

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, August 14, 1969.

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

### PETITIONS: ABORTION LEGISLATION

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN presented a petition signed by 17 persons, stating that the signatories, being 20 years of age or older, were deeply convinced that from the time of its implantation into the woman's womb (that is, six to eight days after conception) the fertilized ovum was a potential human being and, therefore, worthy of the greatest respect; and that the termination of pregnancy for reasons other than the preservation of the life or physical and/or mental welfare of the pregnant woman was morally unjustifiable; that, where social reasons appeared to exist for termination of pregnancy, then the social condition rather than the practice of abortion should be treated; and that experience in countries where abortions were permitted on social or economic grounds indicated that such practice created many new problems. The signatories also realized that abortions were performed in public hospitals in this State, in circumstances which necessitated it on account of the life or physical and/or mental health of the pregnant woman. The petitioners prayed that, if the House of Assembly amended the law, such amendment should definitely not extend beyond a codification that might permit the current practice.

Mr. CLARK presented a similar petition signed by 29 persons.

Mr. FERGUSON presented a petition signed by 40 persons, stating that the signatories, being 16 years of age or older, were deeply convinced that the human baby began its life no later than the time of implantation of the fertilized ovum in its mother's womb (that is, six to eight days after conception), that any direct intervention to take away its life was a violation of its right to live, and that honourable members, having the responsibility to govern this State, should protect the right of innocent individuals, particularly the helpless. The petition also stated that the unborn child was the most innocent and most in need of the protection of our laws whenever its life was in danger. The signatories realized that abortions were performed in public hospitals in this State, in circumstances claimed to necessitate it on account of the life of the pregnant woman. The petitioners prayed that

the House of Assembly would not amend the law to extend the grounds on which a woman might seek an abortion but that, if honourable members considered that the law should be amended, such amendment should not extend beyond a codification which might permit current practice.

Petitions received.

### QUESTIONS

#### PAIRS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Arrangements which have previously operated in the South Australian Parliament about the granting of pairs are that, on constitutional issues, pairs do not operate since it is an absolute vote and not the relative vote which counts. On issues of confidence, pairs have not usually been granted, but on those issues either there was a specific vote of no confidence of which notice was given or a motion moved to reduce a money Bill, and in either event it was possible to keep the debate going for sufficient time for people who would not otherwise have been in the House, because of a pairs arrangement, to be brought to the House to vote. Moreover, it is quite clear from any examination of the records that pairs have in the past operated from time to time on votes involving the confidence of the Government where other arrangements concerning pairs have super-vened.

In the case of Mr. Loveday, in present circumstances the agreement I made with the Premier was that Mr. Loveday would be granted a pair on all matters other than constitutional matters and therefore that arrangements should operate on votes of confidence as well. An entirely new departure has now been taken if the Premier is to persist in his present course of seeking to ensure the passage of measures, not normally questions of the confidence of the House in the Government, by declaring the matter to be a matter of confidence, and doing so without notice. There have been many occasions during this Parliament when the Premier has declared a matter to be a matter of confidence unlike normal votes of confidence in the Government, and he has done so to ensure the passage of the measure in this House in order to bind members to a vote. Last evening the Premier, apparently unsure of the voting position in the House, in the last sentence of his speech in reply and when other members were excluded from speaking or continuing the debate until such time as absent members could be brought

to the House, declared the measure to be vital to the Government and sent the Whip over to cancel the pairs which he had signed for.

If that sort of action is to be repeated, then there can be no arrangements about pairs at all because, without warning to the Opposition, a measure can suddenly be declared a measure in which no pairs will operate. Therefore, we have no guarantee at all as to the effect of pairs: we could rely upon them and be told at the last minute that the carpet granted had been swept from under our feet. If that is to be the position, then it is useless our making arrangements about pairs and we would not grant them. If Mr. Loveday is not to be granted a pair on the basis which I have previously outlined of a pair on all measures other than Constitutional measures while he is a delegate from the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association overseas, then the Opposition will not be in a position to grant pairs to the Premier and Ministers for absence from the House on essential Government business. Sir, since his repeated statement last night that he would not grant pairs on this issue, the Premier has had second thoughts. He telephoned me at 1.20 this morning to say that he would grant pairs today on a vote that he had postponed from last evening.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want to interrupt the Leader, as this matter is rather important, but his question is getting into an explanation. Does he require leave of the House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will now ask the question specifically. I ask the Premier for an undertaking publicly here in

the House that, when pairs have been arranged, they will be honoured, except in the case of a no-confidence motion or an issue vital to the Government of which notice has been given at the commencement of the debate. Implicit in this undertaking would be the understanding that pairs were not granted for votes on constitutional matter and did not apply to them.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Because I expected that the Leader would ask a question on this matter today, I have with me some material dealing with pairs granted within this House and agreed to between the two Parties. The Leader will know that the convention as to pairs is that they are not granted on tests of confidence in the matter of the Government's continuing in office.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They have been. There are numbers of cases of that.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I intend to cite for the Leader a number of cases where this has occurred and other cases in which, on the other hand, pairs have been granted. This morning, because of the problem that arose last evening, I have studied the previous situation in this State and in other States.

Mr. Corcoran: But on all those matters notice would have been given at the commencement of the debate.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will deal with that in a moment. I now intend to refer to what has happened in this House between 1918 and 1969. The following table sets out the position:

#### NO-CONFIDENCE MOTIONS—PAIRS

Year	Mover	Subject	Pairs Granted
1918	Leader of Opposition	Non-observance by Government of basic wage	Yes
1919	Hon. Sir Richard Butler (ex-Treasurer)	Removal from office of Treasurer	No
1925	Leader of Opposition	Opposition to deportation provisions of Immigration Act	Yes
1933	Independent member	Treatment of unemployed	No
1933	Leader of Opposition	Reduction of item on Estimates	Yes
1938	Leader of Opposition	Amendment of Address in Reply	Yes
1938	Independent member	Three-year Parliaments	No
1951	Independent member	Settlement of ex-servicemen	Yes
1954	Deputy Leader of Opposition	Reduction of item in Loan Estimates	Yes
1959	Leader of Opposition	Right of Parliament to discuss Royal Commission	No
1966-67	Leader of Opposition (Hon. R. S. Hall)	Omission of line on Estimates	Yes
1968-69	Leader of Opposition	Chowilla dam	No
1969	Leader of Opposition	Mr. Donald Currie	No

The Leader will see that there has been a variety of treatment according to the circumstances of the pairs situation in these instances, but in most cases no pairs have been granted, although there has been a substantial number of cases when pairs have been granted. It is always a matter of some controversy when the motion is not moved by the Opposition. Last evening, as I explained, the Government regarded a particular issue as of such vital importance that it must stand or fall with the motion relating to the adoption of the M.A.T.S. plan.

Mr. Corcoran: You said that in the last sentence of your speech: you could have told us earlier.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I said last evening (and I believe my subsequent reaction to the complaint of the Leader and his Party confirmed my attitude) that on thinking of the complaint I moved to have the decision rescinded so that the matter could be deferred to today and the pairs undertaking examined. This has been done, and after the House rose last evening I consulted one or two of my colleagues, thought about the matter, and decided that we should grant pairs today. I must say that one of the important points raised by the Leader that we considered, apart from the illness of members, was the absence of Mr. Loveday. I believe that convention would still mean (and I think the Leader indicated this in his question) that, if he moved a motion of no confidence in this Government and gave notice of it, the pair could not be used to put out the Government. That is an attitude I have reached in my thinking on this matter in the last few hours. No harm has been done except that there was a large-scale ventilation of the matter in the House last evening. However, the vote was won and we could have proceeded, but the complaints of the Opposition were listened to and, as I conceded last evening, the timing factor was not just and the Opposition should have been given notice of any vital issue. I indicate to the Leader that this, in some way, substantially resolved the area of doubt as to how pairs should apply in the present circumstances. Also, I indicate that pairs will be given to his member who is ill and to Mr. Loveday, who is absent. However, I must insist that Mr. Loveday's pair cannot be used to oust the Government on a motion of no confidence from the Opposition, and I think the precedent and convention of granting pairs agrees entirely with my view on that aspect. The opinion is strongly held by many people, and

by most thinking people, that a motion of confidence transcends any pairs that exist. However, I would be willing to confine that to any initiative taken by the Opposition, and if the Government again made an issue vital of its own accord a pair would be granted to Mr. Loveday in these circumstances. I think that clears up last evening's issue.

Mr. Corcoran: It doesn't, really.

Mr. Hudson: Are you going to wait until the last minute in future?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: One query of the Leader was whether I would indicate at the beginning of a debate whether the issue would be vital. I state categorically that good and sufficient notice will be given to the Opposition. I do not think I could or should tie myself to the commencement of the debate, because a debate could start in August and finish in November. All sorts of things could occur, affecting a specific issue during that period. As from now, I think there is no disagreement on this issue, except perhaps in relation to giving sufficient time. If the Leader requires time for a member to return, say, from overseas, I will give sufficient time for him to assemble his members in the event of any clash likely to occur in this area. However, I think I must preserve my right in this regard and not commit myself at the commencement of the debate, because of the many peculiarities that can occur to lengthen debates in this House.

I think I have made the position clear. A pair will be provided in respect of members who are ill, and the pair provided in regard to Mr. Loveday will be honoured, as indicated, except in the case of a motion of no confidence moved by the Opposition which might result in ousting the Government. If that is not sufficient information, I shall be happy to receive other questions on the matter.

Mr. CORCORAN: The Premier said he did not think it was possible, at all times at any rate, to say at the outset whether the subject of a debate would constitute a matter on which the Government might stand or fall. As the debate with which we are concerned commenced only last Thursday and was completed last night, will the Premier say what factors arising from that debate determined his attitude, which was expressed in the last sentence of his speech? What made him at that stage consider this to be a vital measure on which the Government would stand or fall?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That is a rather hypothetical question.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is evident that, as any debate goes on, what members think of the subject matter of that debate may change. The decision was taken and put to the House at the stage when I was speaking late last evening.

#### COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about the extension of district council areas?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is too early to state whether it is intended to introduce local government into those parts of the State where it does not exist at present. The Government has appointed a committee under the chairmanship of the Secretary for Local Government (Mr. M. E. S. Bray) with, as members, Mr. S. F. Heaslip, representing the Stockowners Association; Mr. J. C. Andrew, past President of the Australian Council of Local Government Associations; and Mr. M. J. Knight, Area Engineer, Far-North, representing the Commissioner of Highways. This committee will investigate the desirability or otherwise of introducing local government in the north.

The committee has only recently commenced its inquiry, having held two meetings in Adelaide. During its inquiries, which are likely to extend over some months, opportunity will be given to every pastoralist and other persons or bodies to give their views to the committee. No decision will be made until the committee has submitted its report and it has been studied by the Government. However, if it were decided to introduce local government, an amendment to the Local Government Act would be necessary.

#### RAILWAY COTTAGES

Mr. WARDLE: In the temporary absence of the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, I address my question to the Minister of Works. Many months ago, through the media of the *Advertiser* and television, there was published a report on the lack of attention being given to railway cottages in Taillem Bend regarding the addition of lights, repairs to the cottages, and certain items of convenience around the cottages. I believe that at that stage the Minister of Roads and Transport intended that many of these jobs would be done. Will the Minister ask his colleague to furnish a report on what has been done regarding the backlog of jobs?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will obtain a report from my colleague on this matter.

#### MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

Mr. BURDON: Has the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, a reply to my question of July 30 regarding alterations to the Mount Gambier Hospital?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Information has been received from the Public Buildings Department to the effect that the work involving alterations to the fourth floor of the hospital to provide accommodation for acute medical cases, so that elderly patients requiring more prolonged medical and nursing care may be accommodated on the first floor, is to proceed forthwith and will not be included in the major works that are to be referred to the Public Works Committee.

#### COOLTONG IRRIGATION

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Irrigation a reply to my question of August 12 regarding the new pipe main to be installed at Cooltong and the capacity of the Cooltong pumping station?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Estimates of cost in respect to a non-pressurized system have been taken out and an estimate of cost, together with a study of the feasibility of an alternative proposal to provide a main that could be pressurized and so do away with individual block pumping units, is being prepared. As soon as it has been possible to assess the relative overall merits of these alternatives, a decision as to which type of main will be installed will be taken. The Loan programme for 1969-70 submitted by the department included expenditure of \$95,000 towards the cost of replacing the existing concrete-lined channels, but the installation cannot commence before the winter of 1970. It is planned to have all the channel replaced by the end of 1971. At this stage, I am unable to say when the output of main pumps supplying Cooltong Division will be increased to 400,000 gallons an hour, because questions relating to the location of a pumping station with such increased output must be resolved before reliable estimates and designs can be formulated and a programme of work prepared.

#### SECONDHAND DEALERS

Mr. VIRGO: The Attorney-General will recall that last session I repeatedly drew his attention to a request by the Corporation of the City of Marion regarding the position of

the council in relation to the issuing of second-hand dealers' licences. On March 4, the Attorney-General wrote to the Marion Town Clerk and said:

After giving this matter a great deal of consideration I do not propose to recommend to Cabinet introducing legislation to amend the Act—

obviously in reply to the council's request. On March 27, I received, as did the Attorney-General, a letter in reply to the one I have just read. It repeated the request of the council in relation to this matter. For the benefit of the Attorney-General and of the House, I point out that, under the Act as it now stands, contrary to any desires in respect of zoning or other matter, the police may grant a secondhand dealer's licence to a person in a zoned residential area and the council cannot do a thing about it. As this is a most undesirable situation, I wholeheartedly support the Marion council in its request. In fact, in my reply to the council, I said that as soon as the Attorney-General returned from overseas I would raise the matter with him. Therefore, can the Attorney-General say whether he will look at the matter again with a view to acceding to what I consider to be a legitimate request by the Marion council?

**The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE:** As the honourable member has said, the letter from the Marion council came while I was away in the United States of America. When I came back I saw it, and the matter is being reconsidered in the light of the points put by the council previously and in this letter. I cannot give the honourable member an undertaking as to what the result will be, but the matter is being reconsidered. In any case, it is unlikely that we can do anything this session, because of the crush of legislation already being prepared for introduction. The matter being in hand, I shall be glad if the honourable member will assure his council that it has not been overlooked.

### COKE

**Mr. ALLEN:** Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the availability of domestic coke supplies in South Australia after the advent of natural gas?

**The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE:** Although at one stage it appeared that the South Australian Gas Company would cease to manufacture coke at the end of 1969, the company has now entered into an arrangement with

Imperial Chemical Industries of Australia and New Zealand Limited to continue to manufacture coke for its Osborne works for a period of 10 years. The company expects to be able to supply all the coke required by the public in South Australia for the next 10 years and export some.

### EDUCATION GRANTS

**Mr. HUDSON:** This morning's *Advertiser* reports that a resolution expressing a lack of confidence in the Minister of Education was passed at a meeting of teachers at Seacombe High School, as well as at one or two other metropolitan high schools. I have been supplied with a copy of the resolutions passed at this meeting, to two of which I wish to refer. The first states:

We, staff of Seacombe High School, censure the attitude of the Minister of Education in failing to admit to the gross deficiencies in our education system and her failure to take any positive action to remedy the situation. So serious is the present situation that we have no alternative than to express our lack of confidence in the Minister of Education.

The second resolution, which shows that the teachers are not discriminating, states:

We, staff of Seacombe High School, censure the Central Administration of the Education Department for its failure to supply a positive lead in pointing out to the public the grave deficiencies in education in this State.

Yesterday I specifically requested the Minister, by way of question, to take up the matter of emergency grants from the Commonwealth Government to Government schools in view of the large sums made available to independent schools. In reply to a further question from the member for West Torrens, whether the Minister would complain to the Prime Minister, **the Minister said:**

No; at this stage I do not intend to do so because, in common with other Ministers of Education throughout Australia, we believe there is a proper way of doing this.

As it is apparently proper and apparently agreed both by the Minister and by the Government that per capita grants can be made available, without a survey, to independent schools to help solve their problems and as grave concern has been expressed by teachers at schools throughout the State (concern that is seriously felt and expressed), will the Minister reconsider the attitude she expressed yesterday and apply to the Commonwealth Government for it to make available emergency grants for primary and secondary education in line with the grants that are to be made to independent schools, so that an immediate start may be made on the rectification of

deficiencies within the system and so that we do not have to wait, as the independent schools have not had to wait, for a full and searching survey or inquiry to take place?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I refute the suggestion that no leads have been given or positive steps taken to put education on the basis to which the honourable member has referred. Many positive steps have been taken in South Australia, and I am prepared to tell the public of them at any time whatever. A concentrated attack on the negative side of education has been made for a very long time. This is not peculiar to South Australia: it is part of a pattern of the campaign that is being developed all over Australia at present. I reiterate that the correct way to deal with the matter is the way I outlined yesterday, when I said that all Ministers of Education, who, incidentally, suffer from much the same kind of want as we do and need more funds to provide the things that teachers, parents, the public, and, more particularly, the Government want, believe that the best way to approach this problem is through the survey initiated by the Australian Council of Education of which all Ministers of Education in Australia are members. Facts are at present being collated by every Education Department in Australia. When they have been collated they will be presented to the council at its next meeting, which I think is to be held in Western Australia early next year. The Commonwealth Government, through the Minister for Education and Science, is participating in this survey because of its interest in schools in the Australian Capital Territory and in the Northern Territory. Also, independent and Catholic schools have been invited to conduct a survey, if they wish to do so, using the same terms of reference but making the surveys as a separate exercise. Those schools, too, will have the opportunity to present facts to the Commonwealth Government. In this way a complete nation-wide survey of the needs of education will be presented to the Commonwealth at the right time.

Mr. HUDSON: Very grave concern has been expressed among teachers at Government schools throughout the State and by parents about the difficulties and deficiencies that are being experienced. Apparently, we are not immediately to get any per capita assistance from the Commonwealth Government for Government schools and, as a consequence, the basic financing of primary and secondary education in Government schools will remain the State's responsibility. In view of the grave

difficulties and of the reluctance of the Minister and, presumably, of the Government to make the necessary approaches to and to criticize, if necessary, the Commonwealth Government on this matter, will the Treasurer assure the public of South Australia and the teachers who are involved in the Government schools that there will be a substantial rise in the percentage increase of money allocated to education for the current financial year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: First, I do not intend to take over the duties, prerogatives and authority of the Minister of Education, because she is perfectly adequate to meet all the requirements of her administration. I think that the information she has furnished to the House on several recent occasions is as good a summary of the situation as could possibly be given. Secondly, all States of the Commonwealth are engaged (and have been for some time) in preparing a solid case to put to the Commonwealth for a review of the financial relationships between the Governments of the Commonwealth and of the States. This matter is being pursued with vigour, particularly from the South Australian end. There is to be a conference of Premiers with the Prime Minister next February to lay what we expect will be the foundation of a new financial agreement that must inevitably, if the system under which we are living at present is to survive, give substantial financial relief to the States. If and when this relief is available, the States will, out of their own management, be able to allocate additional funds to lift the level of services in the States and, in particular, the level of adequacy in education to a level more comparable with that enjoyed in the Australian Capital Territory. This applies not only to education but to other services as well.

The possible provision of additional funds in this year's Budget for education is at present under review. I will not (nor can I at this point of time) make any firm comment on this matter. However, the honourable member well knows that the situation of this State's Budget and of every other State's Budget is such that most of the services which we are called on to render (and which are, indeed, demanded of us) are beyond the capacity of the States to finance. We will do our very best for education, as indeed we do for health, hospitals and every other facility which makes a vital demand and which has an important impact on the social structure of the community.

Mr. HUDSON: Can the Premier say whether deficiencies in our education system in Government schools and the general difficulties that the State was having in meeting those deficiencies and financing measures to cure the problems were part of the case that the State presented to the Commonwealth Government? If they were, can he say why the State Government will not admit in public that these deficiencies exist and that there is a near crisis? Also, can he say whether a special approach will be made immediately to the Commonwealth Government for emergency grants to be made to Government schools in this State on the same basis as they have been made to independent schools?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member's question is a reasonably long one and relates to a number of facets. I am not sure whether he opposes grants being made to independent schools.

Mr. Hudson: Of course I don't.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I take it that the question relates basically to the State Government's attitude to Commonwealth-State financial relationships and to what part education played in the case presented by this Government to the Commonwealth Government. Let me say immediately that I believe it played by far the greatest part in that case. The information contained in the submission was (and I believe still is) publicly available. This applies generally to the cases that are presented at the Premiers' Conference. On both occasions I have attended the conference I have voted that it be held in public, and this has, in fact, occurred, as all Premiers are of the same belief.

The contents of the submission are, as I say, available to the honourable member, and he will find that they are based predominantly on education needs. In fact, a number of effective comparisons were made which showed the increasing burden on State finances as a result of assuming responsibilities in education. This included meeting increased needs not only as a result of larger numbers but also as a result of higher standards and of additional expenditures required. The relevant information will be contained in one of the financial reviews and it is, after all, in a public document. While I cannot promise the honourable member a copy without fail, I can promise to try to get him one. It is a fairly extensive document.

Mr. Hudson: I can read.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: In that case, the honourable member apparently is not a victim of the crisis in education. Anyway, I will try to get him a copy of the document so that he can exercise the powers he has so ably demonstrated this afternoon.

#### MINISTER OF EDUCATION

Mr. JENNINGS: Reports have appeared in the press over the last couple of days that two additional schools have passed no-confidence votes in the Minister of Education because of her general administrative ineptitude. Will the Premier now insist on the resignation of the Minister of Education or, preferably, will he resign himself so that in future we will know who is really responsible for the crisis in education in South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member displays his political interest in the education of South Australian children.

Mr. Jennings: I always have.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I suggest he remove politics from his attitude, and then he may be able to contribute more to the general debate and towards building up the educational facilities in this State. His reference to the Minister was discourteous.

#### CADELL TRAINING CENTRE

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked the Chief Secretary through him last week about the policy of the Prisons Department on the Cadell Training Centre's exhibiting at country shows?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It has been policy to allow the Cadell Training Centre to exhibit in four country shows each year. Invitations are usually received from a number of committees, and the centre has alternated where possible, depending on commitments already entered into and the suitability of dates.

#### SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. HURST: I think the Premier knows the importance to South Australia of the shipbuilding industry. The member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) raised this matter in his speech on the Address in Reply, referring to a statement by a director of a shipping company about certain difficulties being encountered by the industry. I think that we all appreciate that some of those difficulties are matters for attention by the Commonwealth Government. When the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) and I attended the launching of a ship and the ceremony following, we listened intently to the remarks

of the Chairman of Directors of the company (Mr. Henry Lloyd) when he said:

There is shortly to be a Tariff Board inquiry which is important to shipbuilders' order books, as it will be dealing with the subsidy to be paid on vessels built in this country. Fortunately, our orders for the last two years have kept the yard gainfully employed, and we can see continuation into the first half of next year. As shipbuilders, we naturally must look a long way ahead. In consequence, it is important that the outcome of the Tariff Board inquiry be not adverse to the existing conditions, as a favourable decision is vital to the prosperity not only of Port Adelaide but of the whole State of South Australia.

As it seems to me that the Premier's Department may be able to interest itself in this important industry, will the Premier say whether the Government intends to make submissions at this Tariff Board inquiry so that the industry will be given a fair and reasonable deal, thus ensuring a continuity of employment of labour in my district?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: At various times my department and I have made representations to the Commonwealth authorities about tariffs and other associated matters concerned with the continuing operation of industries in South Australia and also about the establishment of industries here. I will discuss with the Director of Industrial Promotion and other officers of my department the question asked about the shipbuilding industry, and I will bring down a considered reply for the honourable member.

#### CAMBRAI WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The Minister of Works, when replying on October 1 last year to questions I had asked in September and October about a reticulated water supply for the Cambrai-Sedan area in the Murray Plains from the recently completed Swan Reach to Stockwell main, said:

It is tentatively planned to allocate Loan funds for a supply to the Sedan-Cambrai area in the 1969-70 and 1970-71 financial years, provided that the majority of the landholders want a supply and a satisfactory revenue return can be assured.

Although I cannot find specific provision in the Loan Estimates recently introduced regarding the Cambrai or Sedan area to which I have referred, the item "Extensions, services, and minor works—\$1,178,000" may cover that matter. I appreciate that part of the Sedan area has been reticulated but, as I am principally concerned now with the Cambrai area, will the Minister of Works ascertain what his

department intends to do about a reticulated water supply for that part of the Murray Plains?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will get the information for the honourable member as soon as possible.

#### WATER QUALITY

Mr. BROOMHILL: If a report in today's *News* is even nearly correct, it establishes that there is an extremely serious situation regarding the State's water supply facing the Minister of Works. The report states, in part:

The Works Minister (Mr. Coumbe) is sending an executive of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to confer with two doctors who claim that some water at Henley and Glenelg is "unfit for human consumption". "The matter will be investigated straight away," said Mr. Coumbe. "We have not previously heard of complaints." The doctors said today the entero coli colony count in samples from mains taps they had used at Glenelg and Henley ranged up to 300 cubic centimetres. A count of only eight is sufficient to warrant the closure of a swimming pool to bathers, they said. The 300 entero coli count came from tap water in the nursery of a southern suburban hospital. One of the doctors connected with this hospital said the count was 120 in water from the operating theatre, 18 from the taps where surgeons scrub up, and 75 from one of the labor wards.

I point out that a count of eight is said to be sufficient to warrant closing a swimming pool to bathers. Will the Minister say whether this problem is confined to Glenelg and Henley Beach (and, if it is, why that is so), or whether it applies throughout the State? As the matter of the purity of Adelaide's water supply has been raised in the past, doubts having been expressed about the types of report the public have received on the matter and a suggestion having been made that, perhaps, something is being covered up, will the Minister give an undertaking that samples of the metropolitan water supply will be taken over a wide area, and will he publish the result of these samples?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I am pleased the honourable member has raised this matter today. As the press report states, as soon as the matter was brought to my attention I instructed senior officers to make investigations immediately. Some statements in the report do not conform to fact. However, samples were immediately taken from the swimming pools referred to and from other places independently by a senior officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and are being tested by means of the modern facilities at the laboratory at Bolivar. Similar samples were taken by the Public Health Department to

the laboratory at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. As soon as I receive reports on the tests now being undertaken I will make a further statement on them. When the investigations were commenced it was found that one of the complainants, one of the doctors referred to, was a person with whom my predecessor had had considerable trouble.

Mr. Corcoran: And your colleague had a lot, too.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: My predecessor in office knows one of the complainants very well. He is a person with whom he had some personal difficulty. I assure the House that the bacterial count of water is normally dealt with by introducing chlorine at various points in the reservoir. This is not to be confused in any way with turbidity or discolouration, as these are a matter of clarification because they are two separate items. I assure the honourable member that strict tests are made daily of the bacterial count of all metropolitan water supplies. As soon as this matter was reported it was investigated immediately. These tests are being carried out independently of each other by two separate authorities, and as soon as I have the results of the tests I will take action and make a statement accordingly.

Mr. LANGLEY: I have recently asked several questions about dirty water in Engineering and Water Supply Department mains. I noticed in last Friday's *Advertiser* the following article:

Why not clean water in South Australia? Clean water from Adelaide taps; the Centre as a water-sports paradise—Some people would see these as impossible dreams. But Tom Harvey, of Dunbarton Street, Windsor Gardens, is sure he has the answers. He showed me a tank full of water which had been dirty when it went in. At the turn of a tap, discoloured water gushed for a few seconds, then cleared. "It is done through the shape of the tank," says Tom. And he says the principle could be applied to Adelaide's water supplies. He says a mud-eliminators could be used for Murray River pumps. He says, "I want nothing for myself—just a chance to be of service to my fellows in Australia."

Knowing that the Minister of Works is keen for the State to have a clean water supply, I ask him whether he has caused any officers of his department to call to see this gentleman, or can he say whether inquiries will be made about this matter so that it may be possible to improve the quality of our water supply at a reasonable cost?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will certainly take up the suggestion the honourable member has so kindly made. I agree with him that I am keen to see whether something can be done about the rather doubtful colour of the water being used in this State. To this end, considerable investigation has taken place within the department in the last few months. Only yesterday, I discussed further investigations being made into this matter. I must repeat the statement I made previously: improving the quality of the water supplied to the metropolitan area is extremely costly not only in regard to capital but also regarding the sum that would have to be added to the annual running costs. Although the hardness of the water we use is not peculiar to South Australia, the water is certainly not as good as it is in some other States, and I frankly do not know the answer here.

Regarding the turbidity and discolouration of water, there is no doubt that an improvement could be made, but the associated cost would be extremely high. As I have said previously, when consumers occasionally experience a concentration of muddy water which may be caused by the rapid draw-off from the reservoirs following recent rains or by the replacement of mains, if they immediately contact the department the officers will try to minimize the problem. However, investigation into the whole matter of purifying the water has been initiated and will continue at a fairly high level so that we may see whether the problem can be minimized if not completely solved.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I am grateful to the Minister for the information he has obtained for me in which he stated that daily the department took samples of water from various places and tested them. If the Minister cannot tell me immediately, will he obtain a report containing details of this type of test and stating whether a random sample of water is taken from the same place on each day or from varying points and whether the samples come from all suburbs in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I have seen some of this work being undertaken, but I will obtain the detailed information sought by the honourable member.

#### MICE

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about mice and the appointment of a moustologist to control them?

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

I have already furnished information on mouse infestation in a reply to a question on this subject from the member for Semaphore, and I invite the attention of the member for Eyre to that reply.

In fact, that reply has not been given by me yet, but I have informed the member for Semaphore that it is available. The Minister's report continues:

In reference to his suggestion that a mouse-tologist be appointed to control the pest, I can only say that whilst I have heard of "mousers" and "mouseketeers", I am completely unfamiliar with the term "mousetologist", and I would be grateful if the honourable member would educate me on the specific qualifications and attributes required for appointment to such a position, and the duties involved. I shall then be pleased to give his proposal further consideration.

Mr. HURST: Most members are interested in the reply to the question concerning the duties of a mousetologist. However, the member for Eyre is somewhat at a disadvantage concerning his endeavours in this field until such time as I obtain a reply to the question I recently asked, also in connection with this matter. I have conferred with the honourable member, and he has undertaken, by next week, to prepare for the duties he intends to carry out. If the Minister will give me a reply, I will pass it on to the honourable member, and we may hear a little more about the matter next week.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director of Agriculture reports that it is difficult at this stage to assess the likely rate of build-up of mouse population, as much will depend on weather conditions during the coming spring and summer months. Discussions will be held with Dr. A. E. Newsome, of the Wildlife Research Division of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, who will be in Adelaide next week, and with officers of the Vermin Branch of the Lands Department, with a view to assessing the seriousness of the problem. Dr. Newsome does not call himself a mousetologist, but he is a well-known biologist. Currently available knowledge does not provide a satisfactory solution to the broad-acre control of the pest, as there are serious objections to the use of strychnine and sodium fluoro-acetate (1080) in preparing grain baits for field use. The most practical measures would appear to be control of mice in and around farm buildings and the protection of stored grain and hay.

## VOTING SYSTEM

Mr. RYAN: I should like to ask the member for Eyre a question. Published in today's *Chronicle* is a large advertisement, authorized by the member for Eyre, in which he requests and solicits votes for a directorship of Southern Farmers Co-operative Limited. According to the advertisement, the honourable member suggests that he is a progressive and dynamic Parliamentarian as the Liberal and Country League member for Eyre in the House of Assembly. Voting for this election is by a cross (or first past the post). Last week a vote by division was taken to make it legal in South Australia for voting by the first past the post system in House of Assembly elections. As the report of the division published in *Hansard* discloses that the member for Eyre is opposed to this method, can he say whether he has two policies: one for the people of South Australia, and one for himself in an election for a directorship?

Mr. EDWARDS: Regarding the vote recently taken in the House, I am sure that members opposite would be the first to grizzle if we did not have the voting system that was retained the other evening: if they were behind, and could gain first place as a result of preferential voting, they would be the first to squeal if they did not have it. Voting for a directorship of Southern Farmers Co-operative Limited is by another method, but that has nothing to do with Parliament, therefore Opposition members cannot hold me to this.

## TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question concerning the financial loss to the State if the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan is not proceeded with?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As the honourable member asked me on July 31 whether the State would lose \$59,000,000 in the next five years if it did not proceed with the M.A.T.S. plan, I undertook to refer the matter to the Minister of Roads and Transport and he has now given me the following reply:

Commonwealth grants to the State for roadworks are made available on the basis of five-year agreements. The terms of the current agreement covering the period 1969-74 are set out in the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, 1969. This Act provides for the allocation to South Australia of \$59,400,000 for expenditure on urban arterial roads. Additional amounts are allocated for other roads. The term "arterial road" is used here to include freeways. Referring to the grant for these roads, the Prime Minister has said:

"This is for construction and reconstruction of the city's major traffic arteries, the freeways, expressways, traffic interchanges and other types of urban road systems. It is not for ordinary street systems."

For the purpose of expenditure of Commonwealth grants, arterial roads are those so declared by the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport. While the matter of declaration of arterial roads in metropolitan Adelaide has not yet been resolved, the Commonwealth authorities have indicated that emphasis will be given projects of a major nature; the type of road improvement projects as generally proposed in the M.A.T.S. plan. The State is required to spend specified amounts of the total Commonwealth grant in each of the five years. These are as follows: 1969-70, \$7,780,000; 1970-71, \$9,450,000; 1971-72, \$11,500,000; 1972-73, \$13,940,000; and 1973-74, \$16,760,000.

It must be clearly understood that these grants are available to the State for expenditure as indicated above, and are not available for expenditure on roads other than the declared roads, and are not available for expenditure outside the Adelaide urban area (defined as the Adelaide Statistical Division). The Act does contain a provision allowing for the transfer of funds to other classes of road, but the Commonwealth authorities have indicated that this will generally not be permitted. There are virtually no important roads in the metropolitan area for which improvement projects are not proposed in the M.A.T.S. plan (excepting those roads which have been widened and reconstructed in recent years). There are virtually no significant road projects requiring attention that have not been included in the M.A.T.S. plan.

If the M.A.T.S. plan is rejected by Parliament, and the Highways Department cannot proceed with the works contained within the plan, it will be necessary to develop other proposals which, while differing from the M.A.T.S. proposals, must conform to the principles established in the authorized Metropolitan Development Plan. To do this would take a considerable time if the planning is to be fully integrated with all other proposals for development. Having regard to the magnitude of the works involved, and the need to conform to the development plan, which would necessarily require the proposals to be very similar to the M.A.T.S. proposals, it is doubtful whether these could be expected to be acceptable if those proposals prove to be not acceptable. Rejection of the M.A.T.S. proposals would not necessarily indicate a rejection of the detail of the proposals, but rather the basic principles which are derived from the development plan. If development of alternative proposals is delayed, pending resolution of the principles involved, through acceptance of a revised development plan, a delay of some four years could be expected before significant expenditure on the works could be achieved.

The Highways Department has completed a considerable amount of planning and design work, and has also acquired considerable property on the basis of proposals contained

in the M.A.T.S. plan. Because of the various factors discussed above, if now the Highways Department was required to start entirely afresh, it would be virtually impossible for the State to take full advantage of the grants available for the urban arterial roads. Unless some special arrangements were made, which at this stage appears most unlikely in the face of competing demands on the Commonwealth from other States, it could be expected that rejection of the M.A.T.S. plan would result in a substantial loss of the Commonwealth grants available to South Australia for work on urban arterial roads within the next five years.

Mr. GILES: Regarding the amount of finance available for public transport as provided for in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, the Premier recently said:

The public transport proposals are estimated to cost \$107,500,000. Of this, \$58,900,000 will be required for rail and bus rolling stock and this figure includes the cost of replacing and expanding the privately operated bus fleet in addition to that of the Municipal Tramways Trust.

As we are exponents of private enterprise and as this statement could possibly be construed to have two meanings (it could be taken to mean that, in the M.A.T.S. plan, we are taking over private lines), will the Premier please explain this statement so that the meaning is clear?

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

#### LAND SETTLEMENT

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about allocating blocks in the hundred of Day?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Five sections in the hundred of Day are at present open for application, and 28 applications have been received. The board will commence taking evidence in support of these applications on August 18. The sections are grouped to provide two farms of about 3,700 acres and an area of about 1,000 acres which will be used to augment a nearby holding.

#### BUILDING BUREAU

Mrs. BYRNE: The Minister of Housing will be aware that during the Address in Reply debate (as reported at page 626 of *Hansard*) I referred to the need for establishing a house-building bureau offering information free of charge to the public, an announcement along these lines having been made by the previous Minister of Housing, so that purchasers of property could obtain free advice on finance and management, suitability of land types,

designs and costs of structures, explanation and application of local government and other building standards, and advice on documents. At the same time, I outlined cases which had arisen in my constituency and which substantiated the need for such a bureau. Will the Minister of Housing say whether the Government has considered establishing such a bureau and, if it has not, whether it will seriously consider this suggestion now?

✓ The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The answer to the question concerning whether or not the Government has considered the matter is "Yes". This matter was considered soon after I took over the portfolio of housing, a little over a year ago. The suggestion has some merit, and I think the idea behind it is good, but whether or not it would achieve the desired result is, I think, entirely another matter. Over the years of administering various departments, it has been my experience that many people do not take advantage of the advice available to them in so many ways. For example, in spite of repeated statements made in this House and in the press that, before people buy blocks of land and accept, in so doing, the assurances of the salesman concerned that water and/or sewerage will possibly be available soon, they should consult the Engineering and Water Supply Department, they rarely do so. Many of these people then come along with a problem and complain they were misled.

There is a good and adequate building advisory section in the headquarters of the Master Builders' Association on South Terrace to which people are invited, by advertisement and other means, so that they may obtain any information they require. Also, there is available at every lending institution advice on finance, and much literature, too, is available on this matter. The Housing Trust is always happy (and competent) to supply any information that people may need on these matters. Therefore, it is not a matter of merely setting up a bureau; that can be done. The question is whether or not such action would benefit the people who most need the benefit, and it is my experience that these people are the ones least likely to seek such information. Although there may be exceptions to this rule, I do not think there are sufficient to justify the setting up of such a bureau and the cost of maintaining it for (I am afraid) the few people who would avail themselves of its services.

#### VAGRANCY CHARGE

Mr. McANANEY: My question relates to a case reported in yesterday's paper under the heading "Vagrancy Admitted"—

Mr. Virgo: Question!

Mr. McANANEY: My question is directed to the Attorney-General. In a court case dealing with a charge of vagrancy—

Mr. VIRGO: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The question must be asked.

Mr. McANANEY: I am asking it.

The SPEAKER: Objection having been taken, the honourable member must now ask his question.

Mr. McANANEY: Is the Attorney-General aware of a case reported in the paper yesterday in which a person coming from Sydney to Adelaide on July 2 with marihuana he had intended to sell in South Australia for \$600 was granted a bond by Mr. Beerworth, Special Magistrate, in the Adelaide Magistrates Court on an admitted charge of vagrancy? Is this a reasonable penalty in the case of a person carrying—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is comment. The Attorney-General must reply.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I saw the item in the paper, but I do not know anything about the matter. I think that the defendant was charged with having insufficient means of support and, apparently, he was in possession of marihuana, having been charged with some such offence in New South Wales. In view of the honourable member's question, I will see what the circumstances were. I am sure that the police decided that this was the most appropriate charge to lay, but I will try to find out the reasons and let the honourable member know.

#### BAKERIES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry tell the House the names of bakeries that have been prosecuted under the amended provisions of the Industrial Code since December 12, 1968; the number of times the respective bakeries have been prosecuted; the fine imposed in each case; whether the fines accord with the new penalties provided by the amending Act assented to on December 12, 1968; and whether the fines have been paid? If they have not been paid, what action has been taken to enforce payment?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I shall be happy to get the information. There are several separate questions in the major question, but I shall be happy to furnish the Leader with all the details I can on this matter.

**WHEAT QUOTAS**

Mr. EVANS: I read recently that in Victoria, where details of wheat quotas have been issued to farmers, a share farmer on a property has his name and his quota shown on the quota card. Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, inquire whether the same procedure will apply in South Australia when quota cards are issued?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As the honourable member knows, this matter is very much in the hands of the industry. I will take it up with the Minister of Agriculture and, when he has given me a reply, I will bring it to the House.

**SPALDING ROAD**

Mr. ALLEN: The Attorney-General has said he has a reply to the question I asked last week about the Spalding-Burra Road. Will he give it?

Mr. Hudson: Another Dorothy Dixier.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, it is not a Dorothy Dixier.

Mr. Virgo: A Dame Zara, then.

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

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I extend to members on this side the same courtesy I extend to members opposite of telling them when I have a reply for them. If members opposite do not want me to continue doing this, as they indicate by ridiculing the practice, I will not do so. I informed the member for Burra that I had a reply for him in the same way as I inform other members.

Mr. Hudson: You are testy.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am not as testy as the honourable member is.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable Attorney-General want to reply to the question?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am trying to do so, Sir. Although problems associated with the railway crossing at Spalding have now been largely resolved, the planning investigation for the whole proposal is not yet complete. However, the matter will reach finality in the near future, and it is expected that construction of the new bridge and approaches will commence during the current financial year.

**EUDUNDA RAILWAY**

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked last week about the future of the Eudunda-Kapunda railway?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Transport Control Board has no plans to conduct an investigation whether the railway line between Eudunda and Kapunda should be closed or remain open.

**PETERBOROUGH RAMPS**

Mr. CASEY: When I spoke to the Minister of Roads and Transport recently about a question I had asked more than a fortnight ago regarding handrails on the ramps of Peterborough subways, he told me that he had sent a reply to his colleague in this place. Has the Attorney-General got that reply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No.

**MURRAY BRIDGE ROAD BRIDGE**

Mr. WARDLE: The Attorney-General has told me that he has obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about the possible life of the existing traffic bridge over the Murray River. Will he give that reply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Under present traffic conditions, where all traffic crossing the river must use the bridge, there will obviously be a limit to the life of this already very old structure. With the completion of a new bridge near Swanport, all heavy loads exceeding a limit to be decided will be diverted over the new bridge, thus restricting traffic using the present bridge to cars and medium to light commercial vehicles. The life of the present bridge would then be extended indefinitely. The only limit to its life at that stage would be caused by corrosion and deterioration of the superstructure, which cannot be predicted with any accuracy.

**MOUNT BURR ELECTRICITY**

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about voltage fluctuation in the Mount Burr township?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: At Mount Burr the Electricity Trust provides the Woods and Forests Department with a bulk supply of electricity to the mill and township. The department owns the township including the electricity distribution system, and is responsible for reticulation of power to residents, most of whom are employees of the department. When the trust's transmission system was extended to Mount Burr in 1966, the question of responsibility for reticulation within the township was considered. There would be no advantage to consumers in the town if the trust took over the supply. They would pay the same for electricity because the tariffs charged by the department are the same as the trust's. The

department maintains the reticulation system with its own staff and equipment from the mill, whereas the trust's nearest depot is at Millicent, seven miles away. On this basis the trust considered that the responsibility for providing the supply in the Mount Burr township should remain with the Woods and Forests Department. This position was reaffirmed by the trust during recent discussions with the new Conservator.

A forest reserve headquarters is situated about two miles from Mount Burr, and it is supplied by the department by means of a light high-voltage line from the township. With increasing loads, the line is inadequate to maintain satisfactory voltages at the headquarters. There are trust high-voltage mains recently built, within about three-quarters of a mile of the headquarters. In discussion with the Conservator, it was agreed that the trust would investigate the possibility of supplying the headquarters from these mains as overall this could be the most economic means of overcoming the voltage problem. This investigation will be completed shortly.

Mr. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands previously said that the Minister of Forests had said that discussions were taking place with the Electricity Trust on this matter. I pointed out that, although the Woods and Forests Department was responsible for reticulation and supply in the township area, officers of that department were discussing with the trust the matter of future supply at Mount Burr. The Minister of Works has said that those discussions are complete and that the trust has reaffirmed its opinion that the responsibility for providing the supply at Mount Burr township should remain with the Woods and Forests Department. As I have pointed out, much inconvenience is caused to Mount Burr residents by voltage fluctuations. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Forests what the Woods and Forests Department intends to do now to overcome this fluctuation and whether the department will rectify the position?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask the Minister of Forests and bring down a reply.

#### ROBBERY

Mr. VIRGO: I address this question to the Premier as I think it should probably be referred to the Chief Secretary. However, if the Treasurer is the Minister to whom I should address it, I should be pleased if he would deal

with it. On June 17 a press report stated that there had been a robbery in a Totalizator Agency Board shop, a disturbing feature being that the sole attendant was the woman manager. I understand that, since T.A.B. agencies have been established, many male managers have been replaced by female managers to reduce overhead costs. Will the Premier obtain from the Chief Secretary or, alternatively, from the Treasurer, particulars of the number of agencies in South Australia where female managers are now in control?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get the necessary report.

#### PARAPLEGICS

Mr. BURDON: My question refers to a plea by paraplegics and concerns many unfortunate people not only in my district but throughout the State. A report in yesterday's *News* states:

Parking plea by cripple: If members of Adelaide City Council were placed in wheelchairs or irons for 24 hours they would realise the necessity of parking privileges for employed severely handicapped people, Adelaide Magistrate Court was told today. Miss Elizabeth Dudley Richards, a 23-year-old paraplegic, told the court this when she appeared, charged with a parking offence. Miss Richards, typist, of Moore street, Toorak Gardens, was fined \$2 and ordered to pay \$2 court costs and a \$5 council fee.

Miss Richards told Messrs. R. C. Ferguson and C. Schultze, J.Ps., she left her car at a meter which expired after 30 minutes.

The defendant, a member of the Paraplegic Association of South Australia, said she was forced to park more than 80 yards from her destination on a half-hour meter. "This is just one of the many occasions when I have been forced to pay \$2 to the Adelaide City Council for a parking fine and I feel it is a great shame that the council cannot see its way clear to help handicapped people", she said.

Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Local Government to take up with the Adelaide City Council on behalf of the paraplegics of South Australia the suggestion that paraplegics who would otherwise experience parking problems be given an identification that they can attach to their motor cars or other means of transport so that they will be able to park near their place of employment or other destination?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am sure that the Minister of Local Government will be sympathetic, as we all are, in this case. I will ask him whether he will take the matter up with the City Council.

### JERVOIS BRIDGE

Mr. HURST: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the footway over the Jervois Bridge?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The rate of vertical and horizontal curvature on the bridge is so slight that it will not create hazards. The concrete surface of the footwalks is fairly smooth but not slippery when wet. Wind squalls are commonly experienced in many exposed places where pedestrians and vehicular traffic are separated only by a kerb. There are no records indicating that such conditions are hazardous. The design of the Jervois bridge footwalks follows accepted Australian standards. Inner rail protection is not normally provided where there is a wide footpath and 35 mile an hour maximum speed limits prevail.

### NORTHERN ROADS

Mr. CASEY: It is well known that the Commonwealth Government will extend the new north-south railway line from Port Augusta to Alice Springs, via Kingoonya, soon. It is imperative that, when the line from Marree to Alice Springs becomes redundant (doubtless, the Commonwealth Railways will not use this section if the other line is constructed), work should be done to upgrade the road through Marree and to Oodnadatta so that the many cattle around Anna Creek, William Creek, and even Oodnadatta will have an outlet to southern markets. The Minister has replied to my question about the section of road from Hawker to Marree but the upgrading of the road through to Oodnadatta has not been considered. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether work on this important section of road can be carried out so that cattle stations that will be deprived of railway transport will have suitable road transport to get their cattle to southern markets?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

### LAND ACQUISITION

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the urgent matter of delays occurring in the determination of the valuation of houses acquired by the Highways Department when the value is more than \$20,000 and these valuations are referred to the Land Board?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As I have received a reply by telephone, I have not the full details of the case with me, but this

house owner wrote to the Highways Department on June 23 last, stating that he wanted to sell his house but was unable to do so.

Mr. Hudson: He first approached the department on May 9.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As I say, I got this information over the telephone and have not seen the documents. I am informed that this person wrote on that date asking whether the department would purchase the property, stating that he had been trying unsuccessfully to sell. He suggested that this should be treated as a hardship case, as many others had been treated, and he was told on July 3 that the department could negotiate for the house. He was also told by the Highways Department that there would be a delay of up to seven weeks. On July 28 or 29, which was less than four weeks after he was told that, a Highways Department valuer inspected the property, and later the department received a formal claim, I think on July 30, for a sum in excess of \$20,000. This was the first intimation the department had received that the sum would be over the normal limit. The Lands Department has informed me that it can inspect the property next week, which it will do. It will be realized that, although two departments were involved, the delay was of only about seven weeks, which is the period that was mentioned. Every effort is being made to help where possible, but it is not practicable to give a letter of intent or anything of that nature in a case like this. It will be next week before a valuer can inspect the property. The honourable member asked whether current procedures could be expedited by the appointment of additional valuers. An additional valuer will commence work next week, so that there will be some expedition. However, high quality valuers, as required by Government departments, are difficult to obtain.

### SCHOOL BUS

Mr. VENNING: In asking a question of the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, I request that the Minister of Education also take note of it. It relates to the road known as the Gladstone to Booleroo Centre (Almond Tree Corner) Road, a section of which is used by the school bus travelling from Gladstone to Laura each day. From Gladstone to Laura the bus picks up about nine primary schoolchildren, deposits them at Laura, and then picks up high school children to be taken down the bitumen to Gladstone. It has been reported to me that

this road is in a bad state of repair, to such a degree that it is possible that the school bus may have to be cancelled. Will the appropriate Minister ascertain what is the present position and what can be done to rectify it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

#### RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

Mr. VIRGO: On July 3, in the Address in Reply debate, I said that, as a result of the railway smash at Violet Town in Victoria, action had been speeded up in the South Australian Railways Department in relation to the demotion of train staff, particularly drivers, and I requested that the Government should assure the people who were, for medical reasons, demoted from their former employment that they would not suffer loss of wages. As I have heard nothing since then, will the Attorney-General press the Minister of Roads and Transport for an urgent reply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will have this matter followed up.

#### KEITH SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on the current proposals for drainage at the Keith Area School?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I will do that for the honourable member.

#### GLENELG SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about erecting screens over windows that face the oval at the Glenelg Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The matter raised by the honourable member has already been discussed by officers of the Education and Public Buildings Departments. I understand that sun screens, which are to be erected over the windows of the new school at Glenelg, have been designed in such a way that they also afford protection from footballs that may be kicked into the schoolground from the oval. The erection of these screens should solve the problem.

#### DEMERIT SYSTEM

Mr. VIRGO: As numerous newspaper statements have been made in the past few months that the Government is considering introducing a points demerit system for drivers of motor vehicles, will the Attorney-General say whether this matter has been considered by Cabinet and, if it has not, will he ascertain from his colleague when the matter will be brought forward?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This matter has been considered by Cabinet, and a Bill will be introduced this session.

#### RIVERTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Representations have been made to me by members of the council of the Riverton High School concerning land north of the town that the Education Department bought some time ago for a project area for an agricultural science course at that high school. I understand that 19 acres was involved in the purchase and, as most people would agree, that would be an adequate area on which an agricultural science course could be conducted. Can the Minister of Education say whether the department has any plans to go ahead with the agricultural science project at this school?

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

#### OUTER HARBOUR TERMINAL

Mr. HURST: During the Address in Reply debate I referred to the necessity for a new terminal building at Outer Harbour. The Minister of Works previously said that the 330 tons of steel purchased for this work in 1965 at a cost of about \$47,000 would be cleaned and painted with a protective coating in order to prevent further deterioration. As the steel is still in the same location and as the necessity for the new terminal building is increasing (people who use the present facilities believe that the immediate need to commence the project is beyond question), will the Minister say when the work on the new terminal building is expected to commence?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I will get a considered reply for the honourable member.

#### SHORTHAND

Mr. CORCORAN: Will the Minister of Education outline to the House the policy of the department in regard to teaching shorthand in secondary schools (both high schools and technical high schools)? Also, will she ascertain whether or not this subject is taught at the Millicent High School and, if it is not, why not?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to obtain a report on this matter for the honourable member.

#### GLENGOWRIE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: I have previously referred in the House to the problem that has arisen at the Glengowrie High School with respect to

the areas between the ovals. I think the last question I asked here concerned whether a subsidy would be made available for any expenditure by the school council in connection with these areas. Has the Minister of Education a reply to that question?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The development of the areas between and adjacent to the various ovals provided by the Government at Glengowrie High School is the responsibility of the school council, which would be encouraged to develop, cultivate and mow natural grasses, and to plant trees and shrubs, etc. A subsidy will be paid in regard to constructing concrete bordering, loam for gardens and any necessary mowing equipment. Trees and shrubs are not subsidized.

#### TURNOVER TAX

Mr. HUDSON: Some time ago I asked the Treasurer about the attitude that the Government would adopt to the 1½ per cent additional turnover tax in respect of on-course totalizator betting which, under the present legislation, goes to racing clubs for three years after the passage of the Bill establishing the Totalizator Agency Board in South Australia. I believe that the matter is being considered and that the Treasurer can now give a progress report.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member, in his explanation, has conveyed to the House much of the information that is contained in the considered reply I have obtained. In accordance with the policy of the former Government and with legislation submitted by it and accepted by Parliament, the diversion of 1½ per cent commission upon on-course totalizator betting for the purpose of improvement of totalizator betting facilities was for the limited period of three years. In consequence of the legislation, this part of the commission will, unless Parliament approves new legislation to the contrary, revert to the Hospital Fund after March 29, 1970, and thereafter be used for the benefit of the hospitals of this State.

The racing and trotting clubs have submitted that this 1½ per cent commission should remain permanently with the clubs and that after March next they should be permitted to regard it as general revenue without being required to use it for the present or any other specific purpose. The whole matter is being currently reviewed, and Parliament and the clubs will be notified as soon as convenient whether or not the Government has been convinced that amending legislation will be desirable later this session and, if it has, of the nature of the proposed amendment. This morning or yesterday morning, Mr.

Keen (of the South Australian Jockey Club Incorporated) rang me to ask whether he could bring a delegation to me to discuss this matter. I have agreed that that should be done, and I think it has been set down for one day next week.

#### HOSPITAL PAYMENTS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary which hospitals have been approved by the Governor as public hospitals under section 31s (2) (c) of the Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1966, and what amounts have been paid to such hospitals for the year ended June 30, 1969?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to get the information for the honourable member.

#### NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I raised with you a matter concerning the procedures of the House when a motion has been placed on the Notice Paper with respect to the disallowance of regulations and on a subsequent decision of the Subordinate Legislation Committee no action is taken. This may prevent some other member, after the closing date for the moving of a disallowance motion, from moving such a motion. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that you can now give a considered reply to this question, and I should be pleased if you would do that.

The SPEAKER: Section 38 (2) of the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915-1957, allows either House of Parliament to pass a resolution to disallow a regulation (as defined in that Act) provided only however that notice of such resolution has been given within 14 sitting days after the regulation has been laid before such House. Regulations laid before the House are listed on the Notice Paper; and against each regulation is shown the final date (assuming the House sits each Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday) by which a notice of motion for disallowance may be given. All such regulations are considered by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and reported on to each House. If no action for disallowance is recommended by the committee, the committee reports accordingly, and an asterisk appears against the regulation on the Notice Paper. If the committee recommends disallowance, the committee reports separately, and a notice of motion for such disallowance in the name of a member of the committee is given in each House.

The committee recommended on July 23, 1969, that no action be taken in respect of the regulations—prescribe fees under the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956-1963—to which the question by the member for Glenelg alludes; and the asterick appeared against those regulations on the Notice Paper from Thursday, July 24, to Thursday, August 6, the latter date being the last day on which notice could be given for disallowance. So there was a fortnight after the committee first reported, recommending no action, in which the member for Glenelg or any other member had the opportunity to give notice of motion for disallowance. On request from the Hire Car Operators Association, however, the regulations were restored to the agenda of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. As the hearing of evidence had not been completed by the expiration of the 14 sitting days, that is, August 6, 1969, notice of motion for disallowance was given in both Houses, not because the committee had decided to recommend disallowance, but because the notice would serve to safeguard the committee should it decide subsequently, after hearing evidence, to move for the disallowance. This is apparent from a report read to the House.

A week later the committee decided that no action would be taken, and that the notice of motion for disallowance would not be proceeded with. Of course, at this stage, when the House was finally informed of the committee's decision to take no action, it was too late for any other member to act. In this particular case, if a member now wants to bring about the consideration of the disallowance he may do this only by asking the member for Angas, a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, in whose name the motion now appears, to move that motion and thereby bring the motion before the House. The fact that he moves the motion, however, does not obligate him to vote for his own motion. The special case raised by the member for Glenelg leads me to express some concern in general about these safeguarding notices of motion, and the prolongation by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation of consideration of regulations after the expiration of the 14 sitting days.

If the committee has not finalized its consideration within the 14 sitting days, and gives a safeguarding notice of motion for disallowance on which a private member relies, and subsequently the committee's notice is not proceeded with, the private member concerned is deprived of any opportunity to move for

the disallowance. The only safe course for the member to pursue in such circumstances is to give his own notice of motion before the expiration of the 14 sitting days, even though this means there will be two identical notices on the Notice Paper. I view with some apprehension the occasional extension by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation of its consideration of a regulation beyond the date on which a notice of motion can be given for its disallowance.

The Joint Standing Orders (No. 25 and No. 27) governing the relevant proceedings of the committee are mandatory, and I quote: "... the Committee shall consider the regulations before the end of the period during which any motion for disallowance of those regulations may be moved in either House... If the committee is of opinion that any regulations ought to be disallowed, it shall report that opinion and the grounds thereof to both Houses before the end of the period during which any motion for disallowance of those regulations may be moved in either House." I know of no authority to depart from the spirit and letter of the Joint Standing Orders. However, I have suggested to the Chairman of the committee that, if safeguarding notices of motion are to be given in the future, the committee's report to his House should include a warning to the effect that the committee may subsequently not recommend disallowance of that regulation. This should help to alert all members to the position.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

#### HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Real Property Act, 1886-1967. Read a first time.

#### TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Votes on the motion of the Premier—

That this House:

(a) acknowledges:

- (i) that the general principles underlying the report of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study were laid down in the Metropolitan Development Plan which was

endorsed by Parliament by legislation enacted in the years 1963 and 1967 and are designed to meet the transport needs of all people of the State whenever they move within the metropolitan area; and

- (ii) that adequate safeguards in the implementation of that part of the proposals accepted by the Government will be assured to the community because the transportation proposals are required (under the terms of the Planning and Development Act) to be consistent with the general provisions of the development plan as it may be varied from time to time;

and

(b) endorses:

- (i) the general principles underlying the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposals for the co-ordinated development of both public and private transportation and ancillary facilities; and
- (ii) the action taken by the Government in approving in principle a major proportion of the proposals as set out hereunder:

Retention of suburban rail passenger service on the four existing main lines to Outer Harbour, Gawler, Blackwood, and Hallett Cove, and extension of the Hallett Cove line to Christie Downs.

Construction of the King William Street subway to connect the two main lines on the north with the two main lines on the south and necessary modifications to rolling stock.

Express bus services on the Modbury Freeway.

Express feeder bus service on the Reynella Expressway to a transfer terminal at the Oaklands railway station.

An extensive programme of station modernization and reconstruction to encourage transfer from automobiles and feeder buses to the rail system.

Twenty suburban rail road-grade separations.

Arterial road system: 220 miles of arterial road improvements including 20 miles of new arterial roads, and 200 miles of arterial road widening.

Expressways—

Dry Creek Expressway  
Glenelg Expressway  
Gawler By-pass  
Reynella Expressway  
Port Wakefield Expressway

Freeways—

Noarlunga Freeway  
Hindmarsh Interchange  
Salisbury Freeway  
Port Freeway  
North Adelaide Connector  
Modbury Freeway

and contained in the report and excepting certain proposals which include those relating to the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway (affecting the eastern and southern suburbs) and the Goodwood-Edwardstown rail diversion (in the western suburbs);

and

(c) is of the opinion:

- (i) that the Metropolitan Transportation Committee should annually make a written report to each House of Parliament on the programme of work in implementing the proposals contained in the report which are accepted from time to time by the Government; and
- (ii) that the Government should continue its examination of existing legislation relating to the compulsory acquisition of land and introduce amendments thereto so as to ensure just compensation for persons affected by the acquisition of land necessitated by those proposals—

which the Hon. D. A. Dunstan had moved to amend by striking out all words after "That" first occurring and inserting:

"this House is of the opinion:

- (a) that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report does not make adequate provisions for the development of transport movement in metropolitan Adelaide;
- (b) that the plan should be withdrawn and referred to the State Planning Authority for reassessment to ensure:
- (i) a properly integrated plan for roads and public transport development;
- (ii) that any plan is financially feasible;
- (iii) that the destruction of houses and other properties is minimized;
- (c) that the Government should proceed forthwith to amend legislation on compulsory acquisition of land so as to ensure just compensation for persons affected by the proposals.

(Continued from August 13. Page 954.)

The House divided on the Leader of the Opposition's amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Teusner and Venning.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Loveday and Riches.  
Noes—Messrs. Giles and Wardle.

The SPEAKER: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, it is necessary for the Speaker to give a casting vote, and I give my casting vote for the Noes, so the question passes in the negative.

Amendment thus negatived.

The House divided on the Premier's motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Teusner and Venning.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Giles and Wardle.  
Noes—Messrs. Loveday and Riches.

The SPEAKER: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, it is necessary for the Speaker to give a casting vote, and I give my casting vote for the Ayes, so the question passes in the affirmative.

Motion thus carried.

### LOAN ESTIMATES

In Committee.

(Continued from August 7. Page 790.)

Grand total, \$101,716,000.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): The Treasurer, when in Opposition, had the habit of making fairly bitter speeches on the Loan Estimates, and he laid down a series of principles that he said ought to operate in relation to the Loan moneys of the State. He not only made these observations in the Parliament more than once: he also stumped the countryside repeating them and accusing me, as Treasurer, of having raided the Loan funds. I want to remind the Treasurer of some of his words, because they make absolute nonsense of the document that he has introduced. When speaking on the last Loan Estimates introduced by the Labor Government, the present Treasurer stated:

If we do not reach out into the public sector, how can we hope to attract industry and for capital investment to accrue in the private sector? This document does not do that. The Treasurer does not intend to use all available funds for developmental works. On the contrary, he has said:

In looking at expenditure proposals, the Government has had regard to the inevitable heavy pressures on Revenue Account—

that is, to the Budget Account—  
and has therefore decided to provide again—

as it provided last year—

in the Loan Estimates for all grants for building purposes for tertiary education and for non-government hospitals. The provisions for these purposes aggregate \$7,000,000 in 1967-68 compared with a peak requirement of \$8,802,000 in 1966-67.

This means that development is to be once again sacrificed to Budget expediency. The sum that should have been available for growth works this year is \$7,000,000 less than it ought to have been, and in the two years the total inroad into developmental works finance is increased by \$16,000,000. That means that, in the last year and the present year of this Government's Administration, \$16,000,000 which ought to have been used for developmental work in this State has been used to bolster the Budget.

The present Treasurer was saying then that we ought not to have used Loan moneys for buildings for tertiary education and for non-government hospitals, that instead we should have charged those buildings to the Revenue Account. Doing that would have meant that we would have had that much less to spend from Revenue Account and, in consequence, we could not have given to the State the services for which we were paying from Revenue Account: we would have had to sack Government employees whose salaries or wages amounted to more than \$12,000,000.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes, but we always—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Treasurer cannot have it both ways. He cannot go around saying that the Labor Government was a spendthrift Government. His Government has not reduced our expenditure. Did members of the present Government say that we should not have increased hospital expenditure by 55 per cent a head of population as we did in the three years in order to catch up on the extraordinarily low level of Government hospital expenditure in the State? Government members would not specify anything, except that the Premier said that I spent too much money by employing a public relations staff in the Premier's Department, yet he has a bigger public relations staff employed at public expense than I ever had! He has even engaged a camera man now to take pictures of him, at Government expense.

From the way the Treasurer carried on when he was in Opposition, including what he said

when he went around the State, and from what was said in Liberal Party pamphlets about raids on the Treasury for tertiary education buildings and non-government hospital buildings, we would have expected that, under this Government, such projects would cease to be charged to the Loan Account, but that has not happened last year or this year. Instead, the present Government has charged to the Loan Account a few more items that the Playford Government and the Labor Government charged to Revenue: in other words, the present Government is doing the very thing that it condemned us for doing and it is going even further.

Last year, the Treasurer's excuse for this was that he was faced with the need for financial stringency because I had used some Treasury balances at a time when it was vital to run a deficit Budget in this State in order to pump money into an economy that had been depressed by the Treasurer's Commonwealth colleagues. One would have expected that this year, if last year's excuse was supposed to be valid, something would be done to reverse the trend and that we would have seen some adherence to the principle that the Treasurer had seen fit to lay down. But what has happened?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What about the \$8,750,000 deficit?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will read out what the Treasurer has done with the money this year. The total amount put aside in the Treasury (not spent) from moneys borrowed by the State, not from revenue, have been salted away in the Treasury, even though we have been paying interest on that money. The total for the two years was \$12,477,000 in savings so set aside. Out of that, \$7,905,000 comes against accumulated deficit.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Reduced from the previous year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, by an unexpected minor surplus of \$460,000 in the Revenue Estimates.

Mr. Corcoran: How did he do that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One can expect some fluctuations in this area, and I do not blame the Treasurer.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You couldn't do it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary, I did it: the Treasurer does not seem to have a good memory. He was hopping up and down here, asking me how I had managed. What I have said means that, even if we were to accept the Treasurer's excuse on this issue

last year, this year he has put into the Treasury \$4,000,000 that he has not spent, but that money is not placed against an accumulated deficit or anything else. He has available for spending on school buildings, hospitals and other Government works, an amount of \$4,000,000. What is happening to it? Is it being invested to the limit to provide for developmental works in South Australia? No. It is money borrowed and we are paying interest on it; it is sitting in the Treasury and nothing is being done with it. The Treasurer is paying interest on the surplus from last year, and in the course of this year he will be putting money into the Treasury and paying interest on it.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That is not correct.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the course of this year to which these Loan Estimates refer that money will be paid into the Treasury and interest will be paid on it. Although it is available for developmental works, it will not be spent. The Treasurer cannot deny that. Why was it necessary for the Treasurer to take the \$7,905,000 and put it away in the Treasury? The Treasurer knows full well that the Treasury of this State at the time this Government took over was perfectly buoyant and was perfectly able to meet every call upon it, that this State was in dire need of money to be spent on developmental works, that we had a number of unused resources, and that the building industry needed a stimulus. Yet during that period, when he could have met every conceivable call made on the Treasury, he made arrangements to stick away in the Treasury \$12,477,000 that he could have used for developmental works.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That is not correct. I did not make arrangements to do that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is correct. That is what you have done.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That is what happened, but I did not make arrangements to do it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Your own statement says that that is what is happening.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I said I did not make such an arrangement.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is how you have chosen to dispose of the moneys. Is that right?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No: I am carrying forward a substantial amount of money.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: You are paying in total into the Treasury \$12,477,000.

There is \$7,905,000 put aside to finance accumulated revenue deficits in the Treasury, and \$4,000,000 is being set aside for any future eventualities. What the Treasurer is saying is, "Oh, well, the kind of deficit that the Labor Government ran up may occur at a later stage. We may be faced with this sort of thing so, instead of using the money on developmental works which I said at the time the Labor Government was having to run a deficit should have been spent on developmental works and not used against any revenue deficit, I am using it against a future revenue deficit." That is what he is saying. That makes absolute nonsense of his claim. The Treasurer accused me of raiding the Loan funds. As far as raids on the Loan funds are concerned, the Treasurer makes Black-beard look like a choir boy. Obviously, he does not have to read the history of piracy to be able to go in for a little bit of it—and that is what is happening here. Consistently, this Government has utterly belied the things it said to the public from this House and on the stump about what should properly be done with the Loan funds of this State. It has used Loan money consistently, as against past and future deficits.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Then I am in very good company.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is happening here is that the Treasurer is calmly admitting that what we did was right and he is going to do the same.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No, I did not.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Then what are you doing it for?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I simply said we were in good company if you think the company is good.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Either the Treasurer sticks up for the principles he is putting forward or he does not. He says that this was what ought to have been done and that we were dreadful people for not doing what he said. Now he is doing it himself and he says, "We are in good company." We are criticizing the Treasurer for the grossest inconsistency and his most cynical and deliberate attempts to mislead the public of South Australia about the proper course of budgeting in this State. It was the constant claim of the Liberal Party that we were being irresponsible in financing and, when we point out that this Government is only doing the same now as we were doing, but more so, it says, "You cannot complain; we are in good company." I do not know what consistency

means to the Treasurer, but obviously he does not know the meaning of the word. Apart entirely from questions of consistency, it is quite clear that South Australia was in a position to be able to spend the money that the Treasurer has decided should be set aside from the Loan Fund, as against past and future revenue deficits. The Government was in a position to spend this money and it is in a position to spend it now. It is not necessary for the buoyancy or the viability of the Treasury for the Treasurer to set this money aside from Loan funds and to fail to spend it upon developmental works which would mean more employment for people and the use of more materials and resources in the State. Because the Treasurer has chosen to do what he has done, this State is worse off in employment, the purchase of materials and the achievement of developmental works (and particularly our vitally necessary schools and hospitals) than it would have been had the Treasurer not made these decisions.

I remember vividly that, when we were in office, no sooner had we taken office than honourable members opposite were leaping up and down (when they were on this side of the Chamber) demanding that we immediately build a new teaching hospital. That started within months of our taking office, although at the time members opposite were in office there was not even a line on the drawing board for such a hospital. They knew the time it would take to plan it and get it into operation. Nevertheless, they were demanding that immediately we should spend the money. They jeered at the provision of a hospital at Modbury but said that, had they been in office, they would have got it built. We planned the teaching hospital and the Modbury Hospital, and we got the land for both of them. We referred the Modbury Hospital project to the Public Works Committee and we undertook the commencement of the works for it.

Our plans for the teaching hospital were ready to go to the Public Works Committee. When this Government took office, having campaigned all around the State on the vital urgency of proceeding first with the teaching hospital at Flinders, which it said should have priority over the Modbury Hospital, the thing was scrapped and withdrawn; the Government said it would set about replanning it. Although this Government has been in office now for a considerable period, a period during which it could have revised any plans for

the teaching hospital and gone ahead with presenting them to the Public Works Committee, this project has not in fact been properly proceeded with. In the meantime, the Modbury Hospital remains largely a hole in the ground, and the projected time table for it has been remarkably lengthened, according to the explanation given in these Loan Estimates. The original time table agreed for the Modbury Hospital has been extended. Why is this money not being used upon these two vital projects on which honourable members opposite, when they were in Opposition, were demanding immediate action from the Government?

What has happened to the Government's fervour for developmental works of this kind, such as necessary teaching hospital provisions about which they were our constant critics, when they have this money available and refuse to spend it? What has happened to the Government's fervour for education development buildings? As the Opposition, it was constantly demanding that we build more schools than we were building. What has happened to the schools programme? There is not an adequate expansion in that and we are in constant difficulties about school accommodation, as is shown by the protests by parent-teacher organizations throughout the State. Why is this money not being spent on schools development? It seems that the Treasurer prefers to go completely contrary to the things he said when in Opposition and to salt the money into the Treasury rather than spend it on development. The only thing one can conclude from the Loan Estimates is that on this, as on so much else, this Government deserves no credibility for the public statements it is prepared to make, because what it does quite cynically is to say one thing one moment and the opposite thing the next moment. What it said it would do when in Opposition it has no intention of honouring when in Government.

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): I should like to comment about the M.A.T.S. plan and its effect on the Hills area. We have an excellent freeway, but it has been over-glorified. I have said this before and it is time to say it again, so that the department may cease in future going to extremes in developing freeways. The cost of the lights on the Hills Freeway is estimated to be \$130,000, and \$3,000 a year is to be spent for the power to maintain them. The people of the area appreciate the benefit and

services they have received from the freeway, but the people believe that too much money has been spent on its glorification. If the Highways Department does the same thing with many other freeways to be developed in the State, we believe that the full benefit will not be derived from money that is available to that department. Some members have claimed that railways are the only form of public transport and that freeways do not help. However, they do, because many people travel on a public transport system that is maintained by bus services, and freeways will speed up these services. There must be freeways to co-ordinate rail and road public transport and, therefore, increase the efficiency of that transport.

I believe that most members have received a letter from the St. Peters corporation stating its objection to the M.A.T.S. plan as a whole. However, I believe that the Mayor, Mr. Tomkinson, would not object to freeways: I think he would believe in them and support the M.A.T.S. plan. I am satisfied that he would be one member of the corporation who would be 100 per cent in favour of the plan and, if he were not, I would be amazed. I remember that in the early 1960's, as a partner in a firm, he advertised frequently that there were benefits to be received by building adjacent to the proposed freeway through the Payneham area. The advertisement stated that the increasing importance of the area was indicated by its being favoured for the route of the newly planned "super" freeway, which was twice the width of Anzac Highway. I am sure that he would be one member of the corporation who would favour developing freeways within the city area.

We have another problem in my district of acquisition, apart from freeways, and that is concerning properties for reservoirs. The Engineering and Water Supply Department intends to acquire at least 45 farming properties at Clarendon in order to build a new reservoir, about two-thirds the size of the present Mount Bold reservoir. People living in this area are as much concerned about compensation and the effect of acquisition on them as are people who live in the path of a proposed freeway, expressway, or road extension. Some of these people are elderly, and some have lived in the area all their lives and have family ties there. Members should not cry pity for some elderly people and not worry about others. We know that people are affected by progress, but if we are to progress

someone has to suffer. We cannot supply services and facilities to the community without someone in the path of progress having to suffer.

I agree that fair compensation must be paid. Whether or not this has been done in the past when people's property has been acquired, we should see to it that this is done in the future. Property ties and family or other special interests should be considered. I congratulate the Government on setting up a court to decide what is fair compensation. I do not think that fair compensation has been paid in all cases concerning the freeway through the hills. At times the compensation has been very good, but in other cases individuals have suffered. I refer to a case of which the Minister is aware, because I have discussed the problem with him several times. I do not think the woman involved has received fair compensation. She is unfortunate: she lost her first husband in a prison camp during the Second World War, and her second husband died from a recurrence of an injury received during the same war. She tried to sell her property in 1965 but could not do so because the Highways Department was surveying in the area: the department was going through the middle of the property but it was not prepared to buy it at that stage. She had an opportunity to sell the property at more than \$10,000 in 1965, but had to borrow money to pay interest on the mortgage on the property and another one she was living in because she could not continue the business at the first property. When the department took possession it paid \$7,700 compensation. She not only lost interest on the money tied up in the property for 3½ years but she also lost on the actual money she was paid for the property.

In cases such as this the court, if set up, could consider these matters specifically and award just compensation. I am a great believer in a Parliamentary commissioner or ombudsman, because I believe that as Parliamentarians we cannot always receive complete justice from some departments. I do not intend to criticize departments always, but if there are faults the only way they can be rectified is for us to keep plugging away.

Concerning schools, there has been an outcry that not enough money is being spent. I am chairman of one high school committee and a member of another, and at a meeting the other evening it was suggested that all members of Parliament be informed of the present position with schools and of the opinions of the teachers in our schools.

I express thanks to the department for the money it is spending on the recreation ground at Heathfield. Some people believe that this is an extravagance. That may be the case, but I cannot judge until the work is well under way. Some \$53,000 has been allotted to this project. The people of the area are thankful that, after four years of pleading, they are to be given this money to develop the area. Heathfield High School has a beautiful brick building and it will have wonderful playing fields, whereas Mount Barker has 27 separate Highways camp buildings to house about 400-odd students and only reasonable playing fields. It is hard to justify one against the other. I am aware that more money is needed for education but, if we spend more money on education, it must come from the people or we must cut down on other services. I think all honourable members would agree with this. We can ask the Commonwealth Government for money. However, it is still the people's money, and the Commonwealth Government would have to cut down another service or ask the people for more money. There is no alternative.

For any honourable member to say that all the money collected in Australia is not spent on the people of Australia, in the main, is wrong. If people ask for more services, they must be prepared to pay more money for them. The Leader of the Opposition has said this on many occasions. It is no good anyone saying that it is only the education phase of our services that has to be improved. Whether it be hospitals, social services, the Botanic Garden or the Agriculture Department, not one department has enough money. It may be because we ask for more than we can afford to pay. We have heard of one country that spends 40 per cent of its income on education, but it may spend only 20 per cent on some other phase of community life. We spend 25 per cent. People go to another country and pick out its best points, but one should not go to other countries and pick out only the best points of their economy and bring those ideas back. To adopt the best things from each country we would need an 80 per cent bigger budget.

We are taxed heavily in Australia, although in some countries taxation is heavier than it is here. As I say, we are taxed heavily enough now, so I do not believe that taxation should be increased. The man in the street who looks at Government departments believes sometimes that there is a wanton waste of money. At times

I believe this is so. I have received a reply from the Highways Department, through its Minister, that the department was not able to shift the gang of men and equipment in the Adelaide Hills during the winter months and work it at the other end of the freeway towards Callington, where the weather is much drier. It was said that this could not be done because the department could not acquire certain property. However, under legislation introduced by the previous Government the department does have power to acquire property; it can serve notice to treat and acquire property and let the matter of fair compensation be decided by the Supreme Court. Proof that this has been done can be found in the cases of several properties within the Stirling-Crafers area, so for the department to use this argument is wrong. If the department had told me that it had had trouble with surveyors or engineers in the designing of the road, it

would have been a different argument. This was the reply I received, and although in the department's opinion it may have been an honest reply I do not believe that it was a correct reply. The department could have acquired and taken possession of the property if it had wished to do so. If the same thing applies at Clarendon, I am sure that the department will serve notice to treat, take the properties and pay the departmental valuation, with the court deciding the balance if necessary. I believe that the Loan funds are being spent wisely. Even though there are some areas of complaint in my own district, I know that (all things considered) my district has been given just consideration.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 19, at 2 p.m.