, and a firm of that standing would not issue such a warning without good cause. About one year after New York City had begun fluoridation, the former New York City Water Commissioner, Mr. Dominick F. Paduano (now President of the Joint Organization Opposing Fluoridation), issued a report which included the following excerpt:

The pumps that deliver the acid (hydrofluosilicic acid) to scales for weighing and measuring broke down; rubber was pried loose from the storage tanks by the corrosive fluoride seeping into the pumps and clogging them; devices that measure water flow past the aqueduct were found to be defective.

That item was taken from the *National Fluoridation News* of January-February, 1967. The city of Concord, New Hampshire, U.S.A., had been fluoridated for seven years when an official decided to have the water analysed for its fluoride content. A random sample was taken and found to contain 3.54 parts per million. The laboratories of New York City Water Department were called in and scientists cut open eight sections of the main pipe, each section being analysed for its fluoride content. No section contained less than 900 p.p.m. of fluoride. A surface scraping of one section contained 3,600 p.p.m.!

Mr. William Kruschwitz, the owner of a laundry at 171 East Street, Methuen, Mass., U.S.A., put an advertisement in the *Evening Tribune*, Lawrence, Mass., giving his experience of corroded plumbing and rust formation in his laundry equipment. He presented to a professor of biochemistry at Harvard Medical School a 24in. steel pipe, 18in. long. Subsequent analysis by a commercial laboratory revealed that this piece of pipe showed it was lined with mush containing 1,600 p.p.m. of fluoride. Mr. Kruschwitz's customers had complained so long about the state of their laundry received from his laundry that he was compelled to install expensive defluoridation equipment. Dr. Willard Edwards is a certified corrosion engineer in the United States and has

spent much time in fluoridated areas, and concludes that many cities have abandoned fluoridation because of corrosion damage to water equipment. Here are verbatim quotations from a long statement made by Dr. Edwards:

Fluorine enters readily into reactions with most of the other elements to form compounds. It is the most electro-negative of the non-metallic elements. It is found in nature as fluorite and cryolite. The latter is a fluoride of aluminium from which the by-product, sodium fluoride, is obtained. Fluorine readily attacks metals and reacts with them to form metallic fluorides. The element, fluorine, is commonly found in calcium fluoride in ground water, but in this state it is more stable and far less toxic than sodium fluoride. It thus becomes more corrosive to metal pipes, tanks, and other metal surfaces in contact with it. Some specific instances of corrosion failure in cities with fluoridated water follow:

a. San Francisco has had frequent instances of burst water mains following fluoridation. One 16in. main burst with a resulting repair damage and clean-up cost of \$30,000. Pipe sludge and residue at the break showed a content in sludge at the breaks of from 1,100 to as high as 22,000 p.p.m.

b. Hot water heaters in San Francisco, formerly lasting (or warranted for) 15 years, now last from nine to 10 years, a reduction of one-third or more in life. This means the annual cost of hot water heaters using fluoridated water increased 50 per cent.

c. In Miami, Florida, a tremendous increase in water heater replacements was required after fluoridation. Seven local manufacturers of electric water heaters went out of business because their tanks corroded before the warranty period expired. Other out-of-town water heater manufacturers stopped shipping heaters into the fluoridated Miami area because so many of the heaters rapidly developed leaks short of the warranty period.

d. In Pinellas County, Florida, the Allied Plumbing and Heating Contractors Association published a statement saying: Because of laboratory reports, personal experiences, and other information studied, the Association believes, beyond a shadow of doubt, that fluorides have an adverse effect on pipes, valves, water systems both public and private, and especially on hot water heaters and hot water storage tanks. Included in the studies of damage to 6in. and 10in. water mains after fluoridation . . . Since the repairs to the new sewer will doubtless cost the taxpayers millions of dollars and since the probable damage to the public and private water systems due to fluoridation was not considered by council when the ordinance was passed, it is therefore felt . . . that since the public will have to defray all costs of any damage done . . . due to fluoridation, the above should be given careful consideration.

e. Fluoridation has caused great expense annually to residential, commercial and industrial water users in the repair and replacement of clogged and corroded equipment, expense that could have been avoided if the water had not been fluoridated.

A considerable amount of literature has been published about this matter, and I am at a loss to know how the Minister can accept the advice given to him (or to the Government) by the people interested in fluoridating this State's water supplies. Some pressure has been brought to bear somewhere along the line; it would stem from the chemical companies which accumulate fluoride as a by-product of their manufacturing processes. It is quite apparent that these companies have been able to create in the minds of people, particularly certain elements of the medical and dental professions (and, in turn, the Government) an impression that fluoridating the water supply is desirable.

I do not want to say that there would not be some benefit derived from a certain dosage of fluoride in the case of infants and young people. In many quarters it is thought that fluoride is beneficial to youngsters but in other quarters it is thought that fluoride does not have the effect that is claimed for it. Another point that concerns many people, many of whom are in the metropolitan area, relates to the purity of the water. Today's *News* carries a story about the addition of chlorine to the water supply. Chlorine has been added to Mount Gambier's water supply during the past two seasons; the aim has been to destroy any harmful bacteria that were present in the water.

I do not want to be unkind to anyone in the Engineering and Water Supply Department or the Public Health Department, but it would be very enlightening to all concerned if we could have some positive indication of what is causing the contamination of the Blue Lake water supply. Inquiries have been made of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Public Health Department over the last 12 to 18 months. I can see that the Minister of Works is flapping his arms, and I presume he is imitating a bird flying over the Blue Lake. I cannot, however, accept that explanation and I would appreciate it if it could be definitely established what is causing the contamination of the water.

We had a pure water supply, and it concerns people when they learn that it is necessary to add chlorine to the water; this has occurred in summer and late summer in the last two seasons. Chlorine has the effect of contaminating water and it has caused much concern at some of our schools. Some people who have not used their water supply during weekends find that an accumulation seems to occur at the ends of the pipes. I

have had reports that this has made the water almost undrinkable for the school-children. This has been reported to me from a couple of schools in my area.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Where does this chloride come from?

Mr. BURDON: It has been added to the water supply. It would appear that this works its way through the pipes and, if two or three days elapse before the water is used, there appears to be an accumulation that builds up in the pipes over the weekend, so that when people attempt to use the water on the Monday it is not usable because of this contamination. I will be honest and say that I myself have not detected contaminated water, but there are many people who do complain and have complained bitterly about this.

We would appreciate it if the Government was able to establish what was causing this contamination so that remedial steps could be taken to overcome this problem, thus eliminating the necessity of adding a chloride chemical to the water. I hope the Minister will note what I have said about this and see whether it is possible for an all-out effort to be made to find out what is contaminating the water supply. An article appears in today's *News* dealing with fluoride. It states:

A Parkholme housewife, Mrs. R. W. Jolly, said today that her tap water was not only dirty, but smelled strongly of chlorine. Her husband considers that the muddy deposits released through taps in the metropolitan area could eventually contain lethal amounts of fluoride.

He claimed that the mud stirred up in water mains as a result of repairs and alteration work carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department could absorb a dangerous amount of fluoride. "It's better to spend money on filtration than fluoride," he said. "I drink tank water at home," Mr. Jolly added.

This claim by Mrs. Jolly has been disputed by the Director-General of Public Health (Dr. Woodruff), who claims that it is not possible for an accumulation of fluoride to occur. This rather contradicts the various articles that I have just read to the House, because it is clearly indicated in articles printed in the United States, Canada and Europe, and even in New South Wales, that fluoride does and can have a harmful effect, and it does accumulate. I do not know how the Director-General of Public Health can refute that claim. He says:

We are perfectly satisfied that Adelaide's water is chemically and bacterially clean.

Most country members who come to Adelaide often notice that, when they turn on their taps, muddy, dirty water issues forth. I am rather

surprised that the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) is shaking his head.

Mr. Nankivell: I do it—I turn on the muddy taps.

Mr. BURDON: Yes. If you turn on the muddy taps, you do not get pure water: you get muddy water.

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

Mr. BURDON: One matter I wish to discuss concerns the Minister of Works, but I will deal with several other matters during his temporary absence from the Chamber. Yesterday evening the member for Eyre covered most of the State and dealt extensively with the problems of primary producers and of his district. However, I found it difficult to follow the logic of his argument about his claim of the worth of primary producers to the State. We know that it is in the interests of the State that primary producers be favoured by good markets and seasons, but I was intrigued by his condemnation of the Labor Government on its record in office.

Although South Australia is considered to be a primary-producing State it also has many industries, and it is important for us to realize that these industries have about 85 per cent of their markets in the Eastern States. During 1967-68 South Australia suffered a severe drought: during that time the South-East received only about 14in. of rain, which indicates the severity of the drought. I point out to Government members, who so often blame everything on the administration of the Labor Government, that in 1966-67 the States of Queensland and New South Wales, as well as parts of Victoria, also suffered from a severe drought. If Government members were honest they would admit this fact.

Mr. Venning: We are always honest.

Mr. Ryan: You aren't fair dinkum!

Mr. BURDON: The member for Rocky River almost stunned me into silence by saying that. Obviously, South Australia depends on the Eastern States markets for more than 80 per cent of its sales: if the member for Rocky River wishes to dispute that figure he can do so when he speaks in this debate.

Mr. Broomhill: Not again!

Mr. BURDON: He will have the opportunity later in the session to prove that I may be wrong, and I hope that he takes that opportunity. However, he will have to do a far better job than he did regarding the member for Wallaroo. He did not help his cause when he was trying to justify the actions of the bulk handling authority in relation to

Ardrossan as compared with Wallaroo. What the member for Rocky River and the member for Light have indulged in over the last day or so has been nothing but complimentary concerning the member for Wallaroo. I believe it was the action taken in this place by the member for Wallaroo that was instrumental in sending the Premier to Wallaroo, contrary to what the honourable member and the member for Eyre might try to imply in this place. There were 500 people at the meeting, and it took the member for Wallaroo to get the Premier and his supporters there, although I understand that the local residents still do not know anything and that the Premier conveyed nothing to them.

He had to take a few of his colleagues as bodyguards, fearing what might happen in Wallaroo. The feeling there is not quite what the member for Rocky River thinks it is. We know that the Liberal and Country League is not faring as well as the member for Rocky River tries to convey, regarding the wheat situation in this country today. The honourable member may look down his nose if he wishes, but I think that the Commonwealth Government is feeling rather uncomfortable about what may happen between now and the end of the year concerning many thousands of wheatgrowers. Indeed, I think that the fear that exists is well founded. All is not well in the wheat industry. Although we hope that we shall have another good season, this will only complicate the situation of the wheat farmers. The real fear exists as to how far the Commonwealth Government will be able to go relating to what it will pay the Australian wheat farmer. However, that is probably not so much a problem this year as it will be in a year or two.

Mr. Venning: Do you suggest that the wheat farmer—

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

Mr. BURDON: The member for Rocky River took the Premier, together with the Premier's Under Secretary, as well as a few others to act as bodyguards in case something happened—

Mr. Rodda: Who told you that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BURDON: There were 500 people at the meeting, and I suggest to the member for Victoria that he must not for one moment regard all those people as supporters of his Party.

Mr. Rodda: It was a public meeting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mount Gambier does not need any assistance to make a speech. The member for Mount Gambier.

Mr. BURDON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that what the member for Wallaroo has been saying in the last few weeks has really sunk into the minds of many people, whether they live in the Wallaroo-Kadina area, in the district of the member for Yorke Peninsula, or in the district of the member for Rocky River. This is something with which the people up there are faced. I was interested to hear what the member for Eyre said about the apparent attempt by the member for Yorke Peninsula to quieten things down. I will be interested to hear what the member for Yorke Peninsula has to say about Ardrossan and Wallaroo. I believe he might want to tear a few strips off the member for Eyre; last evening I think he was prepared to do so. His speech will be an interesting development.

We know all is not well with members opposite. We hear great play made by members of the Liberal and Country Parties, whether Commonwealth or State, about certain difficulties in the Labor Party. We have difficulties, but I do not think anyone will deny that certain difficulties are also being experienced by the Liberal and Country Parties. There are so many differences of opinion today that country people are saying that they are not getting anywhere with the Liberal Party, which they think is a city-based Party interested in big manufacturers and shareholders only. I do not hear any denial of that from members opposite. I see that the member for Eyre has come back into the Chamber and I congratulate him on his speech last evening. I went to the trouble of reading it, and I think the honourable member will consider that a real compliment. If the honourable member continues in the vein in which he was speaking last evening he will definitely be an improvement on the member for Light. I was intrigued to hear the honourable member say when speaking about the Poldo water scheme on Eyre Peninsula:

I am pleased to say that the main has been started, and I have great faith that the Minister of Works will carry on with the job. If he does not whilst my Party is in office, I will keep niggling at him to get something done.

I do not know what will be the good of niggling the present Minister if he is not in office.

Mr. McKee: Is he predicting a defeat?

Mr. BURDON: I think he is indicating that his Party's term of office is coming to an end: he made that obvious last night.

Mr. McKee interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BURDON: He also said—

Mr. McKee: I think he's thrown in the towel.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not warn the member for Port Pirie again. There have been too many interjections.

Mr. BURDON: The member for Eyre continued:

In South Australia today we have many people who are grateful to the L.C.L. and to have what it stands for. I am proud to say that I am a member of that Party and, as such, represent the country viewpoint.

I do not disagree with the fact that the honourable member represents the L.C.L. and the country viewpoint; far from it. However, I take issue with him in relation to his statement that many people are grateful to the L.C.L. and to have what it stands for. What have the people who support the L.C.L. got to be grateful about? Have they got to be grateful to the L.C.L. for the good season last year, as some members of that Party claim? Do they claim that this is a Divine right that they have? It seems to be some peculiarity of theirs that they assume they are the Divine section of the community. I strongly take issue with the member for Eyre on this question, because I well remember the shock people received when the first Budget was brought down by this L.C.L. Government; there was a \$2 levy on third party insurance, and there was the imposition of the 1c tax on every \$10 turnover.

Mr. McKee: And it didn't finish there.

Mr. BURDON: There was the recent increase in water licence fees. There are many other items on that list of seven articles that the people of South Australia are grateful to the L.C.L. for!

Mr. Lawn: What about fishing licences?

Mr. BURDON: Yes, and gun licences; in fact, everything that the L.C.L. has been able to get at it has increased. No-one can tell me that the people are grateful to the L.C.L. for that.

Mr. Clark: Practically all the things they have taken out of price control have affected everybody.

Mr. McKee: You could go on for months.

Mr. BURDON: Yes, one could go on indefinitely about what the L.C.L. Government has done to the small people of this State.

Members of that Party do not believe in taxing the higher levels. As I said a short time ago, it is the people in the higher levels of the community that this Government protects. This is having a very detrimental effect on the L.C.L. in the country, so much so that the Liberal country people are talking about joining the Country Party.

Mr. Rodda: Ah!

Mr. BURDON: The member for Victoria can say "Ah". If he spent a little more time in his district than he does sitting down in his office as Under Secretary or bag carrier, or whatever it is, he would become aware of what is going on in his district.

Mr. McKee: What about the new Party formed this week in Canberra?

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

Mr. BURDON: I know that there is a group being formed in South Australia. One group is a splinter group from the L.C.L.

Mr. Rodda: Is there a Country Party in Mount Gambier?

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not going to have these continuous interjections. I have warned the House two or three times. The proceedings are getting completely out of order with the conversation that is going on continuously. I appeal to honourable members to maintain the high dignity of the House and the spirit of debate. The honourable member for Mount Gambier.

Mr. BURDON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was addressing my remarks, through you, Sir, to the member for Victoria. There are more problems in the L.C.L. Party today, not only in this State but throughout the Commonwealth, than the Labor Party has ever had. If some members opposite were honest with themselves they would admit that. The question of what is taking place in the Liberal and Country Parties is their concern, not ours. No doubt the people of South Australia will have something to say when they have to pass judgment on this Government, which is ruling the State with 43 per cent of the vote. Last night the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) quoted from Erskine May as the authority of Parliamentary debate; he endeavoured to enlighten members on certain matters and said:

I suspect that members opposite do not believe in our system of Parliamentary democracy. They do not want to be helped.

These remarks were addressed to members on this side of the House. We certainly do not want to believe in the kind of Parliamentary

democracy that is expounded by the Liberal and Country League. "Democracy", as it has been practised by the L.C.L. in this State over the last 30 years, is a system where a minority forms a Government. My remark does not bring much response from Government members because through the years they have been able to govern South Australia with about 38 per cent of the vote. At present the L.C.L. holds 43 per cent of the vote and it finds itself in Government. Is this democracy?

Mr. McKee: They claim it is.

Mr. BURDON: I suspect, from what the member for Light said last night, that this is the kind of democracy that the L.C.L. wishes to impose on the people of South Australia; we have suffered it since 1932. I believe I heard someone say last night that a great Party was formed in 1932, but it did not take it long to impose its system of "democracy" on the people of South Australia. Between the general election in March, 1968, and the by-election in the Millicent District in June, 1968, the people realized that all was not right in South Australia. After the general election people wanted to know how South Australia could be ruled by a minority Government of 43 per cent. If any member on the other side can get up and prove to me that that is a majority he will be very good.

Mr. Venning: You lost the election.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River is out of order.

Mr. McKee: We got 53 per cent of the vote.

Mr. McAnaney: Come on, speak the truth.

The SPEAKER: I am not going to allow this any longer. I will adjourn the House and, if honourable members want to have a conversation, they can go into the lounge and have it there, but they must not have it in here.

Mr. BURDON: Regarding the article read to this House by the member for Light, by which article he tried to draw attention to the manner of dress and debate that took place in this House in earlier years, I point out that levée dress should have gone out with the ark. I do not think the member for Onkaparinga and the member for Gumeracha would have been very happy standing up in that form of dress to address the House the other week. As I was saying, the whole question concerns the form of democracy as we know it in this State. I hope (and I think other members hope) that out of the shambles of what the State now has electorally something fair and equitable to the people of the State will evolve.

Mr. Rodda: Forty-three per cent.

Mr. BURDON: I am certain that, if the member for Victoria was to get 43 per cent of the vote at the next election, he would be very happy. However, I think he will be scratching hard to get that. I am sure that in his own heart he realizes that, because I believe that he has indicated in one or two places that his Party is not very happy about the present set-up in the State. As I have indicated, the honourable member is well aware of the position, as are most members on the Government side.

Let me refer to one more matter before I resume my seat—public buildings in the electoral district of Mount Gambier. I refer to the statement made by a former Minister of the Liberal Party Government on December 11, 1962, when campaigning in Mount Gambier. He said that the then Government would proceed with the building of public offices and a new courthouse in that locality. Up until 1965 nothing in this line happened. (I was hoping that the Minister of Works would be in the Chamber now, but that is not the case. However, I will proceed with what I have to say). In 1965 and 1966 the former Minister of Works (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) had certain plans formulated and specifications for these buildings prepared. The question of site arose and it was decided that, before these buildings were proceeded with, alternative sites would be looked at. In the meantime, there was a change of Government, and I have been making representations on this matter to the present Minister during the last 12 months. While alternative sites are being considered, I have reason to believe that the Public Buildings Department and the Government may go back to look at the original site proposed in 1962. While this is going on, we are certainly not getting these badly needed new offices for the Public Service in Mount Gambier.

One thing I will say in favour of the Minister is that I appreciate the action taken by him last year to provide better facilities for the Public Service officers in Mount Gambier. The facilities are a big improvement on what we previously had, and the officers of the Public Service departments appreciate the change that has taken place.

The people of Mount Gambier and I would appreciate action by the Government and the Public Buildings Department to provide permanent public buildings and a new courthouse. I repeat the plea I have made that the old courthouse in Mount Gambier should be pre-

served for the National Trust. It is a unique structure, is more than 100 years old, and is in a fit condition to be preserved for the use and activities of the trust. When building the new courthouse I should like the Government to consider the growth of the Mount Gambier district, and the increasing work of the courts, because the activities of the Supreme Court and the work of the magistrates and justices of the peace cause some difficulties at times in the present building and, therefore, more rooms are needed. These activities are sure to increase in the future. The Minister and the Government should consider these points, but I hope they do not consider them for too long, and that a decision will soon be made to provide a new courthouse and that the Government will commence building new public offices soon.

I hope that the Public Buildings Department will include in the public offices sufficient space to establish a branch office of the Motor Vehicles Department. I have requested that this should be done for several years, because I believe it would be an advantage to do so not only in this district but in other country districts, too. The member for Eyre and the member for Chaffey would both appreciate having branch offices of this department established in their localities. I recall that the present Leader of the Opposition indicated, prior to the last State election, that the Labor Government intended to do this, and I hope that the present Government will incorporate these plans in any move to provide better public buildings in Mount Gambier. The Royal Automobile Association opened a regional office in Mount Gambier about eight or nine years ago, and with the growth of that association it has now become necessary to double its office space.

This association provides a good service in Mount Gambier and a branch office of the Motor Vehicles Department would complement its activities. I have been told there might be some difficulty with insurance, but I believe that this administrative problem could be overcome as it has been overcome in other States. Therefore, there is no reason why a regional branch of this department cannot be established. The Public Buildings Department and the Education Department have appointed regional officers, and, particularly in regard to the latter department, this is one of the best moves that have taken place for a long time. The appointment of regional officers, which has been successful in decentralizing those two departments, indicates that the same can be

done also concerning other departments, including the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which undertakes many activities in the country.

Headmasters, for example, have previously had their hands tied: requirements often involving only small sums have necessitated the preparation of paperwork which has had to be sent to Adelaide and eventually returned to the school concerned. However, it will be a big improvement on the previous situation applying to country officers if they are given the authority to make decisions on general administrative and various minor matters. I hope other members will also press for decentralization in this respect and for the setting up of regional offices of as many Government departments as possible.

I believe that we could and should establish in the South-East, for example, in the Struan area in the district of the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda), a school similar to the Roseworthy Agricultural College. Indeed, I should like to see the Government formulate a policy in this regard. Such an innovation would benefit the farming community generally and would help many people gain a greater knowledge of farming procedures in the wetter type of country as well as of details concerning the growth of various pastures entirely different from those to be found in the northern parts of the State. This is a matter to which I believe the Government could well turn its attention, and which I believe would benefit the future development of primary industry in South Australia.

People in the South-East are aware of what has occurred over the last 20 years since the commencement of the drainage scheme, the Western Division having been brought into production to the extent of between 500,000 and 750,000 acres, trebling and in some cases quadrupling production. This applies also to the Eastern Division. At an inquiry conducted at Penola in 1968, I had the pleasure, as Chairman of the Land Settlement Committee, to preside over a meeting concerning what was probably one of the committee's last references relating to drainage in the South-East. Of the 70-odd people who came before the committee at that time, only about nine wanted to see further drainage undertaken in the South-East. I have much sympathy for some of those in favour of additional drainage. When we made an inspection down there in 1967, it was the driest year on record. Of course, the country we inspected was dry, but late last winter in August I inspected the same

country and I had much sympathy for some of the owners whose properties were practically under water. I have reservations whether anything can be done to help these people. They are the victims of circumstances. People in that area believe in their own hearts that further drainage could be beneficial. However, I am certain that they fear that further drainage and the payment of drainage rates would cause most concern at present. I believe it will be impossible to have further drainage whilst the present situation exists.

Conceivably, in years to come, there may be another run of wet winters as the State had in the late 1930's and mid-1940's. If this happened it would cause concern not only to eight or nine property owners in the South-East who suffer great difficulty in wet years but also to many other people. I think other members of the Land Settlement Committee will agree that this could happen. To all intents and purposes I think the committee's decision last year was instrumental in saving the South Australian Government \$500,000, because that was the sum contemplated to be spent on further drainage in the South-East. I understand that at present all the works in relation to drainage proposals in the South-East have virtually come to a standstill.

Mr. McAnaney: The Labor Party should know about standstills.

Mr. BURDON: The honourable member has prompted me into talking about something involving a colleague of his. The Speaker has attempted to stop interjections and, had the honourable member heeded him and not rudely interjected, I should not have dealt with this matter. Regarding things coming to a standstill, I well remember that in 1966 works in relation to the Tailm Bend to Keith main in the District of Albert came to a standstill. The member for Rocky River referred to a meeting last week attended by 500 people, and I remind the member for Stirling that in 1966, when the previous Minister of Works went to meetings at Coonalpyn and Keith, a similar number attended. It is interesting to know that the people who campaigned, when this work was brought to a standstill, to have it started again, are now campaigning to have the thing stopped. A writ has been taken out against the South Australian Government, yet people kicked the Minister of Works in the Labor Government all over the district down there, saying that he had prevented their getting water by stopping construction of the main. Now that work has started again, the

same people have caused an injunction to be taken out to prevent it.

Mr. McAnaney: What percentage?

Mr. BURDON: I am not talking about percentages: I am just saying what has happened. Two groups have been formed down there to oppose certain aspects of the Taillem Bend to Keith main, and I understand that another group is being formed in relation to it. However, a campaign was waged in 1966 against the Labor Government. One has only to look at what was printed in the *Sunday Mail*. If the member for Stirling doubts me on this, I suggest that he go to the Parliamentary Library and have a look at what was printed in that newspaper. The honourable member is quite free to go on with an argument on this subject if he cares to do so, but I suggest to him that the least he has to say on the subject the better.

I now know that the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) is ready to join in the debate, so I will conclude by saying that although I support the motion I do so with not a great deal of enthusiasm because I believe that there is not a great deal to enthuse over. I think that those who prepared this Speech for the Governor had a rather difficult job, and I also think that Sir James Harrison, in one of his first duties as the Governor of this State, had a rather difficult job in getting through it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Albert.

Members interjecting: Hear, hear!

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful to honourable members for the support they appear to be giving me. I hope that they are just as anxious to support me after I have made my remarks. I liked the comment of the member for Mount Gambier that now that I am ready to speak he can sit down. I have been waiting since 4.45 p.m. for the honourable member to finish his speech. I listened with considerable interest to some of the things he had to say.

Mr. McAnaney: You are no better informed though, are you?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do not propose at the outset to use my resilience, or whatever one may call it, in rebuttal. The *Bulletin* gives me some claim to fame that I do not claim. However, there are a couple of matters to which I should like to reply. First, I want to reply on the question of teacher-training quotas, and I want to deal with this in a broad sense.

Mr. Broomhill: Have you read the stop press of the *News*?

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for West Torrens wishes to communicate with the member for Albert, I suggest that he write him a letter.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I welcome the interjection.

The SPEAKER: I do not. The honourable member must debate the question before the Chair.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The question of quotas for teacher training is the point that I have raised, and I should like to reply on this matter because it is not only at teacher-training level that this lack of interest in science teaching is causing considerable concern: it is causing considerable concern also at university level. At both universities in South Australia interest in science has waned considerably. There is a far greater demand for arts courses, and it has been the practice at one university to direct people (who are in the lower groups of applicants for arts courses) to undertake science and in that way fill the vacancies at the university. This problem stems not only from a shortage of teachers at secondary schools but from an overall pattern, a pattern evident not only in South Australia but throughout the world.

The discipline and regimen of a science course is not popular among many students: they prefer to deal in the realms of theory rather than in the hard facts that one is required to study in science courses. In reply to the member for Mount Gambier I point out that the question of student quotas is a problem facing not only the department but also universities and those sections of the industrial world where science graduates are engaged in research. The question of tertiary training in the country was raised, but such training has been difficult to establish. The University of New South Wales had considerable difficulty in establishing a new university at Armidale. It has become a university because it is purely residential and, of course, New South Wales has a far greater population to draw from than has South Australia.

In the field of technical training, however, it is becoming the policy to construct colleges of advanced education, or technical colleges, in various centres. Whyalla is a case in point, and I think it was rightly suggested by the member for Mount Gambier that a similar institution or college of technology might well be established at that city under the control of the Institute of Technology of South Australia. It might well be associated with the industry that has been established in that area and

might have an agricultural bias rather than an industrial bias, as has the one at Whyalla.

The other matter that was raised was the question of the Chowilla dam. As the member for an electoral district that has half of Lake Alexandrina and the whole of Lake Albert, I can say that much irrigation is done from the lake. The livelihood of quite a number of people there depends on irrigation, and an industry at Meningie depends on it. The point that has never been raised is this: what is the future of Lake Albert and, to a lesser extent, Lake Alexandrina if a dam is built on the upper reaches of the Murray within South Australia? I venture to say that, if two dams were built, Lake Albert would be drained—this can be proved conclusively. This has been suggested by the former Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Dridan) and it was stated in this House at various times by Sir Thomas Playford whilst he was Premier, the simple reason being that our present entitlement and our entitlement under the River Murray Waters Agreement so far as Chowilla is concerned would not provide sufficient water, if we were obtaining only our entitlement, to replace the evaporation in the lakes. Furthermore, it would not provide the water required to meet the commitments entered into by both Governments in respect of water licences. On the other hand, 1,500,000 acre feet would meet these licences and would provide sufficient water surplus to requirements to maintain the balance in the lakes—some 700,000 acre feet. My concern in this exercise is what concerns my district, and I am concerned at the future of Lake Albert and the industry associated with it.

Turning now a little more directly to the Speech so ably delivered by His Excellency the Governor, appearing as Her Majesty's representative for the first time to open our Parliament, I refer to agriculture. Mr. Speaker, I commend the organization from which you have just retired as General Secretary for its part in implementing the orderly marketing of wheat and accepting the responsibility of establishing a quota system.

Mr. Corcoran: What did you say about orderly marketing?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I was referring to the part played by the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation in the establishment of the orderly marketing scheme that we now have in Australia—the wheat marketing scheme. I know it was started in 1948, when the Labor Party was in office.

Mr. Corcoran: I didn't say anything about that.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I know what the member for Millicent was implying, but at the same time I believe the success of this legislation, in large measure, rests upon the representations made by you, Mr. Speaker, and your organization at that time to the then Government and successive Governments for the maintenance and retention of this scheme.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr. NANKIVELL: I believe that what has been done at this point of time has been the only course of action that could be taken, but I express my fears (and in this I echo those expressed by the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry when he opened the conference of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia on Monday) that these quotas may be abused and that people may take the easy course of disposing of wheat privately because, if they did, it could destroy the whole marketing scheme as we now have it. I have a real concern about this because, Mr. Speaker, you and I share an area adjacent to the Victorian border, a district that has grown considerable quantities of barley. We know that however hard we have fought for an all-Australian barley board, in the same form as the Australian Wheat Board, this has not proved successful. However, we have a nominal Australian Barley Board, involving the States of South Australia and Victoria.

Notwithstanding this, when it has suited the purposes of the farmer to get cash for his crop, he has without hesitation sold to the merchants over the border, and that in some measure embarrasses the marketing scheme of the Barley Board by affecting its control over delivery and, therefore, affecting it in its capacity to commit itself in advance for any fixed quantity of grain. I have real fear that the same situation may develop with wheat, and I echo the remarks of the Minister for Primary Industry, that unless the farmers observe these quotas and are prepared to contain their deliveries within those permissible and not sell outside, this could completely end orderly marketing of wheat in Australia. In South Australia the question has arisen of shipping. My information is that about 3,000,000 bushels of wheat a month is being shipped out of South Australia from various outports, and that this will continue. It is hoped that there will not be more than 40,000,000 bushels to 45,000,000 bushels in storage when the next harvest has to be received, but as you, Mr. Speaker, and

other country members would know, this will place a considerable strain on bulk handling facilities in the State and will tend to encourage people to dispose of their surplus.

One other fear I have with respect to farm storage is the use of fumigants. Malathion only is used, but there is a maximum amount of malathion contamination that is acceptable in the trade for wheat in particular. I am concerned that this will be used by the farmer when he stores his grain and it will of necessity be added to when the grain is taken from his storage and placed in bulk handling facility storages. This situation will have to be carefully watched because, if it is not, we may find that some of our surplus wheat will be unsaleable when we deliver it from farms to the terminals.

The dairying industry, like all other primary industries, is having its problems. I noticed in His Excellency's Speech reference to milk production being maintained at a high level. It is true that milk production has increased tremendously, but one of the major problems is the disposal of the products of milk. Apart from the large sales made of whole milk, the principal means of disposal of milk is through cheese, but today the position with cheese sales is serious.

Our ability to sell to the Philippines has been severely jeopardized by the activities of the countries of the European Economic Community, which have been dumping cheese on a market that we had been developing. The British market, too, is saturated, so that here again is an industry with considerable problems, none of which will be easily solved unless we find other markets or our production is contained within limits for which we can safely guarantee prices. One thing that concerns me is that, notwithstanding certain opposition in the trade, the price of butter (which is also as you are aware, Mr. Speaker, a by-product of the milk industry) was raised. This increase has placed butter in an unfavourable position compared with margarine. I draw the Minister's attention to what is happening with respect to margarine sales in this State. The advertising law has often been breached by advertisements placed in our newspapers, and I believe that to protect the butter industry we need to do the same as has been done in other States: that is, to insist on a colour differentiation between butter and margarine. I understand that in Victoria it is necessary for margarine to be white, not yellow.

I now address myself to one or two other matters that have been covered in some measure by previous speakers. One of my principal concerns since I have been in this House has been with agricultural education and, in the broader sense, education in the country. It must be admitted by anyone who can observe developments that an agrarian revolution is taking place, although to what extent this will mean a change in the whole concept of farming in Australia remains to be seen.

There is a distinct and a natural desire to retain the efficient family farm unit, but this is becoming increasingly difficult because of the capital required to provide a livelihood and because of the capital taxes that have been placed on the community which are, of course, making it increasingly difficult to transfer a means of livelihood from one generation to the next. Although the total export income from primary industries has increased substantially, we know that at the same time, with the cost price squeeze, despite the 16 per cent increase in regard to rural production in the past financial year, the income being earned by each property has not been increasing to the point where it can sustain the principal (that is, the farmer) and also provide for his son.

It is my belief that the only way that this type of farming can be perpetuated is by implementing a system similar to that being promoted in the dairying industry, so that assistance is given through the Government and money made available to people desiring to expand their unit to an economic one. Unless this is done, the situation will change slowly and progressively. One reason why I suggest Government assistance in this matter relates to the difficulty of borrowing large capital sums from the normal lending institutions and, more particularly, to the difficulty not just in meeting the normal interest payments required but also in making capital repayments. In no other business situation does this apply. In commerce or industry there are numerous shareholders in a company who invest their money and expect a reasonable return by way of interest. Those people certainly do not expect to have their capital repaid over a fixed term.

I contend that rural industries can support a reasonable rate of interest, but at the same time they cannot find the additional moneys from their returns to pay off capital over a period of eight years to 15 years, which seems to be about the longest term available from a

lending institution. It is this, as much as anything else, which is preventing the single farm unit from expanding and which is making it possible for people from outside who have capital to come in and acquire the assets of the properties concerned and to farm on a larger scale. I am concerned about this because, as I have said, it is causing an agrarian revolution, which will have all sorts of impact in the long term.

My original concern was, as I said, in regard to education in the country. Today, I venture to say that my district is no different from the average country district and that half the people live in the towns. The children attending country schools are in the main children whose fathers work in motor garages, with the Electricity Trust, in the Highways Department, or with local councils. These people live in the country to provide a service to the community and I am concerned to see that children in this position are not deprived of a standard of education that will enable them to compete with children educated in the city when the country children go to seek employment in open competition. Unfortunately, in many country areas a problem of standards of teaching still exists. The small number of students at secondary level in the country does not permit a sufficient depth and breadth of subject teaching in the fourth and fifth-year classes to enable these children to obtain the same benefits from education as are obtained by children living in the city. This applies similarly to country children who might not be able to remain on farms. They, too, need to have every educational opportunity available so that they can enter universities or institutes of technology and receive higher education to equip them for other forms of employment.

I bring this forward to ask the Minister to have her department consider what has been done in even a small State such as Tasmania where halls of residence have been established. I should like the department to consider providing halls of residence at some central point in order to accommodate children who, having reached the limit of teaching at their local school, are unable, because of financial restriction, to obtain access to another school. I should like them to be able, through assistance, to live close to a school that will give them the opportunities of higher education. This is done in Tasmania and could well be done here.

The question uppermost in the minds of many country people whose sons will be able

to continue on the land is the problem of getting an education in agriculture. In reply to a question I asked the Minister of Agriculture through the Minister of Lands, the Minister of Agriculture agreed that there was a vacuum in agricultural education as a result of the raising of the standard of education at Roseworthy Agricultural College. Today we do not hear much about the course at Urrbrae, but I believe the course now being taught there could fill this gap. It is a two-year course commencing after an intermediate level of instruction has been obtained at another school. An area school certificate level is adequate, provided the student has the required standard of education to compete (and unfortunately he must compete) with many other students for positions at this school.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Introduced by the Labor Government.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do not deny that. I do not mind who introduced it: the important thing is that this course has been introduced.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Of course, most of the students do not go on to farms at all.

Mr. NANKIVELL: On discussing this matter with the Headmaster only today, I was told that what is happening now in this new two-year special certificate course is contrary to that, because one of the provisos laid down is that students must have a job to go to either on a farm or in a stock firm. I believe the stock firms are showing particular interest in this course.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: The object was to create interest.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I assure the honourable member that from my information it has been more than successful. Although the course has never been canvassed, 93 students applied last year for 60 places in the course. I know the Headmaster and some of his officers. They are enthusiasts who are dedicated to this course, and they are satisfied (and I am satisfied from what I have learned of the course) that it is admirable and fits the bill. The thing that concerns me is that there is no hall of residence associated with Urrbrae. It is limited to two classes and to 60 students at this point of time, and because of this limitation it is soon going to be placed in the position of many agricultural colleges of not being able to admit students at third year because there are fourth and fifth-year students who may have higher academic qualifications and who may wish to gain entry, and it may well become competitive unless something is done to duplicate it.

I believe that this course is adequate for what we need. I have looked at the prospectuses of the agricultural high schools of Western Australia. Frankly, I do not think high schools of that sort, which are practical training schools, are the sort of thing we need to be bothered with here. If we are going to do as the member for Whyalla has suggested (namely, to provide training for people who have a practical background: that is, boys who can go back on to a farm and definitely have prospects of employment), I do not think we need to teach them how to milk a cow or do some of this detailed work that is taught at the agricultural high schools in Western Australia; but we do need to give the boys a good grounding in the theory and the scientific application of much of the work that is available so that they can understand, apply, question, and take advantage of all the information in agriculture available to them through our extension services and from other sources.

I consider that this is the sort of course that we should be looking to expand. This being the case, it does not involve tremendous expenditure in land and establishment. What it does need, of course, is a pool of trained teachers to draw upon. As these are science teachers, I can tie this back to where I started: namely, the problem of getting a sufficient number of science teachers today to teach this sort of subject in our schools. I support the member for Mount Gambier regarding Struan. I have mentioned Struan before. I believe that at this point of time there is some prospect of the Social Welfare Department wishing to vacate Struan. Here we have a residential college in potential. It has been occupied as a residential school by the Social Welfare Department, and it has capital structures that could be used. It could, as the member for Mount Gambier said, have a certain bias towards the type of agriculture that applies in the South-East, although I do not think we need to bias the general sort of course that I believe needs to be taught.

I think general principles have their application anywhere; it is a question of teaching the principles. I should like the Minister to have a look at the possibility of Struan being acquired by the Education Department as an agricultural high school to teach a course similar to the Urrbrae course, in which case it would only be catering for students who have already completed three years of secondary education, and I believe at this point of time it would

probably be big enough to deal adequately with the numbers seeking entrance.

In the long term, I know that it would not be adequate unless it was expanded. I believe that, moving forward a little, what has been done at Roseworthy Agricultural College has been very necessary. The course being provided there now is a technological course of a very high calibre and it is fitting into the concept of the division of tertiary education into higher or academic tertiary and the technological tertiary as taught by the advanced colleges of education. In this field it has a proper place, but it is more suited to training people as technologists rather than to teaching general agriculture for a boy who perhaps does not wish to go to such extremes of education but who does wish to have a sound grounding to enable him to farm profitably, from the point of view both of satisfaction and of return.

So I want to make it clear that in what I am saying I am in no way wishing to be derogatory about what has happened at Roseworthy. I think it is a most necessary development, but I point out that this vacuum that has been created needs to be filled quickly because of the demand, and this can best be done by expanding the course taught at Urrbrae where, in two years of specialization, above-third-year secondary students are included in the course and a special certificate in agriculture is awarded to those achieving a satisfactory standard.

I also want to talk about another matter, though not at great length. It follows a resolution passed in this House last year in respect of an investigation of the water resources of South Australia. I say at the outset that I am pleased that not only was that motion carried in this House but also that some action has already been taken in an investigation into the water resources of the South-East. Various views have been put forward about the available water resources of the South-East. Although the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) quoted a figure of about 600,000 acre feet, I would be a little more conservative and take Professor Holmes's figure of 500,000 acre feet as being perhaps nearer the mark, even if that is not optimistic. Until this survey is completed, however, it will not be known just what surplus water is available in the South-East for other purposes: by that, I mean for intensive agriculture or for utilization for other projects.

Professor Holmes has suggested that sufficient water would be available for 200,000 acres of irrigation in the South-East. The problem is: 200,000 acres of what? I think this is one of the problems we have to face up to. We have the potential to develop this area, but in what form can we profitably employ this water? I believe I could well be told by some people that in most instances this could best be used for forestry development, because there is no lack of market for forestry products; in fact, there could be an expanding industry for forestry products, but there is always a conflicting interest in land usage and the fact that people feel it is an intrusion by the State into a private field. However, the Minister of Lands, whilst Minister of Agriculture and subsequently, has expressed the point of view that we could have profitable tree farming in the South-East and, if we had sufficient water for tree farming, we could well put some of this water to effective use; and, now that we know we have this volume of water available, we could with a greater degree of safety explore the prospect of establishing a paper pulp industry in the South-East.

I was a member of the committee of inquiry which, with Harmac, looked at the prospect of a paper pulp industry in Mount Gambier. One of the big problems was the water requirement for the industrial processing, for the sulphating treatment of paper. Not only the supply of timber concerned us, but also the supply of water for the treatment and processing of timber into pulp. I suggest there is room for the expansion of forestry in the South-East of South Australia, which could profitably use much of this water.

Whilst I agree that we must use this water *in situ*, if possible, we must not overlook the fact that the water must be used economically in the interests of the State. If it can be established, and only after it has been established, that there is surplus water that cannot be used by industry in the South-East, then, and only then, should we investigate its use for other purposes. However, we must not overlook the fact that a sponge of water (I think that is how it could be described) in the South-East is filled every year by the rain that falls on the land. The fact that it is replenished annually and supplemented by the water catchment from Victoria means there is some certainty of a continuation of supply being available.

A problem of salinity exists with drainage water. At the present rate of movement

forward in the drains the water reaches the salt content of about 300 to 400 grains before it reaches the northerly end of the drainage scheme. This water is not really adequate for irrigation purposes, nor would it be satisfactory for domestic use, but it would be adequate as stock water. I am still waiting for the report that I previously asked for from the Drainage Board with respect to the possibility of diverting certain of the northern drains, such as the Blackford drain and Baker Range drain, into either the Coorong or *via* Alf's Flat into the Coorong, and thence into the lakes system.

One problem that has arisen as a result of drainage has been the question of who should pay. I have been indirectly involved in this question because of my interest in the drainage problem. I have been advised (and I think properly) that to all intents and purposes the expenditure of money on the construction of the drains has been written off, and that the money that will be collected now in betterment rating will only meet the interest payments on the capital structures: it will meet the interest and replacement costs on the capital structures over the drains. If it has been proper to write off the cost of constructing the drains, then I do not think it is proper that the people whose land abuts the drains should bear the full cost of the capital structures, because those structures are used in a large measure by the community in the South-East as they largely cross the drains on council roadways, main roads or roads that are used by the general public. I think that whoever devised the betterment rating was someone who did not have much concept of land usage, because it is almost an impossible rating to apply.

I have read the reports of the two court cases that have been held contesting this drainage rating, I have discussed the matter with one of the prosecuting solicitors, and the general consensus of opinion is that it is almost impossible to arrive at what is called a betterment rate based on the value of improvement to the property in question. It can change from property to property because of management, because of circumstances at the time the pastures were sown, and because of the type of application of fertilizer or some form of pesticide control. It is a purely notional figure, arrived at to try to establish what the total production of that land may be under a set of hypothetical circumstances.

I believe it is as hypothetical as one could wish it to be and, therefore, not a very practical type of rating to apply to land in any circumstances in trying to arrive at some means of compensation for the cost of the scheme.

Of course, one of the tragedies was that people who actually received the betterment were the people who sold the land in the first place and that the people who are now being obliged to pay for the betterment are in many cases people who paid for that betterment in the capital price they originally paid for the land. This is something else that needs examining. In my view, if it is good enough to write off the cost of the drains, and if members of the public are using the capital structures, it should be a charge borne by the community in general and not by the unfortunate people whose properties abut the mains.

One other matter was raised, and it was also referred to in His Excellency's Speech, namely, the Tailem Bend to Keith main. This main has had a checkered career, having been originally commenced in 1964. True, as the member for Mount Gambier said, work on the main slowed down and protest meetings were held. I wish to quote from the report of the South Australian Government to the Commonwealth Government when applying for the welcome grant of \$6,000,000 that was made available to us. The report states that in the year 1964-65, the amount spent on the scheme was \$1,184,000. In 1965-66, the amount spent was \$866,000; but in 1966-67, the amount spent was \$384,000. It was in the latter year that the protest meetings were held. The reason given for this reduction is twofold and is as follows:

First, heavy commitments of the Government in other fields led to the department's annual appropriations being less than previously anticipated. Secondly, for various reasons it was necessary to step up expenditure on other works in progress, notably the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline duplication, the Bolivar sewage treatment works, and the Swan Reach to Stockwell pipeline.

In other words, less money was allocated to the department in that year by the Labor Government and, as a consequence, work was brought almost to a halt, except for one thing. I think the member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. D. Hutchens), who was Minister of Works at that time, will agree that he was saved regarding this matter by the break-down in negotiations concerning the Chowilla dam, because he was able to divert both men and

money from that project to recover a reasonable rate of progress on the Tailem Bend to Keith main.

Mr. Venning: Didn't they move some of the pipes away from the site?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, they were taken away and sent to Eyre Peninsula, but this was part of the policy to slow down work on the scheme. I commend the former Minister of Works for having attended quite hostile meetings. I accompanied him, and I did not envy him his position.

Mr. McKee: Didn't you do your best to stir things up?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I think the member for Port Pirie would find that that was not so. Be that as it may, I was concerned to see that progress was made on the scheme, and I was satisfied when progress was resumed. The problem has subsequently arisen because, in 1962, a decision was made and a scheme was commenced that was supposed to have been completed by 1967, but unfortunately that scheme is still not completed. Over a period of about six or seven years one can have a change of heart. During that period financial and other circumstances can change. People who are told they are not getting water for 20 years can make alternative provisions and find themselves consequently embarrassed when the scheme is not only resumed at full force but, as a result of representations made to the Commonwealth Government, additional moneys are made available to enable it to be completed by 1974, and that is the total scheme and not just the construction of the trunk main to which I referred previously.

Mr. Venning: Do you think they will be sorry to have the water down that way?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do not think the people in that area will ever be sorry to have the main constructed. The cost-benefit ratio established by the Commonwealth Government satisfied that Government that the scheme was worthwhile. Tremendous effort by officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department was put into the preparation of the document I have here. I want to commend all those persons concerned for the positive document they produced in such a short time. They were given little time to make representations to the Commonwealth Government but I believe that, because of the comprehensive and factual manner in which the document was presented to the Commonwealth, it was convinced at least that the scheme was worth looking at and, on looking at it, the Commonwealth was prepared to accept the evidence as

factual and to support the State Government in its request for assistance. As I pointed out, this grant of \$6,000,000 by the Commonwealth Government is free of strings except that the State Government shall not charge more for water. However, nothing was said by the Commonwealth about our rating system. The Commonwealth also insisted that the State's contribution be maintained at its present level. In other words, the State is committed to spend \$3,000,000 on the scheme before June, 1974, and in that time the Commonwealth Government is prepared to make a grant of \$6,000,000, which is a \$2 for \$1 subsidy to the State to enable it to complete the scheme.

I do not believe the scheme will ever be regretted by the people of the district or by the State, because indirectly the State will receive substantial benefit from the extra produce coming from this area of country, and the scheme will enable many more people to be supplied with water. At this point of time the scheme is proceeding with almost surprising speed, as I see weekly as I return home to Keith. I also want to pay a compliment to the teamwork of the people who have constructed the main. No-one will ever tell me that people employed by the Government cannot do a good day's work and cannot do a job comparable with that done by those in private industry. The manner in which this scheme has been carried out is a commendation in itself and nothing more really need be said. The speed with which it has been constructed has also meant considerable savings in cost. I repeat that I think it only proper to say that the people who have undertaken this work have done a good job for the State—a first-class job of work by anyone's standards.

Of course, the question arises, as it always does with these things, as to who should pay for it. Despite what is said in correspondence, it is not a question of the people not wanting the water. They want water; they have all asked for services; but they do not want to pay for it. I think anyone who knows the situation of the people who are objecting to paying rates will appreciate their position.

I am in full sympathy with those people in so far as, just as did the people who bought drained land, they paid a price when they bought that land that covered the value of the water that underlay it. They have had sufficient water to enable them to develop some 700 acres of irrigation on country adjacent to the pipeline, and at this point of time they can gain no extra benefit in production as a result of this water main passing their gateways.

However, I do not think they should overlook that 10 years ago the bores in this area were flowing bores with an 8ft. head. Today, many of these people, if not most of them, when they are pumping at capacity are pumping from a depth of 30ft. So without having a study of the water resources of this area, I think it is a brave man who would say that his water supply was inexhaustible at the level of draw-off that is presently taking place. Notwithstanding that, they have an asset which presumably it is their right to exploit now and not just to be preserved for posterity and, if so, it is quite proper to say that they will not be able to recover from increased production the amount of money that they will be obliged to pay in rates.

Mr. Venning: There would be other areas in the State in a similar position, would there not?

Mr. NANKIVELL: That is quite true. This has applied in other parts of the State, but that is something that is past and accepted, whereas this is something that is current and is the subject of litigation. Looking at this problem as the member for the district, and trying to think of any better way of providing the necessary money, I cannot see any way other than two alternatives to the present system of rating, and I think that although these may be acceptable to the people who are complaining they may not be acceptable to all the other people in the area. A sum of about \$935,000 is required to pay the interest and depreciation on the capital in that pipeline, taken at a rate of interest of 5½ per cent.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: A similar situation occurred on Eyre Peninsula with the Tod line; people could not use the water then because the scrub was not cleared.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In this case the situation has changed: they can use the water, and the land is there. It is somewhat similar to the case referred to by the honourable member, but there are differences. The point is, of course: how much of this amount of money can the State carry from general revenue? This is a decision that has to be made by Parliament when it considers the Budget. Whatever amount the Government or Parliament is prepared to carry is an amount that can be deducted from this amount, and if we accept the rate of 2.03 per cent of return, as is suggested on the present system of rating, and if instead of applying it on the present system of rating we apply it on a fair basis by charging people on total acreage rather than on frontage, we would need to charge

25c or thereabouts an acre on every acre included within the hatched lines on the map approved by the Commonwealth Government as the area to be serviced by the scheme.

In many instances this would mean that some of the people who are not happy with the present system of rating could find that they had to pay more. The only alternative to this would be that we would have some guaranteed usage of water. This would be similar to what applies with the Electricity Trust, which has a requirement regarding the guaranteed use of electricity. In other words, the consumers meet a standing charge as a contribution towards the capital charges; they at least guarantee a certain minimum usage from the scheme in order to make it viable. This would be the only alternative, accepting that the State carry the whole burden of the capital finance needed for the scheme—because there is no question that we could arrive at the cost of water supply on the basis of pumping, maintenance and servicing only, but how we can arrive at a cost of water that would cover the capital charges as well without having some guarantee of the quantity of water usage I fail to comprehend.

This is an unfortunate situation that will have to be looked at sympathetically and, whatever can be done to relieve the burden of rating on the people who stand to gain no capital advantage from the scheme and no increase in financial return as a result of having water, should be done. I think it only proper and just that something be done, if possible, to help these people. They will get no capital appreciation as a result of a water main past their doorway but, as the Prime Minister pointed out in his letter to the Premier, there will be many people who will get a tremendous capital windfall on properties presently having a comparatively cheap price because of the lack of water but which, after they receive water during the next four years, will substantially increase in value as the productivity of the land increases solely as the result of water being reticulated to those properties.

How one achieves a system whereby those who gain most contribute most I do not know, but I appreciate what these people did in not protesting at the time the matter was under discussion with the Commonwealth. They played the game. I want to ask that the Minister and his officers (and Parliament, if the necessity arises) do whatever is reasonable and possible to enable those people to have some

redress from a tax from which they can hope neither to recover nor to gain any material benefit.

Mr. Ryan: It is out of the Minister's hands now and before the court, is it not?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I think the charge is not on the question of rating but that rates were illegally applied. The court can only determine whether or not the rates were illegally applied. That is a matter of dispute, but the system of rating is something that can still be determined by the Minister, and I understand that he has this matter in hand. There is a report from his department on various systems of rating that can be applied, and he has now referred this to a special committee to advise him what, if anything, can be done by way of legislation to change the system of rating. The Minister has announced publicly that such a committee exists and that this matter is under review.

Mr. Broomhill: Can you appear before that committee?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I suggest that the honourable member direct that question to the Minister, because I do not know the answer. There is one other thing, and one only, to which I want to refer, a matter that arose out of my inquiries into this scheme: that is, land tax, which is to be reviewed in 1970, when the new quinquennial assessment is due. What I want to put on record here is the fact that, although I agree that in most areas there has been an increase in the unimproved value of land, I hope that, if the land valuers are going to use fair prices regarding land sales, (that is, fair prices received on a sale without any restriction on an agreement freely entered into), and if they accept this market price for land, they will at the same time take into account the cost of the replacement of capital improvements at present-day values, and not at some depreciated value, because only by this means can they arrive at a fair value for the unimproved value of the land itself.

If a person bought a property today with a good house worth \$10,000 he would be upset to find that the land valuers valued it at \$3,000 because it was a depreciated asset. He would know it would cost at least \$10,000 to put a comparable house on that land. It is the same with all improvements, because one cannot write them down to a low depreciated figure and at the same time accept a market value for a fair price for the sale of the land.

I hope that this matter is reviewed and that the valuers will bear this point in mind so that they will arrive at a proper and fair valuation for the land. I congratulate the member for Gumeracha, who moved the motion, and the member for Onkaparinga, who seconded it, on the manner in which they did this, and I support the motion.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I am perturbed and also disappointed at the low standard of debate and the lack of ethics shown by some members that have developed in this Parliament since the general election in 1968.

Mr. Venning: And it isn't improving at the moment.

Mr. LAWN: I particularly refer to the member for Light. One evening, during the life of the 1965-68 Parliament, three members of the Queensland Parliament were present in the gallery, and they described the conduct of members who were walking across the House and sitting and kneeling in the aisles of this Chamber as conduct that would not be tolerated in the Queensland Parliament. In Committee, I drew members' attention to those remarks by members of Parliament from Queensland. The member who sits and kneels in the aisles more than anyone else is the member for Light, but I am not so much perturbed or concerned about his doing that as I am with the standard of debate during last session and this session. I have been a member since 1950 (and I have always been proud to say that I was a member of the South Australian Parliament), but I have never known the lack of ethics to be so obvious as during the last two sessions of this Parliament. I know that Government members would not have carried on in this manner (and I want members to understand I am referring particularly to the member for Light) during the days of Sir Thomas Playford. He was a man who insisted on ethics being observed by members of both sides of the House.

Mr. Rodda: What are you talking about?

Mr. Clark: Those who have ears to hear let them hear.

Mr. LAWN: The member for Light commenced last night by quoting from page 292 of the 17th edition of Erskine May's treatise, trying to make the point that, according to Erskine May, the purpose of an Address in Reply debate is to allow members to speak to the paragraphs contained in the Opening Speech. However, the remainder of his speech

was a complete departure from the point he endeavoured to make, and he never said one word about His Excellency's Speech. His remarks merely constituted a tirade of abuse and lies directed at members on this side.

I can tolerate a person whom I always know to be boasting about what he can do, etc., but a person I detest is one who cannot make a speech without attributing lies to other people. I hate it; I detest it. That is all the member for Light did last year and all he has done so far this year. He has made abusive remarks and has said that members on this side make statements which, in fact, we are not making.

Mr. Clark: And never have made.

Mr. LAWN: That is so. His remarks have been just a tissue of lies, showing a complete lack of ethics, and this would never have been tolerated by his previous Leader, Sir Thomas Playford.

Mr. McAnaney: You've got one black sheep over there, though.

Mr. LAWN: I cannot hear what the member for Stirling is saying.

The SPEAKER: He is not in order, anyway.

Mr. LAWN: If the honourable member is seeking information from the member for Adelaide, I point out that that is all members on his side ever do; they seek information from members on this side. I recall at one stage when working in industry that my foreman once suspected me of doing something I should not have done; he asked me whether I had, in fact, done this thing, and I said "Yes". I knew that my admission would get me the sack. The foreman reported the matter to his superior and then told me to report to that person. I was told that I was sacked and that the firm could not tolerate employees doing this thing (it was smoking).

Mr. Corcoran: Did he give you a second chance?

Mr. LAWN: I am leading up to that. I was told that every other person caught smoking had always denied having smoked, thereby implying that the foreman was a liar. I immediately replied that that was something I detested and that I could not say that Mr. Joyce (I forget the foreman's first name) was wrong, because he was not wrong. In fact, I said, "I was smoking. I wouldn't suggest he is a liar. I don't like that sort of thing." I was sacked but, unlike all the other people

who had denied doing something wrong, had been sacked, and had never got their jobs back with that firm, I was given another job with the firm a month later and worked there for years afterwards. A few other complaints were made about me over the years, but I was prepared to front up to the foreman who made the complaints and to the divisional superintendent and to deny the allegations: I would not go behind their backs to talk about them. In view of the incident to which I have referred, my statements were always accepted.

I did something here a few years ago. The Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) had a drink of milk and coffee with me about half an hour later and I expected him to ask me whether I had done it, but he did not. The next day I received a note from him, handed to me by a messenger in this Chamber and asking me whether I had done it or whether I only looked guilty. As I nodded, the present Treasurer (then the Minister of Works) and Sir Thomas looked at me and smiled. I went over and spoke to Sir Thomas, telling him that had he asked me the previous evening I would have told him then that I had done it, that I would not lie. I would take whatever is coming to me: I do not lie. While I dislike a person who continually lies, I hate and detest a person, such as the member for Light, who cannot make a speech without accusing other people all the time of lying and of making statements they have not made. Although I do not know what his purpose is in doing this, he does it deliberately. It is not doing him any good, either. Last evening and today was his opportunity to speak on behalf of the people he represents in the District of Light.

Mr. Clark: Did he mention them?

Mr. LAWN: He did not refer to any matter concerning the district and people he represents. On a previous occasion I read in the House a letter which had appeared in the *Barossa News and Light Herald* and which was signed by a Mr. Ryan, one of the honourable member's constituents, and it is a shame what he said about the member for Light. He said that the honourable member never did anything in the district, never looked after the interests of the people, and that the people could not even find him or see him. In recent months the Public Works Committee has investigated the proposed closing of the Morgan-Eudunda railway line. The Chairman of the Morgan District Council, in evidence

before the Public Works Committee, referring to the member for Light, said:

The people in this district have become very cynical towards the Government (or Governments) regarding the neglect of the area. Further we are represented in Parliament by a young man who holds a blue ribbon seat and who has no interest whatsoever in this end of his district. We have received no help from him, and he is actually no use to us at all. You will see that we are really up against it and are receiving no assistance.

The closing of the Morgan-Eudunda railway line has not been finalized and his speech in this debate was the honourable member's opportunity to protest about the closing on behalf of the people he represents, yet he did not say even one word about it. I said before (I think last session) that the honourable member is in his 30's and unmarried, and I said a bit more, about which I will not remind members because they know what I said. However, the honourable member reminds me of a little story I heard some years ago. It seems that when God, the Creator of man, was making the world, he called man aside and bestowed upon him 20 years of normal sex life. Man was horrified: only 20 years! But the Creator did not budge. That is all He would grant man. Then He called the monkey in and gave him 20 years. "But I don't need 20 years," said the monkey, "Ten years is plenty." Man spoke up and said, "Can I have the other 10 years?" The monkey agreed. Then the Creator called the lion in and gave him 20 years. The lion said, "I only need 10 years." Again man asked, "Can I have the other 10 years?" "Of course," roared the lion. Then came the donkey. He was given 20 years also and, like the others, said, "Ten years is all I need." Again man asked for the spare 10 years and again he received them.

This explains, Mr. Speaker, why the honourable member for Light has the normal 20 years of sex life, 10 years of monkeying around, 10 years of "lion" about it, and 10 years of making an ass of himself. That is all he can do. The only sport the member for Light indulges in, as I remarked last session, is playing with himself; he does not play competitive sport. Yesterday evening, when he was speaking, he made an ass of himself. I understand there were a few young Liberals listening in; I will not say where, because I am not supposed to refer to the place, but they were very close handy and listening, and some members opposite told the member for Light to ask leave to continue and

not to continue in the strain in which he was talking yesterday evening, because they did not want the members of the Young Liberal Party to see how some at least of their members in this House conduct themselves. To prove my earlier point, members need only look at the colour of the honourable member's face to see what sort of sport he indulges in. It is

obvious: he is flogging himself to death. Mr. Speaker, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 24, at 2 p.m.