

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 17, 1969.

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

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The **SPEAKER**: I notice in the gallery His Excellency the Ambassador of Thailand (Mr. Prasong Bunchoem). I know it is the unanimous wish of honourable members that His Excellency be accommodated with a seat on the floor of the House, and I invite the honourable Premier and the honourable Leader of the Opposition to introduce our distinguished visitor.

Mr. Prasong Bunchoem was escorted by the Hon. R. S. Hall and the Hon. D. A. Dunstan to a seat on the floor of the House.

PETITIONS: ABORTION LEGISLATION

The Hon. R. S. HALL presented a petition signed by 51 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; 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 current practice.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE presented a petition signed by 57 members of the Immanuel Lutheran Church, North Adelaide, 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 rights 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 that might permit current practice.

Mr. JENNINGS presented a similar petition signed by 37 persons.

Petitions received.

PETITION: COLEBROOK HOME

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 139 persons who strongly objected to the decision not to grant a licence to Colebrook Home to enable it to care for more than four children under the age of 12 years and to deny it the renewal of the lease of the premises and grounds. The petitioners prayed that the South Australian Government would be guided by the recommendation of the Parliamentary Select Committee on the Welfare of Aboriginal Children that the home should be encouraged to expand its activities.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

HOSPITAL TREATMENT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A constituent who is a pensioner aged 80 years was advised by his doctor to seek assistance at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for an eye condition. He took to the hospital a letter from his local practitioner and at the weekend received advice of an appointment with Doctor Handley at what I presume is the ophthalmology clinic for Friday, April 17, 1970. As this seems an extraordinarily long time to wait for attention of this kind, will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to take up with the Superintendent of the hospital the possibility of pensioners who require medical services at hospital clinics getting earlier appointments?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get a report from the Chief Secretary.

PENSIONERS' ACCOMMODATION

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I understand that, pursuant to legislation introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament, the Commonwealth Government will make \$25,000,000 available to the States over five years for the building of self-contained accommodation for single pensioners. As the Treasurer knows, in past years institutions in South Australia, particularly religious organizations, have been providing rest homes for the aged and cottages for persons in need, for which work these institutions have been subsidized by the Commonwealth Government and the State Government. As I understand that South Australia will benefit from the Commonwealth plan by several million dollars, has the Treasurer any information about the plan and about whether the institutions to which I have referred will receive some of the money available to build this accommodation? Further, can he say whether some of this money will be allocated to the Housing Trust to build the type of accommodation referred to?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As announced in the press, a Bill has been introduced in the Commonwealth House of Representatives providing for the Commonwealth Government to make a grant of \$25,000,000 to the States to provide single-unit self-contained accommodation for single pensioners. This has been confirmed in my discussions with the Secretary to the Commonwealth Minister for Housing (Dame Annabelle Rankin) and the General Manager of the Housing Trust. Mr. Nimmo came to Adelaide to discuss the details, and subsequently forwarded a letter to me from the Commonwealth Minister, with a copy of the Bill and the second reading explanation, confirming the discussions already held and the terms on which the money would be made available. It will be allocated on the basis of the relative number of persons entitled to this assistance in each State. South Australia will get about \$2,000,000 during the five-year period. The Commonwealth Government has asked that, because of this Commonwealth grant, the State do not diminish its own activity in this field or in any other field concerning aged persons' accommodation, and we have given this undertaking. It will not affect the Commonwealth's general provision for subsidies to aged persons' homes conducted by any organization or institute, as this is a subsidy for general application, and it will not affect the State's subsidy to such enterprises, which we are still subsidizing in respect of furniture and fittings, and so on. The money

is allocated first to the State: the question whether the State is entitled to pass on, or the Commonwealth would accept the State's passing on, to private or semi-private organizations any portion of this money for the same purpose has not been canvassed, so I cannot say directly whether other parties can participate in this scheme. The honourable member's question is interesting and important, and I will carry out research into the matter and, if necessary, discuss it with the Commonwealth Minister to ascertain whether this is intended as part of the scheme or whether the money must be spent entirely by the State. If it is to be spent by the State, this will be done through the agency of the Housing Trust.

FISHING VESSELS

Mr. CORCORAN: About two or three weeks ago a notice appeared in newspapers throughout the South-East informing professional fishermen who owned vessels under 25ft. long that they were required to register the vessels for survey in accordance with the regulations tabled in this House. As the Minister of Marine is aware that the fishing season will commence on November 1, can he say whether the department will be able to survey all the vessels under 25ft. long (they will be surveyed first, I take it) before the season commences, or will fishermen on whose vessels the surveys have not been completed before November 1 be required to lose time during the season in order to comply with the survey regulations?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The problem raised by the honourable member has caused me concern: he will realize and recall that the introduction of these survey regulations for vessels of a smaller footage than previously applied was a recommendation of the fishing industry, and this is one reason why extra publicity was given when the regulations were introduced, in order that persons concerned could inform the department, comply with the regulations, and have their vessels surveyed. As recently as last week I was informed by my officers that the response was not as great as had been hoped, and this presents some problems. I would not lightly defer implementing the regulations, because the survey regulations are designed principally to ensure the preservation of the safety of the fishermen themselves. Indeed, in the honourable member's district at least two unfortunate disasters have occurred recently.

I believe that the regulations should be strictly enforced and that it is essential that this be done on an equitable basis. Not only

small vessels but all vessels that require a re-survey are involved. Having agreed last year to a deferment of the normal survey while these regulations were being prepared, I cannot agree to any further extension. I believe it is in the fishermen's own interests that the vessels in question be surveyed now, especially as the fishing industry itself has requested this survey. However, I will consider the point raised by the honourable member. I suggest that he may help both Parliament and the fishing industry if he points out to the people concerned the necessity for conducting this survey.

Mr. Corcoran: I want to know whether the survey will be completed on the vessels prior to the opening of the season.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Let me add that, in an effort to help the small-boat owners concerned, the department has engaged extra surveyors so that the work can be expedited. Further, at the request of the fishermen priority is being given to surveying the small-length craft.

Mr. CORCORAN: The Minister of Marine will be aware that in conjunction with the survey of fishing vessels there is also to be issued, I believe, to skippers of fishing vessels, a certificate of competency, and this would replace what was previously known as a certificate of service. I believe that certain examinations (written, oral and practical) have to be undertaken by applicants, who must have had about three years' service, not necessarily consecutive (as I may be incorrect concerning the details, I would appreciate it if the Minister would obtain for me the exact requirements laid down in connection with obtaining this certificate). Will the Minister find out what steps his department is taking to implement the issuing of the certificate and to see that people in charge of fishing vessels hold a certificate of competency?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I shall be glad to get the details the honourable member seeks.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. GILES: At the beginning of August our metropolitan reservoir holdings were satisfactory and, despite the most unseasonable and dry weather that occurred later in August, there has since been considerable rain during and since the show period. As I am sure that the House will be extremely interested to learn of the present holdings of the metropolitan reservoirs, I now ask the Minister of Works to give that information.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: True, the rains of the last week or so have been extremely welcome but, although the reservoirs received an appreciable intake, I remind the House that pumping is continuing on the Mannum-Adelaide main, involving the use of two pumps off-peak. In addition, in connection with the Warren reservoir we are pumping on the Swan Reach to Stockwell main. Referring specifically to the honourable member's question, I point out that as of yesterday at 8.30 a.m., with total capacity for the metropolitan reservoirs at about 36,000,000,000 gallons, the reservoirs are currently holding about 31,295,000,000 gallons—equivalent to about 90 per cent capacity. I understand the watershed is still running and, if there is considerable rain in the next few days, the metropolitan reservoirs could fill. However, we cannot count on that, and pumping will continue.

The water position in the metropolitan area for the coming summer is secure, and this applies also to the Murray River position. We will have a satisfactory river level this year not only because of the snow on the mountains but also because of the welcome rains falling in the Australian Alps over the last two weeks. Mount Bold reservoir is about 95 per cent full; Myponga reservoir is almost full; South Para reservoir is about 85 per cent full; and, whereas Millbrook reservoir was extremely low until a month or so ago (because of the construction work taking place downstream at Kangaroo Creek), because of the rain and more particularly the pumping being undertaken, this reservoir now holds 2,398,000,000 gallons, its capacity being 3,647,000,000 gallons. Warren reservoir is about 75 per cent full and Tod River reservoir about 80 per cent full.

ABORTION

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The *Advertiser* of September 10, in a report of a meeting of the National Health and Medical Research Council, states that the matter of an abortion should be left to individual doctors and that the doctors should not be subject to prosecution for recommending or carrying out, in their wisdom, such an act. I understand that the purpose of the current Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill is to make what is case law into Statute law so as to give medical practitioners the protection which, according to the council's resolution, they seek. Is the Attorney-General satisfied that the Bill does that (I think it does) and, if it does not, will he ensure that it does?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Bill, which was before the House last session and which it is intended to revive some time this session (probably in the reasonably near future, depending on the business of the House), provides for what is in essence the putting into statutory form of what is believed to be the present common law position in South Australia, as well as the controversial social clause. I think that most of the petitions that have been presented to the House have been couched in the terms of a request that the law be put into statutory form or codified (I think that is the word used) but that it should not go any further, whereas my view is that the Bill, as it stands, puts the law into statutory form and makes one or two other administrative reforms, except for the social clause. This latter is a matter of great controversy on which each member will be entitled to speak and, after full inquiry, I hope each member will make up his own mind and vote on it.

As a result of my observations in Great Britain and, to some extent, in the United States of America, where this is a very live matter as well and where alterations in the law have already been made in a number of States and other amendments to Bills have been introduced in some of the other States, some of which I visited, to alter the law along the lines of the model Bill drafted by the American Bar Association or the American Law Institute (but I shall be able to canvass that at the proper time), I think it is probably desirable to move further amendments to the Bill, particularly regarding consultation before an operation is undertaken and who should be permitted to perform the operation. If those amendments are moved, they will be moved by me personally and not as a result of the Select Committee's report. I assure the honourable member that there will be a full opportunity to debate all these matters, I hope within the next few weeks.

LEAF CUTTER BEE

Mr. RODDA: My question concerns the pollination of lucerne by the leaf cutter bee, which has been used successfully in the United States of America. Overtures have been made to the authorities to import this bee into the country. I understand that, if agreement is reached among all the States, it is intended to bring the bee into the insectories and have its working ability examined in this country to see whether it will be as valuable as it has proved to be in the U.S.A. However, there seems to be some slowness in reaching

agreement. As the people in my district are greatly concerned with the pollination of lucerne, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture to find out what progress is being made in these negotiations?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have noticed that, in a report of his recent trip, a Winston Churchill Memorial Trust scholar, Mr. R. H. Badman, draws attention to the leaf cutter bee and its use in the U.S.A. I will follow up the matter with my colleague and get a reply.

DENTURES

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the waiting time for patients of the Dental Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital requiring dentures and about whether the waiting time will be reduced when the new wing has been constructed?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Acting Administrator states that the facilities now available in the Dental Department would result in a better service if competent technical staff could be recruited and retained. At the present time there are vacancies for seven dental technicians. Because of the shortage of staff, the waiting list of persons requiring dentures is increasing rather than decreasing. Despite the new modern facilities difficulty is still being experienced in attracting suitable applicants to fill the vacancies.

WHEAT STORAGES

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of September 2, whether the silos at Eudunda, Hamley Bridge, Kapunda, Robertstown, Saddleworth and Tarlee will be able to accommodate quota wheat from the coming harvest?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The General Manager of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited states that, on account of large stocks of old season's wheat in silos and lack of shipping from Port Adelaide, it is not possible at this stage to indicate the space that will be available for quota wheat next harvest. The co-operative is anxious to receive all quota wheat during next harvest but the carry-over stocks which will be governed by sales and shipments will be the determining factor.

STAMP DUTIES

Mr. VIRGO: I have received correspondence from a constituent who has previously communicated with the Treasurer regarding

the amendment of the Stamp Duties Act involving payment by his firm, which is a motor-dealing firm in Adelaide. The part of his letter to which I wish to refer states:

A reply received from the Treasurer recently, stating that "sales tax is a Commonwealth matter and not under our control", merely ignored our complaint and appeared to indicate that there was no intention of modifying the Act.

The point this constituent is raising is that the new Act requires this company and, in fact, all companies, to pay stamp duty on money received for or on behalf of the Commonwealth Government in the form of sales tax. I refer particularly to Exemption No. 18 in the Act, which provides:

Receipt for any payment or any payment of a class made to any person under any Act of the Commonwealth or of a State of the Commonwealth which payment or class of payment is declared by proclamation to be a payment or class of payment, as the case may be, for the purposes of this exemption.

From this exemption provision, it appears that there is a provision under which the Treasurer could exempt the sum received by a firm in the form of sales tax, which must be immediately remitted to the Commonwealth Treasurer. I believe that sum could be exempt from stamp duties under this provision. If he can recollect the case in point, will the Treasurer say whether he considered the provision to which I have referred? If he did not, will he fully consider exempting from stamp duty moneys received which, in fact, are received virtually by a firm acting only as an agency of the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Frankly, I have not looked at this aspect of the matter and I have not been requested to look at it in the terms the honourable member now puts to me. The reply I gave to his constituent dealt with the situation as I saw it and as the Act has been interpreted, namely, that the tax is payable on all moneys received, and that is in accord with the reply I sent to his constituent. The honourable member now asks whether under another section of the Act I have power to remit certain moneys received, namely, in this case, sales tax. As I must look at that before I reply, I will do that.

LOANS FOR ABORIGINES

Mr. EDWARDS: Recently an Aboriginal had a long talk with me about his obtaining a loan from the Aboriginal Affairs Department so that he could set up in business on his own. This man is well educated and expressed himself to me as well as could any-

one else. A few years ago, he married an Englishwoman and they have three young children. He and his wife are as capable as any other Australian couple of bringing up their family. This man has been assured by three leading architects' firms in Adelaide that, if he can set up in business, they will give him all the work he can cope with, and that is why he asked me whether it was possible for an Aboriginal to obtain finance through the department to set himself up in business. I told him I could not answer his question but that I would raise it with the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. I thought I should raise it by way of a question in the House so that, when the answer was given, other Aborigines would also know whether they were eligible for loans. Can the Minister say whether Aborigines, such as the man to whom I have referred, are eligible to receive loans to set themselves up in business in South Australia, or anywhere else in Australia for that matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I very much appreciate the honourable member's approaching me about the matter in this way. I hope that what I am about to say will be given publicity so that all those eligible will know of the assistance that can be made available to them. The answer is that one of the ways in which the Commonwealth Government is anxious to help Aborigines and people of Aboriginal blood in Australia is by helping them set up in business. I suggest that, if the honourable member gives me the name and address of the man to whom he has referred, I shall write to him, suggesting he come in to see either me or the officers of my department. That is because our practice is to assist those who seek help to formulate and present an application to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance to establish in a business undertaking. As I have said, I hope this information will be made known widely throughout the community, because in my view this is an extremely valuable way indeed in which Aborigines and those of Aboriginal blood may be integrated fully in the community.

NOARLUNGA FREEWAY

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my question of September 2 about the Highways Department's purchasing houses along the route proposed in 1962 for the freeway to Noarlunga where hardship was being experienced by the owners, who otherwise would not know the position until the route

of the freeway had been re-examined and the result of such re-examination known in six months?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Until a decision is reached on the route to be adopted for the Noarlunga Freeway, the Highways Department has been instructed to give sympathetic consideration to the purchase of land along both the 1962 and the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study alignments in all cases where hardship is established. Each application will be treated on its merits.

BRAEVIEW SHOPPING CENTRE

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question about traffic congestion at the Braeview shopping centre?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The council has recently sought advice from the Highways Department regarding the landscaping of the areas and the regulation of access to minimize interference with South Road traffic. A request from the council for financial assistance for landscaping and kerbing is under consideration by Highways Department officers and will receive urgent attention. Parking arrangements are entirely under the control of council, except that parking on the through carriageways of South Road, which is a controlled access road, can be regulated by the Commissioner of Highways. The problem is one affecting mainly the service road and abutting properties where off-street parking is provided for, and the council's consultants have as recently as September 9 forwarded a parking scheme to the Road Traffic Board for consideration. The board will give this matter early attention.

DERAILMENT

Mr. HUGHES: On September 4, several grain trucks and sulphuric acid tankers were involved in a derailment on the railway line between Bute and Kadina, causing extensive damage to the trucks and, I understand, tearing down several poles carrying telephone lines. Fortunately, the acid tankers did not burst. As an inquiry has doubtless been held into this derailment because it is not the first on this line, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what was the likely cause of the derailment?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

COUNCIL AMALGAMATION

Mr. ALLEN: As members know, amalgamations of councils are taking place in various parts of South Australia. In my district, the

Corporation of Clare and the District Council of Clare have amalgamated and have seen fit to retain the mayoralty, whilst the District Council of Burra Burra has amalgamated with the Corporation of Burra and in this case the position of Chairman of the district council has been retained. Both amalgamations are working smoothly and, I understand, are approved by the ratepayers generally. Another amalgamation at present being negotiated is in the District of Light, involving the Upper Wakefield and Saddleworth councils. Will the Attorney-General obtain from the Minister of Local Government a report on amalgamations that have taken place or are pending and on the Government's views on council amalgamations?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be pleased to ask my colleague for the information.

FLINDERS RANGES

Mr. CASEY: I have been extremely concerned to read in this morning's *Advertiser* a letter to the Editor from Mr. David Higbed (President of the Town and Country Planning Association of South Australia) about the desecration, as he describes it, of the Flinders Ranges. The area that Mr. Higbed mentions is near Mount Painter and, as the Minister of Lands knows, uranium has been mined in this area for a number of years, extensive open-cut operations having been carried out during the last 12 months to establish whether the mine is an economic proposition. I understand, however, that so far it has not been proved to be such. Nevertheless, the mining companies are causing much desecration in an area which, as the Minister also knows, takes an extremely long time to regenerate. Will the Minister take this matter up with the Minister of Mines (who, although I understand he has been approached on the matter, unfortunately does not seem to be interested in conservation in this area) to find out whether the operations of the mining companies can be so regulated as to cause a minimum of damage to the area, which is one of the most beautiful spots in the State and which will continue to grow in popularity?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have taken this matter up with my colleague already and consideration of it is continuing. No change has been made in the present position and my inquiries have been directed at finding out just what is necessary and the importance of taking action. I agree that too much earth-moving to provide access tracks can be bad. On the other hand, the provision of

such tracks is not necessarily all bad, and I cannot say whether the company is at fault in doing what it is doing. I should like to correct the honourable member's statement that the Minister of Mines is not interested in conservation in this area. I know that my colleague is interested in it and that he is not merely pushing the matter aside. However, it is difficult to arrive at a satisfactory solution and we must try to establish how important the mining operations are likely to be. I do not expect to have a solution in the next few days, but the matter is being considered.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. FERGUSON: Recently, through the Minister of Lands I drew to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture the importation of pig meat into Australia and asked him what effect this would have on the pig industry in Australia and whether foot and mouth disease would enter this country because of such importation. Has the Minister of Lands a reply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The importation of canned pig meats is controlled by very rigid quarantine regulations which, *inter alia*, restrict imports of meat processed in this way to cans not exceeding two pounds in weight. This ensures that the normal heat processing (which is also strictly regulated) is adequate to sterilize the contents from the point of view of disease. I am informed that pig meats imported under the regulations are subjected to stringent ante and post-mortem inspections, and after canning must not be refrigerated during transport or after storing on arrival. These requirements are also designed to safeguard against the existence of disease-producing and other putrefactive organisms in the meat.

Importations from countries other than Canada, Ireland, New Zealand and the United States may be made only on the prior approval of the Director of Quarantine. The quarantine authorities throughout Australia regard these stringent conditions as adequate to guarantee that there is no risk of the introduction of animal disease. The importation of pig meats will no doubt have some effect on prices of pig meats on the local market. The question of tariff protection or prohibition of importation on economic grounds is a matter for the Commonwealth Government.

DOG-RACING

Mr. JENNINGS: When the member for Stirling was, I hope, winding up his reply on his motion for the establishment of totalizator betting on tin-hare coursing, he said:

I have for many years been a member of both the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the Animal Welfare League of South Australia, but they have not said that I am doing the wrong thing rather they have favoured this move.

He said later that Mr. Colley (Secretary of the R.S.P.C.A.) had said that the society had no complaint about the greyhound owners' association or its members. In the public columns of the *Advertiser* on September 8 both Mr. Colley and Mrs. Joyce Mills (Secretary of the Animal Welfare League) denied any association with tin-hare coursing and, indeed, they also made it clear that both organizations persisted in their opposition to the motion moved by the member for Stirling. In the light of these statements will the honourable member recant, and will he also say whether or not he knows that, when the Animal Welfare League was granted a considerable donation from the association, the league returned it as being unacceptable from that source?

The SPEAKER: Order! Previously, I have referred to Standing Order 124 about directing questions to private members. I shall read the Standing Order again, as follows:

At the time of giving Notices of Motion, questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members, relating to any Bill, motion or other public matter connected with the business of the House, in which such members may be concerned.

Members will understand that I ruled out of order a question asked of the member for Rocky River, because it was not a matter connected with the House. As this matter refers to a motion that is before the House I rule that it is in order. Does the honourable member for Stirling desire to reply?

Mr. McANANEY: As I shall still be speaking to this motion when the Order of the Day is called on, I will reply to any of these questions then.

RIDGEHAVEN SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General, in the absence of the Minister of Education, a reply to the question I asked on September 3 concerning access to the Ridgehaven Primary School?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have notified members on both sides of the House that, on behalf of the Minister of Education, I have several replies to questions that have been asked of her. In regard to this question, the registered proprietor of the land over which access to the Ridgehaven school will be obtained has indicated his preparedness to

consider the granting of rights of way, provided the Education Department erects a child-proof fence around the perimeter of the land on which his mother lives, and constructs suitable footpaths and roads for the children to walk on. The matter has been resubmitted to the Public Buildings Department for a report as to the feasibility of this proposal.

RISDON PARK SCHOOL

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General, in the absence of the Minister of Education, a reply to my recent request for a protection guard to be provided around the pumping installation at the Risdon Park Primary School?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member's suggestion has been noted by the Education Department, and a request will be forwarded to the Public Buildings Department asking that some sort of protection guard be provided around the pumping installation at the Risdon Park Primary School.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. WARDLE: In a summary of the Auditor-General's Report contained in this morning's *Advertiser*, the article states:

Any decision to abandon the Chowilla dam project in favour of alternative storage will mean financial loss to South Australia of \$5,000,000.

As I was under the impression that South Australia's share was a quarter of all costs involved under the River Murray Waters Act, will the Minister of Works say whether this published report is correct?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I saw the report in this morning's newspaper, and the honourable member is correct in his assumption that the indebtedness of South Australia is one quarter of the whole cost, and if just over \$5,000,000 is involved the State's involvement is about \$1,250,000. The position clearly shown in the Auditor-General's Report is that any indebtedness of South Australia is one quarter of the whole cost.

LARGS BAY SCHOOL

Mr. HURST: Has the Attorney-General, in the absence of the Minister of Education, a reply to my recent question about the position of the Largs Bay Primary School on the list of priorities for replacement?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Largs Bay has been included on a list of schools, which it is intended to replace. It has not been given a priority as yet but its claims will be reviewed from time to time when priority

lists are being drawn up. Much work has been done in recent years to provide better facilities at the school, but it is realized that there is a big proportion of timber frame buildings that it is hoped to replace in due course.

MIGRANT SCHOOLCHILDREN

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Attorney-General, in the absence of the Minister of Education, a reply to my recent question about consideration being given to provide extra teachers to help migrant children in schools, as many such children are included in the intakes each year?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Officers of the Education Department are well aware of the difficulties associated with the integration of migrant children. A recent survey has revealed that the number of migrant children who are finding it difficult to cope with their school work because of lack of English is about 900. The honourable member suggests that migrant children who are admitted to grades 1 and 2 should be placed in separate classes. Such an arrangement is not favoured. Experience has shown that migrant children at grade 1 and 2 level are absorbed and assimilated into the school situation much more readily than are older children, because of the ease with which they mix with English-speaking pupils. Most of these young migrant children manage the language well by the time they reach grade 3. Migrant children, who enter school at a later age, present a greater problem, and efforts are made to place them for part of each day in a special class where special instruction is given in language. Twenty-two such classes have been formed in primary schools throughout the metropolitan area, and as the supply of teachers improves, additional special classes for such children will be established.

BORES

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Premier obtained from the Minister of Mines a reply to my recent question about the logging of bores in the South-East?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Under existing legislation it is possible to compel drillers to provide accurate logs, samples, etc., of all wells drilled below prescribed depths in defined areas, and also for artesian wells. The great bulk of the State is not included in defined areas, and here the Mines Department is dependent on the good graces and reliability

of private drillers for accurate data. Much valuable hydrogeological information is being lost under the present system. To rectify this satisfactorily would entail fairly sweeping amendments to the Underground Waters Preservation Act and possibly some increase in water boring charges to cover time spent in collecting accurate strata and water samples.

SALINITY

Mr. ARNOLD: My question relates to the saline water build-up in Eckert Creek which is caused by the release of water from the Berri evaporation basin. This problem having arisen last year, certain work was carried out on the entrance to Eckert Creek in order to improve the flow and to try to push the saline water out and on its way once it had been released from the basin but this work evidently was not sufficient to solve the problem. Will the Minister of Works ask his department further to consider installing a large pipe with a lock-up gate, if required, which can be used in conjunction with the release of the saline water from the Berri evaporation basin, in order to solve this problem and to provide satisfactory water to the private irrigators along the creek?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The honourable member asked me this question some time ago, and investigations are currently proceeding within the department to see whether this problem can be solved by installing a larger inlet pipe. However, now that the honourable member has again asked the question, I will see whether the matter can be expedited and whether I can give him an early reply.

ST. PETERS LAND

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Following the occasion on which I put before the House material from the St. Peters corporation, I have had the following communication from the Town Clerk of that town:

This council has received a reply to its submission of January 20, 1969, from the Metropolitan Transportation Committee, and a copy of this reply is enclosed.

I will not read all of that; it is pretty vague. The letter continues:

The council regards this reply as being totally unsatisfactory, particularly in regard to the council's proposed major recreation ground adjacent to the Torrens River which will be bisected by the proposed Modbury Freeway. The principal factor which influenced this council in proceeding with the proposed recreation scheme was that only one dwelling would have to be demolished. If surrounding properties are to be acquired to compensate for the area lost to the Modbury Freeway,

it appears that some 20 dwellings will have to be acquired and demolished. This, of course, would be absolutely unacceptable to council.

The reference in the reply to the proposed Hills Freeway, that is, "the proposed Hills Freeway recommended in the study has not been approved by the Government" is not at all clear, and the council would be pleased to have some accurate and factual advice on this so that it may write to the residents in College Park in an endeavour to restore the status of the area to the position pertaining prior to the announcement of M.A.T.S., which has unquestionably created considerable hardship for property owners in College Park, particularly for those desiring to sell their properties. Any assistance which you can give the council will be greatly appreciated.

Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to examine urgently that part of the Modbury Freeway which is closest to the city area and which does involve the proposed recreation ground (the only possible recreation ground in the area; the council at the moment has only four acres of open ground in the whole of its area) to see whether the previous route of the freeway cannot be retained and to allow the recreation ground to proceed, this being an urgent necessity for the people in the area? Secondly, will he see whether some better and clearer information cannot be given in relation to the Hills Freeway so that the residents in the area are released from the present threat to their properties which makes it so difficult for them to dispose of their properties?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable the Leader should know (and I think he does know) that the Government has announced that the Hills Freeway will not proceed. However, I will discuss the matters he has raised.

HACK BRIDGE

Mr. EVANS: Recently, I received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply stating that the limit applying on the Hack bridge at Mylor was 10 tons. I sought this information because, when the main Mount Barker Road was flooded, all traffic, including semi-trailers up to 36 tons, was sent across this bridge. It is expensive having to police the limit applying on this bridge, as it necessitates officers of the department sitting in the area for hours at a time. In addition, it will be some time before the new bridge is completed and able to be used. In view of these facts, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether it is possible to increase the weight limit applying on this bridge by the construction of an additional support? I point out that next winter, in the event of flooding, the bridge

will not be able to be used safely, although it will form an important part of our means of communication with other States. Will the Attorney-General also find out when work on the new bridge will start?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will discuss all these matters again with my colleague.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: I draw the Premier's attention to an article in the *News* of September 8 headed "Dial-Bus Transit System", which states:

Two research workers have devised a computerized system for transporting people in a metropolitan area.

The article gives the details of the dial-a-bus system. I refer also to the comment of a Highways Department officer (Mr. Flint) who has done more than any other person to promote the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan and who, on September 16, forecast the development of personalized mass transport or public transport systems using small, automatic and convenient vehicles about the size of the present motor car. Today's *Advertiser* goes further and refers to the term used by the Minister of Roads and Transport—"the capsule comedy". That paper is obviously also of the opinion that this type of transport is now something of a reality. In view of the situation that has developed, showing clearly that the proposal put by the Leader of the Opposition on his return from the United States of America is both feasible and workable, will the Premier apologize for ridiculing the Leader when the Leader has really brought forward a sound workable proposition for the benefit of the State? In addition, will he require the Metropolitan Transportation Committee to take this matter into consideration when determining its future attitude on the M.A.T.S. plan?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I agree with the member for Edwardstown when he calls it "the capsule comedy", because in relation to the present needs of transportation for the planned period of the M.A.T.S. plan it would indeed be a comedy to think that South Australia could afford the very costly dial-a-bus system that the research workers have projected on paper. The reference to Mr. Flint's statements arose from a talk he gave to the Australian Road Federation Symposium on September 15. I was present at this symposium and Mr. Flint made it very clear that his role in the symposium was to discuss transportation developments in the post-1986 period, that is, beyond the M.A.T.S. period. He dis-

cussed as objectively as possible all the developments in transportation that could possibly be imagined at this point of time. This included tunnelling by laser beams and reference to many forms of transport, ranging from fully personalized to fully public transport. He made the point that all of these were purely in the very early stages of investigation and required many more years of research and development before their practicability could be assessed. He made the point that most of the systems, including capsules, appeared to require a road and freeway system on which to operate and, hence, any works of this nature that were constructed now and in the near future would almost certainly be a sound investment for the post-1986 period.

I consider that nothing which Mr. Flint said detracted in any way from the soundness of the present M.A.T.S. proposals. Obviously, if the member for Edwardstown were an exponent of capsule transport he would support the M.A.T.S. proposals, which provide for the freeways on which these capsules might operate. I do not know why he omitted the reference to laser beams; perhaps he could transport us by them in some miraculous fashion. However, he selects only that part of Mr. Flint's predictions for the future that will support his argument in this House. If he raises the matter of laser beams, I will obtain a report on their use as a means of transportation in the District of Edwardstown.

TANUNDA SEWERAGE

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on August 28 about priorities for effluent drainage schemes in country towns and about when plans for an effluent drainage scheme for Tanunda were likely to be completed?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Common effluent drains are installed and maintained by local authorities. Designs and specifications for all common effluent drainage schemes are approved by the Central Board of Health, and officers of the Department of Public Health supervise the installation of all schemes. Where requested by the local authority concerned, the department undertakes a preliminary survey to enable preliminary plans and estimates to be prepared to enable the local authority to decide whether or not it will proceed with the common effluent drain. Priorities for the preparation of preliminary surveys, and estimates and the subsequent preparation of plans and specifications are determined by the order of application by the local authority

unless there are strong public health reasons that demand urgent action being taken to install a drain in a particular area. Preliminary plans and estimates have been supplied to the Local Board of Health of Tanunda and if the council decides to proceed with the scheme the department will proceed with the preparation of final plans and specifications.

KAPUNDA HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I understand that the Attorney-General, in the absence of the Minister of Education, has a reply to my question regarding Kapunda High School.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Headmaster of Kapunda High School wrote to the Director-General of Education on August 21, 1969, requesting that art be introduced into the school curriculum. Approval of the request would entail the erection of an art room and the appointment of an art teacher. The matter is being investigated and it is hoped that a recommendation can be made at an early date. When a decision has been reached I shall be pleased to inform the honourable member.

WINDANA HOME

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to my question of yesterday regarding certain incidents that had taken place at the Windana Home over the weekend?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I did not bring this information to the House yesterday, but there are only four or five points I should like to make to amplify what I said yesterday. These lads were put into the section for neglected children because the Superintendent exercised his discretion and considered that they looked a little immature (I use his phrase) to go into the delinquent section, where they normally would have been put. This was not done because Windana was full. The figures for last Friday are as follows: in the delinquent section, there were 27 boys, and the capacity of that section is 33; there were 16 girls, and the capacity of that section is 21. In the neglected section, there were 27 boys, and the capacity of that section is 33; there were 14 girls, and the capacity of that section is 35. The honourable member will see that the decision to put these boys into one section instead of into another had nothing to do with the accommodation available: sufficient accommodation was available.

Mr. Hudson: Was it the Superintendent's decision?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. He made an assessment of the boys and considered that they could more properly be put into the neglected section instead of into the delinquent section. Perhaps, as it turned out, it would have been better to put them into the other section, but this is a matter of discretion on which the Superintendent has to make up his mind. He decides to the best of his ability. I do not think it is necessary to read out the medical certificate, which I have here. In fact, I always find it difficult to read the writing of medical practitioners.

Mr. Broomhill: And lawyers.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, lawyers' writing on the whole is good, as is my writing. I think I described the medical certificate yesterday to the honourable member, and he is welcome to have a look at it. It is on Social Welfare Department paper, but he will see it is signed by a private medical practitioner. I wish to make one correction. I said yesterday that four boys had been punished before any complaints were made by the mothers; in fact, only one boy had been punished up to that time. Subsequently, the three other boys were punished. Finally, I wish to make it clear that every effort is made at Windana and all the institutions under the department's control to avoid this sort of incident but, in the very nature of things, it is not possible to be absolutely certain that this sort of thing will not happen from time to time. We do everything we can to see that it does not occur, and I have made it clear again, as a result of this incident, that efforts are to be maintained, and indeed increased, to see that it does not happen again. One cannot guarantee that it will not happen, but every effort will be made to see that this sort of thing does not occur.

CAREY GULLY ROAD

Mr. GILES: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question whether the Minister could assist the East Torrens District Council to straighten the road to eliminate a bad corner, called White Corner, at Carey Gully?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague states that records show that only one accident has occurred at White Corner since the advisory speed signs were installed about a year ago. The cause in this case was recorded as inattentive driving. The Highways Department has determined that it is

not difficult for buses or heavy commercial vehicles to negotiate White Corner on the Carey Gully Road safely without the need to cross the road centre line. Further consideration has been given to realignment of this road, but the Highways Department is unable to justify the extremely high cost of carrying out this work.

PENSIONERS' SPECTACLES

Mr. BURDON: On August 20, 1968, I directed to the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, the following question in connection with pensioners' spectacles:

During the term of office of the previous Government I took up with the then Minister of Health the matter of providing a spectacles service for pensioners in country areas, and particularly in Mount Gambier. The then Premier (now the Leader of the Opposition) announced on February 19 that a pilot scheme would be introduced and that Mount Gambier would be the starting point. I understand this service was ordered by the Director-General of Medical Services. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, say what the present position is?

I received a reply to that question on September 3, 1968. Recently, the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) asked the Premier a similar question and, on September 4, 1969 (one year and one day after I received the reply to my question) the honourable member received a reply that was, word for word, the same as the one I had received in 1968. This matter was initiated while the previous Government was in office. In view of the long delay since an assurance was given in the original reply to me, will the Premier make urgent representations to the Commonwealth Government and the Australian Medical Association so that a scheme can be instituted in South Australia for the benefit of pensioners requiring spectacles?

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

PERPETUAL LEASES

Mr. NANKIVELL: During the term of office of the previous Government some restriction was placed on the transfer of Crown land leases: these could be transferred only to joint tenancy. Can the Minister of Lands say whether consideration has now been given to transferring leases to any other forms of tenancy, such as common tenancy, and whether or not land can now be held in the name of a private company?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is permissible. The Government does not object

to a private company's holding perpetual leases but it requires that it be notified of any transfer of ownership of shares, and the right is always there to refuse a transfer if the Minister considers that, on its merits, an application should not be allowed.

COMMONWEALTH WORKS

Mr. CASEY: I was rather surprised to read in this morning's *Advertiser* that South Australia was again the last in line of all the States regarding money received from the Commonwealth Government under the provision for the Commonwealth Works Department for 1969-70. During both of the two years the Premier has been in office, South Australia has been last in line. The Premier has given assurances time and time again that we will get a better deal from the Commonwealth, and it is unfortunate that this present state of affairs should take place when we are in dire straits regarding Commonwealth works in South Australia. I understand that Senator Bishop pointed out that 27 Commonwealth departments were located in South Australia and should be housed in a Commonwealth building. Will the Premier say whether, at any stage, he has approached the Commonwealth for a better deal for this State regarding the money allocated for the Commonwealth works programme and, if he has not, will he take up the matter urgently with the Commonwealth? I do not see why South Australia should be restricted in this way, for this State has about 10 per cent of the Australian population. I do not understand why South Australia should be the last in line both last year and this year. There has been an increase of about \$20,000,000 in works expenditure by the Commonwealth, yet this year South Australia has received \$613,000 less than it received last year. Will the Premier get a report on the matter?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This morning I saw a report that Senator Gordon Davidson had raised this matter in the Commonwealth Parliament. I think the honourable member will realize that Commonwealth expenditure cannot be maintained at a constant rate in any State, and that this expenditure is related to national policy and must follow the dictates of the national policy in regard to defence and national development. The honourable member will understand that, in previous years, when defence facilities such as Woomera were developed here, the implication for South Australia was different. Also, the injection of Commonwealth funds into this State is

not always recorded under the provision for Commonwealth works. The honourable member will understand that the \$6,000,000 provided for the construction of the Tailern Bend to Keith main is not shown in the provision for Commonwealth works generally. The direct grant of \$3,350,000 last financial year to assist the South Australian Government to more than balance its Budget does not appear in the general provision for works; in fact, that \$3,350,000 included \$2,000,000 that was specifically made available to the State without regard to the needs of other States. Therefore, this sort of activity, combined with the Commonwealth's obvious inability to keep this expenditure at a constant rate because of the size of the projects it has approved, has caused a slow spot to occur this year. The honourable member will realize that my Government has been able to make a start on standardization on the railway line between Adelaide and Port Pirie. The honourable member would also know that his Government tried for some time to start this project but that my Government, by commencing the study by consultants, has succeeded in getting it off the ground. The honourable member can expect that, because of my Government's representations to the Commonwealth Government, that Government's contributions will increase significantly in future years.

GOODWOOD TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about whether all the improvements asked for in the document sent to members of this House by the teaching staff are included in the building and improvement programme to be carried out at the Goodwood Boys Technical High School in this financial year?

The Hon. J. W. H. COURCE: Funds amounting to \$87,000 have already been approved for improvements to the Goodwood Boys Technical High School. Details of the proposed works are as follows:

1. New toilet facilities for students and staff are to be provided in a central and convenient position; offices for Headmaster, Deputy Headmaster, adult education class head, general office, duplicating room, and store are also provided in the same wing.

2. A new standard change room is to be built at the western end of the grassed area which will provide changing, showers and toilet facilities for students, as well as separate change and shower facilities for the physical education teacher.

3. The existing library is to be demolished and a new timber library 72ft. x 32ft. is to be

built in a central position of the school buildings.

4. A new timber building is to be erected on the site of the existing library which will provide for a staffroom approximately 32ft. x 32ft., a book room 16ft. x 24ft. and a boys' sick room 16ft. x 8ft.

I do not have a report on the other matters raised in the circular, but I will advise the honourable member further when these details become available. I have extended to the honourable member the courtesy of replying at this stage to most of the matters he has raised.

WEED SPRAYS

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question about hormone spraying?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director of Agriculture states that there is no metering device in existence that can test the atmosphere for hormone herbicide pollution in the vicinity of tomato glasshouses. If it did exist, the warning it gave would be too late, as once the air is polluted nothing can be done to remove the spray droplets. It is possible to detect small quantities of hormone-type herbicides in the plant by laboratory techniques. This, of course, is also too late, but such tests have been made recently by departmental weed control officers to determine whether standards set for the cereal growers to observe in the vicinity of the tomato glasshouses have been adequate. As soon as these tests have been completed a report will be submitted covering all aspects of the problem of spray drift at Murray Bridge.

ISLINGTON LAND

Mr. JENNINGS: Soon after the last State election I introduced a deputation from the Enfield council to the Minister of Lands about the use of the old Islington sewage farm site, and I have asked several questions of the Minister subsequently. He has told me that the biggest problem is to get the various parts of the land under one sovereign control and that when that is done his department will allocate the land to those who have sought it. I have found out, by rather devious means, that, instead of progress being made, the matter is almost where it began, scarcely anything having been done about the disposal of this extremely valuable piece of land. Once again I ask the Minister: can he give me the latest information about his sewage farm?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member has not got the position correctly. Very little progress was made until the land was transferred to the Lands Department some

time ago. Over a period of many years, several committees had dealt with the matter. When the land was transferred to the department, an officer was placed in charge of collating particulars of the requirements of the departments and semi-government organizations concerned. Most of the progress made was made then and the land has now been allocated to the semi-government and other instrumentalities, including the Enfield council, all of which have been consulted. Although the honourable member was given a plan and asked for his comments, no such comments have been received from him since he last asked a question about the matter. The allocation has now been settled and all that remains for determination is the way in which the industrial land, comprising about 300 acres, will be used. When roads are provided, about 266 acres of land will be available. This morning a submission was made to Cabinet on the final determination of the method of subdivision and it is likely that, when that decision is made, the matter will have to be referred to the Public Works Committee in connection with the industrial land. However, other blocks have been finalized as far as the various organizations are concerned.

GRAIN TRUCKS

Mr. VENNING: Yesterday the Attorney-General, when giving me a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my question about the cost of grain waggons, stated:

The final unit cost of the aluminium bulk grain waggons, 3ft. 6in. gauge (32.5 tons capacity), is estimated at \$13,588, which figure includes a nominal sum for the use of surplus narrow gauge bogies from the Peterborough Division. The corresponding figure for the standard gauge steel bulk grain hopper waggons of 53 tons capacity is \$11,055.

Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport why the Railways Department decided to use aluminium bulk grain waggons when their price was twice that of steel waggons, and whether the two contracts that have been called for and let will determine what type of rail waggons will be used in future?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will try to find out.

SENIOR CITIZENS CLUBS

Mr. HUDSON: Under current legislative provisions the maximum subsidy available to establish a senior citizens club is \$6,000, a limitation that was originally fixed in about 1963, and since that legislation was introduced several clubs have been constructed by taking

advantage of the available subsidy. Until now, the attitude of the Treasury has been that it was desirable to support as many senior citizens clubs as possible, so that it was not appropriate to increase the limit to, say, \$8,000, because this would have meant that a limited number of clubs would receive the subsidy. In the last six years, and particularly in the last 18 months, a fairly substantial increase in building costs has occurred. As the subsidy limit of \$6,000 is starting to look a little puny, will the Treasurer consider raising this limit to, say, \$8,000, because if this increase does not occur there will be a decline in the number of clubs established with the support of this subsidy, and a small increase in the limit would do much to assist new clubs that have been planned.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Although I think the question is reasonable, the policy has been to limit the subsidy in any one case to \$6,000. Several requests have been received for an additional subsidy to be used to enlarge an existing club, but the Government considered that this was not necessarily a good thing because, after all, the number of people who would benefit from using the clubs would have little or limited means of transport. So it is desirable not to establish large centres but to establish more smaller centres closer to the place of living of the people who use them. For that reason, as well as the actual amount involved, the subsidy has been held at \$6,000. I have not received any correspondence from a group intending to establish a club in which it has been stated that the club cannot be established because of the present subsidy limit. There have been two recent cases of clubs being established and I have attended both of them: one in the district of the member for West Torrens, where this matter was not raised, and one in my district. I am prepared to consider this matter, but I think that for this financial year, at least, it may be better to hold the subsidy at its present level.

TINTINARA BRIDGE

Mr. NANKIVELL: As I understand that a contract is to be let to construct a new overway bridge south of Tintinara on Main Highway No. 8, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether tenders have been called for this project and, if they have been, when the work will commence?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

ROADSIDE SIGNS

Mr. GILES: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my question of August 27 about two advertising boards used on the median strip on Grand Junction Road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Section 41 of the Highways Act requires that the consent of the Commissioner of Highways be obtained before the erection on any main road of "direction signs which may be used for advertising purposes". Signs erected without such consent may be removed by the Commissioner or by the local council, and the cost of removal may be recovered; there is no provision for a penalty. No consent was given for the particular signs referred to by the honourable member. The detection and removal of such signs, which are temporary and generally displayed only at weekends and holidays, is difficult, and the lack of a penalty, under the Highways Act, limits the effectiveness of this Act in preventing the practice.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. VENNING: As I understand that a committee of review is to be appointed to hear evidence from growers who are dissatisfied with their wheat quotas, which are to be imposed towards the end of September or soon after, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture for the names of members of this committee?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will refer the question to my colleague.

CLARENDON RESERVOIR

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the objection of the Stirling council to the closing of arterial roads through the proposed Clarendon reservoir area?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: The Engineering and Water Supply Department has written to the district councils of Stirling and Meadows and indicated on a plan the roads that the department intends to close to enable Clarendon reservoir to be built. The approval of each of the councils has been sought to these proposals. All but one very short section of road between sections 220 and 221N, hundred of Noarlunga, is in the area of the District Council of Meadows. A reply has been received from the District Council of Stirling objecting to the closing of the portion of road in that council's area, but so far no reply has been received from the District

Council of Meadows. When replies have been received from both councils, further consideration will be given to these road-closing proposals.

DARLINGTON WATER SUPPLY

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked him recently about the water supply for the Darlington area?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: Allotments 1 to 10 in Victoria Parade and allotments 34 to 39 in Wayne Avenue, Darlington, are at an elevation which is too high to be commanded and served satisfactorily with water. The mains in Victoria Parade and Wayne Avenue have been laid as far as lots 11 and 33, respectively, which are the highest allotments in those streets that can be satisfactorily supplied. At the time Mr. Korff was granted an indirect service he accepted the conditions that the supply might be intermittent with no guarantee of minimum pressure. Conditions have not changed in this area since May, 1967, and the department has no plans at this stage to serve this isolated area which is above the normal limits of supply.

MURRAY RIVER STORAGE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That in the opinion of this House any Bill introduced for an amendment to the River Murray Waters Act, 1935-1963, should provide that any contract let for the building of a major storage on the Murray River system should not precede the letting of a contract for the building of a storage at Chowilla, but may provide for the simultaneous letting of such contracts.

I do not intend today to traverse the whole of the argument concerning this matter. We have dealt previously in this House with the respective technical merits of a scheme for a better regulation of the flow of the Murray River by use of the Dartmouth dam and the assistance of the Menindee Lakes scheme as compared with the building of the dam at Chowilla. Members are well aware of the arguments on each side; they have made up their minds about it, and I do not think that any argument now advanced by anyone will change their mind about it at all. However, I believe it is vital that it be made clear what is the attitude of the people of this State to these projects.

Most South Australians believe (it is the unanimous view of members on this side and I believe it is also your view, Mr. Speaker)

that South Australia has to insist on its right to the building of Chowilla; and if an additional storage is to be built, that has to be an additional storage and not a substitute storage. In these circumstances, we could not countenance in this House legislation to alter the River Murray Waters Agreement in such a way as to simply leave the Chowilla agreement on the books, without any provision as to the date on which that agreement was to be carried out, and allow the building of some other major storage to proceed which could antedate the building of the storage at Chowilla. We have been given many excuses about the reasons for not having any hope of proceeding with the Chowilla scheme in South Australia, and the one that is put forward constantly by the Commonwealth Government and the proponents of the Dartmouth scheme is that both storages could not possibly be built. Well, any examination of the recent history of the attitudes and actions of the Commonwealth Government shows that that is not so and that this State has been ignored in regard to major construction works, whereas the Commonwealth Government has shown itself able to find vast sums of money for dam works in other parts of Australia—indeed, in every other State.

The Commonwealth Government can provide finance for the building of Chowilla and, if it wished to have an additional storage on the upper river at Dartmouth (this was evident from the decisions of the Minister for National Development before any technical studies were carried out) it could finance such a dam as well. Immediately before the Senate elections in 1967, the Commonwealth Government suddenly found \$68,000,000 for dam projects on the Ord River and in Northern Queensland. That was apart from its promise of \$50,000,000 to assist in water conservation projects in the States generally and in the Commonwealth, and it was apart from the existing works programme. In June of that year every State Treasurer had been told at the Loan Council meeting that there was no additional money for major storage works; that the Ord River and Nogoia projects could not proceed, because there was no money for them; and that it would be impossible to finance a Loan works programme beyond that which was agreed to at the Loan Council meeting.

We were told there would be no special grants whatever, not to any State, and that it was useless to go to Canberra to ask for anything. Suddenly, when a Senate election

was to occur just after the Capricornia by-election, when the Government had lost because of its neglect of development in Northern Australia, \$68,000,000 appears from nowhere to finance the Ord River and Nogoia schemes, \$48,000,000 being for the Ord and \$20,000,000 for the Nogoia scheme. How many people is the Ord River scheme to benefit? A few thousands! And how many will the Chowilla scheme benefit? More than 1,000,000! Is South Australia not entitled to its rights in these circumstances? But let us get a little closer to the present time: currently, the Commonwealth Government is financing other major works of water conservation in the Eastern States.

New South Wales, be it noted, did not agree to come in on the Dartmouth scheme until it had made a special arrangement with the Commonwealth. It played cagey for a while about Dartmouth while it was fixing up a special little deal of its own. It did not agree to come into the Dartmouth scheme until it had obtained a \$20,000,000 grant (not a loan) towards the \$45,000,000 Copeton dam on the Gwydir River. Only then did it agree to put in \$16,000,000 towards the Dartmouth dam, \$8,000,000 of which is to be on an extended loan from the Commonwealth at no interest rates.

Mr. Clark: That is pretty good.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a nice little profit to New South Wales.

Mr. Lawn: That State is a member of the family.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We were told that if the L.C.L. came into office our State would also be a member of the family, but we have not seen much benefit so far. The Queensland Government has just announced that it has confidently approached the Commonwealth Government for aid for the \$47,000,000 Bundaberg irrigation project and for the \$35,000,000 irrigation project on the Burdekin. The Commonwealth Government is currently getting a substantial net return (millions of dollars a year) from the Snowy River project, to which South Australians have contributed in taxation revenues but from which they have had not a penny piece in benefits.

The Commonwealth Government, even though a vast amount of electric power from hydro-electric projects in the Snowy River is being put into New South Wales and Victorian grids, is proposing to spend an enormous sum on an atomic power station in New South Wales which will have to provide electric

capacity far beyond the conceivable demand in that area. In the foreseeable future, the Commonwealth Government will have a net return of \$42,000,000 a year from the Snowy River project.

How can it be said that the Commonwealth will not have money to be able to finance, over the number of years it would take to construct them, both the Chowilla and Dartmouth projects which, if constructed to full cost, would not cost more than \$120,000,000. The Commonwealth is able to find substantial sums at short notice for Western Australia, Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria; it gave substantial assistance to Tasmania for the Dennison River project only a short time ago, but it cannot find one brass radoo for South Australia. It is time we made it clear to the Commonwealth that we are not going to forgo the rights so hard fought for by South Australians and the protections which the Chowilla dam will give us—quantity and quality of water.

This is something that is essential to our protection: there is no way in which South Australia can be protected as to quantity and quality of water the same as it can be protected by the Chowilla dam. Given recent history in relation to salinity and given the fact that we can expect a build-up of irrigation projects that will increase salinity from the Upper Murray area, we need the Chowilla dam. There is not the slightest reason why it should not be done if the Commonwealth Government will give this State the kind of benefit and consideration it says it is prepared to give the other States, but, if it persists in its present attitude, that is all of a piece with what has happened in its financial attitude to South Australia over a considerable period. I can go back with the Premier to the headlines over the last year relating to every occasion on which any major submission has been made from this State for financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government: "Outburst by Premier", "Disgraceful Treatment" and "Disgrace". These are the kind of things the Premier has said about the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Clark: I agree with him, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course. I publicly agreed with him the moment he said these things. He was right in saying them, and I hope he will continue to say them and to bring home to the Commonwealth Government that we are entitled to this money. If he wants Chowilla, I hope that he will vote for the motion to insist to

the Commonwealth Government that, if it is going to provide for regulation of the Murray River system by use of the Dartmouth dam in the way he is talking about, that does not mean to say that we must give away Chowilla. There is not the slightest reason why we should do that, and I believe that everyone in South Australia should fight to retain for us the rights that already exist under the River Murray Waters Agreement.

The Hon. R. S. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELIZABETH TRANSPORT

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. D. A. Dunstan:

That in the opinion of this House feeder bus services in Elizabeth and any direct service to Adelaide should be undertaken by the Municipal Tramways Trust.

(Continued from September 3. Page 1418.)

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): The obvious aim of the motion is to detract in some way from the Government's decision to institute a direct bus service between Adelaide and Elizabeth and to divert attention from the fact that the Opposition during the three years it was in Government refused to institute such a service.

Mr. Clark: As did the previous Government for many years.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will deal with that in a moment. The only way the Opposition has been able to think of detracting from the action taken by the Government is to suggest kicking out the private operator who has operated the feeder bus services in Elizabeth since 1957 and who is now to operate the service between Adelaide and Elizabeth as well. I suppose it is not surprising that the Opposition should take this attitude because, after all, that is in line with its Socialist outlook: bus services should be taken away from private operators and given to the Municipal Tramways Trust. Hence the motion before the House. The motion is not only that the bus service between Adelaide and Elizabeth should be run by the M.T.T. but also that the service out of Elizabeth should be taken away from Transway Services Proprietary Limited and given to the M.T.T. It is not that Labor, when in Government, was not asked repeatedly to institute a direct bus service between Adelaide and Elizabeth or that it did not realize the need to do this: the fact is that it did nothing about it.

I have done some homework and have looked into what moves or requests were made,

especially by the member for Gawler, during the time the Labor Party, first under the Hon. Frank Walsh and then under the present Leader, was in Government. The first move is contained in a letter dated March 24, 1965, to the member for Gawler from a very influential body, the Salisbury Sub-Branch of the Australian Labor Party. The letter states:

The object of this letter is to advise you on the deplorable state of public transport serving the Salisbury-Elizabeth area. In accordance with a motion passed by the Salisbury A.L.P. Sub-Branch on March 23, 1965, you are requested to place this matter before the Minister of Transport as expediently as possible. The Transway Bus Service, a private enterprise which is heavily subsidized by the railways, has a licence authorizing it to provide a connecting link with the railway station in Elizabeth, thereby providing a service for the whole area. However, there is no service provided for workers, particularly in the fast growing areas of Brahma Lodge and Madison Park and the new Housing Trust areas. The Salisbury Sub-Branch also requests that consideration be given to the provision of a bus service between the city and Elizabeth operating along the Main North Road—

the request which the present Government has now granted. The letter continues:

The Mayor of Elizabeth has publicly stated that this service is a necessity, and here we must point out the extensive building taking place along the Main North Road.

That was within a few weeks of the Party opposite coming into Government. A letter dated May 10, from the member for Gawler to the then Minister of Transport, states:

With regard to the provision of a direct bus service to Adelaide, I advise that this has been a matter of a number of approaches to the previous Government which held the view that such a service would not be in the interests of co-ordination. I have received a report on both matters from the Transport Control Board.

The letter then sets out the report in full. There is no further comment on the matter, except to set out the board's report. After referring to the letter from the Salisbury Sub-Branch and the time tables, the letter concludes:

It would appear that the current service is not known to this body, and it would probably solve its problems if it made contact with Transway Services Limited.

The Minister was apparently happy to tell the sub-branch that it did not know what it was talking about and that it should get in touch with Transway. The next letter, dated June 7, 1965, is from a resident of Madison Park and addressed to the Hon. Frank Walsh. The writer set out in detail the particular inconvenience, and indeed hardship, which he and his wife, who worked in Adelaide, suffered as

a result of poor transport facilities. In the final paragraph of his letter to the late Mr. Walsh, he stated:

I do beg you therefore to give priority to a full-time service at least between Adelaide and Elizabeth. I should think South Australia must be the only State in the world having its two major cities only 15 miles apart and no bus service between them. May we look forward to a happier state of affairs very soon.

He received a reply on July 22, 1965, from the then Premier in which the service was turned down. The last paragraph is as follows:

There have been a number of representations for the provision of a bus service from Elizabeth to Adelaide, but all of them have been refused on the basis that, with feeder bus services operating to Salisbury and Elizabeth stations, an adequate rail service is provided.

This was what the Leader said, in his speech a fortnight ago, was now absolutely outdated. I think that was the phrase he used but I will check it later. The letter continues:

The Minister—

that is the Minister of Transport—

agrees with this—

and that means he agrees that the service is adequate—

although future development in the long term may at some stage be sufficient to warrant both bus and train services.

Mr. Clark: That is the type of reply I've been getting for 10 years.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is right, and it is the reply the honourable member received from his own Government, too.

Mr. Clark: That is not the point of the motion, though.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It has much to do with the motion.

Mr. Corcoran: You're quibbling.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The next development was that nearly 12 months later, on May 5, 1966, there was a letter to the present member for Edwardstown (who was then the State Secretary of the Australian Labor Party), as follows:

Dear Mr. Virgo, At the last meeting of this sub-branch—

and this came from the Elizabeth Sub-Branch of the A.L.P.—

before the election of 1966 officers the following resolution was carried: "That State Executive be requested to refer the matter of extending transport along the Main North Road to serve the needs of the Elizabeth and Salisbury area to the State Parliamentary Labor Party for attention". The position of people living at the far eastern side of Elizabeth is becoming desperate.

On May 26, 1966, Mr. Virgo, as he then was, was sent a reply by the Hon. Mr. Kneebone (of course, it was a refusal) that concludes:

This matter is being constantly reviewed, and it is most likely that future development in the long term may eventually warrant both bus and train services. If the sub-branch so desires, however, there could be no objection to its placing appropriate evidence before the Royal Commission on State Transport Services.

Members on both sides will recall that Royal Commission of unhappy memory. The next development was an interview between Mr. Brian Taylor of channel 7 on June 9, 1966, and the Minister. On that occasion, apparently three questions were put to the Minister, and I will read the questions, and the answers the Minister prepared, as follows:

Question 1: It appears that many people in Elizabeth want a direct Municipal Tramways Trust bus service between Elizabeth and Adelaide. What chance have they got of getting it?

As part of the answer is crossed out (and I presume it was not in fact given), I will not read the whole of it. The following answer was apparently given:

The possibilities of a direct bus service—he does not mention the M.T.T., incidentally—between Elizabeth and Adelaide will be more adequately known when the current Metropolitan Adelaide Transport Study is completed.

Question 2: Are you opposed, as Minister, to an M.T.T. bus service running in competition with the railways?

Answer 2: The question of whether there should be two systems providing a transport service between Elizabeth and Adelaide is one of economics—

and with that I heartily agree—

As I said before, this could be clarified when M.A.T.S. is completed.

He does not say he is in favour of an M.T.T. bus service—far from it. However, members opposite now favour such a service. The third question was as follows:

Does the internal running of Transway buses at Elizabeth come under your jurisdiction? If so, is there any truth that this is an inadequate service and does not service all of Elizabeth?

Answer 3: The Transway bus service operates under licence from the M.T.T. There have been a number of investigations in the last 12 months into the service provided by this company, and adjustments to the company's time tables have been made from time to time to provide a better service in the district. I think—

and this is the important point in regard to this motion—

in the main Transway does provide a reasonable service, but there could always be some areas, because of remoteness, which do not obtain a service which the residents desire.

This again gets down to the basis of what is economically possible.

Now, the Party opposite, to which the former Minister belongs, wants to take the service away from Transway and give it to the M.T.T. The next development was a deputation to the Minister from the Elizabeth Sub-Branch of the A.L.P. on June 24, 1966. I will not go through that, except to quote the following:

The Minister suggested that this was the type of thing that would be looked into by M.A.T.S., and no doubt would be included in its report—

and I shall have something more to say about that—

It appeared, the Minister said, that the people in the remote areas were probably in need of some assistance in regard to transport. He said "probably", after receiving the sort of letters the then Government had received. I have referred to one of those letters. The report of the meeting continues:

And he would have discussions with the M.T.T. and Transway to ascertain what had taken place since the present service was put into operation. The Minister pointed out that if a direct service from Elizabeth to Adelaide were put into operation, the railway service would then become uneconomic.

He repeated this, in effect, in his formal reply to the honorary secretary of the sub-branch (Mr. Andersen) on July 28, 1966. I do not think I need read that reply except to read the following:

I consider that no major alteration to the existing arrangements should be made until the Transportation Study has completed its investigation and has reported on its findings.

In October, 1966, there was a letter to the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) from B. F. Balnaves Proprietary Limited, master builders, in relation to that company's development adjacent to the Main North Road between Saint Road and Gum Road, and asking, in effect, for a service. This, again, was knocked back in a letter on November 11, 1966, to the member for Gawler from the Minister of Transport. Most significant of all is the next development which I have been able to find and which occurred on October 26, 1967. As members will recall, that was just a few months after the change in the Premiership of the State, and this development is in the form of a minute.

Mr. Langley: He should still be the Premier.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will leave that to honourable members to judge after I have quoted this minute, which is to the Minister of Transport from the Premier of the State, the present Leader of the Opposition.

The minute states:

To note paragraphs 3 and 4 of the attached minute from the Director of Industrial Development—

and I will refer to those in a moment—

I feel that the matter of transport to and from Elizabeth is a matter that must receive urgent consideration.

I ask members to note the next sentence of the minute, which is as follows:

Now that the report of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study has been received I would be glad if you would submit proposals for consideration for improved transport facilities for Elizabeth.

That is dated October 26, 1967. The Party opposite has said repeatedly in this Chamber that it did not know the contents of the M.A.T.S. Report until it went out of office; yet its own Premier on October 26, 1967, said:

Now that the report of the M.A.T.S. has been received, I would be glad if you would submit proposals for consideration for improved transport facilities for Elizabeth.

The irresistible inference is that the M.A.T.S. proposals with regard to Elizabeth were known to the Government, and here was a request from the Premier to the Minister of Transport, now that those proposals were known, to prepare proposals for upgrading public transport in Elizabeth. How can one reconcile that minute, which is signed by Mr. Dunstan (his initials are on it), with the repeated assertion in this House that the Party opposite did not know of the M.A.T.S. proposals while it was in office?

Having made that point, let me, in all fairness, read paragraphs 3 and 4 of the minute that the then Premier mentioned. This is a minute from the Director of Industrial Development, dated October 20, 1967, to the Premier. It reads as follows:

At the October monthly informal meeting with the officers of the Department of Labour and National Service and the Immigration Department, etc., the position of the State's economy was discussed, especially in relation to employment and migration.

I need not read paragraphs 1 and 2, but paragraphs 3 and 4 are as follows:

3. The Commonwealth Director of Migration said that he had been informed that migrants coming to Australia had specifically asked not to be sent to South Australia, especially Elizabeth, as they understood that unemployment was rife in the State.

Every citizen of this State will remember the situation when the previous Government was in office. The minute continues:

Mr. Spicer clarified the position, but both he and Mr. Sharp, Regional Director of Labour

and National Service, said that Elizabeth was getting a bad name with prospective migrants.

4. Following on from the above, it was also pointed out the disadvantages that unemployed people have in Elizabeth compared with those in the metropolitan area, the main point being that they often did not have the fare to travel to Adelaide to seek employment outside Elizabeth as this would cost in the region of \$1 a day. They maintain that this non-availability of cheap transport did not occur in other States in similar locations.

We as a Government are doing something about this, but the previous Government, in spite of minutes of this nature and of requests to the then Minister of Transport, did nothing to help the people of Elizabeth to get a direct service to Adelaide, although its own people in Elizabeth repeatedly through the member of Parliament for the district asked for some action to be taken. Now, members opposite have the hide to introduce into this House a motion criticizing us and saying that the service should be run by the Municipal Tramways Trust and not by Transway, which has run the service so far.

Mr. Clark: There is not any service.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member's own former Minister thought there was a service, and said so. He was referring to the services within Elizabeth. There will be a service next month or early in November: that is when it is expected to begin. Let us come a little further up to date and look at a minute of January 10, 1968, from the then Minister of Transport to the Premier. Again, there is some mention of M.A.T.S. in this. It states:

The feeder bus services in past years have been subsidized by the South Australian Railways, but are now almost self-supporting.

I will give the figures later in view of the inaccuracies that occurred in the Leader's speech a fortnight ago. The minute continues:

A direct bus service would result in the feeder bus service operated by Transway losing substantial patronage, particularly at peak periods.

The Opposition now wants to take it away from them altogether. The minute continues:

This must result in either (a) a considerable increase in the Government subsidy or (b) a severe pruning of the internal services at Elizabeth which provide facilities for movement within Elizabeth itself, or a combination of both. Reduced internal services would bring complaints from Elizabeth residents. I am satisfied that present feeder bus arrangements are reasonable having regard to the patronage available.

It is within the last 18 months that he said this. The minute then states:

Any upgrading of the service can only be achieved at a cost to the Government. The fact that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study does not recommend a direct road service to Adelaide further convinces me that the present arrangements are satisfactory.

When I read out that earlier minute, members opposite started to protest and said (and still say) that they did not know what was in the M.A.T.S. proposals when they were in office.

Mr. Broomhill: You think we did?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am certain of it, from this minute. What other interpretation of it can there be? I will read it again; it states:

The fact that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study does not recommend a direct road service to Adelaide further convinces me that the present arrangements are satisfactory.

In view of that sentence from the Minister of Transport in his own former Government, does the member for West Torrens say that the Minister did not know what was in the report? The Minister was saying what was in the report. In all the debates in this House and in every public statement made by members of the Opposition on M.A.T.S. they have said they did not know what was in the M.A.T.S. Report; yet here is a minute signed by Mr. Kneebone—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We do not want half-a-dozen speakers at once.

Mr. Corcoran: It is a lie.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will read it again.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much interruption. The member for Millicent must restrain himself and cease interjecting.

Mr. Corcoran: The Attorney-General is telling a lie.

The SPEAKER: That does not justify an interjection. There is an appropriate procedure for dealing with an allegation of that kind.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Millicent says I am telling a lie. I challenge him, when he speaks, to explain the meaning of this sentence if it does not mean that the Minister of Transport knew what was in the M.A.T.S. Report.

Mr. Corcoran: That is not the point I take.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Let me read it again:

The fact that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study does not recommend a direct road service to Adelaide further convinces me that the present arrangements are satisfactory.

That was addressed to the then Premier by the Minister of Transport. In his own handwriting, on January 15, 1968, the following note appears on the letter:

Ask Mr. Clark, M.P., if he would like to see this file and discuss it with me.

The final note here is marked "Memo for Premier" and dated February 28, 1968, just a few days before the general election. It reads as follows:

I phoned Mr. Clark, M.P., 26/2/68 and he summarized his attitude after reading this file as:

- (1) Not very happy with situation. He would like some easy means to help local residents with better transport facilities.
- (2) He realizes, however, that the situation cannot be altered at present.

We have altered that situation: we have provided, or are about to provide, a bus service for his constituents from Elizabeth to Adelaide, yet he and his Party have the gall to criticize us for the way—

Mr. Corcoran: We are not opposing the provision of a service, and you know it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I should hope the honourable member is not, but he is criticizing our action in the hope that he can detract from the fact that we as a Government have done something and that his Party did nothing in its three years of office. Having gone through these minutes, I will now give the history of the matter during the years from 1965 to 1968.

Mr. Clark: You did not get the M.A.T.S. Report until you had been in office for several months.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Why did the Minister say what he did? I hope I will get an answer in due course. Transway has been operating services within Elizabeth since 1957, which services will almost certainly be affected by the introduction of a direct service to Adelaide: this is common ground between us. It would be quite unfair if, having done all the pioneering work and just when its services in Elizabeth were becoming viable, Transway had its services taken away from it and it was not given the opportunity to operate the direct service to Adelaide. The Government hopes to keep Transway viable by allowing it to operate the service to Adelaide in addition to the feeder services within Elizabeth. This is in keeping with the Government's own political philosophy, which is to help private enterprise.

I realize that the motion is in keeping with the philosophy of the Opposition Party—Socialism. Whilst I do not detract for a moment from the achievements of the

Municipal Tramways Trust on its routes, I believe that private enterprise should be given the opportunity to operate this service, and this is the recommendation to the Government from the M.T.T. It does not want to operate this service.

Mr. Corcoran: Can you support that statement?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. If the honourable member thinks I have been at all unfair in what I have said and if he can prove it, I will acknowledge it quite freely. I acknowledge that the member for Gawler had been trying for many years before the Playford Government went out of office to get a bus service to Elizabeth, but his requests were refused by the Playford Government. The point I am making is that, now we have done something that is in stark contrast to what the Labor Government had an opportunity to do for three years, we are being criticized.

Mr. Corcoran: We are not opposing what you have done.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Members opposite are doing their best to minimize it.

Mr. Corcoran: No.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. I will now deal with the specific points made by the Leader of the Opposition in his rather inaccurate speech. He referred to the express railway service to Elizabeth and to the feeder bus service as extremely outmoded. He then made some wild and nebulous suggestions about a palletized service. He did not, however, canvass this in detail or deal with its cost. He then asserted time and again that the Adelaide-Elizabeth service would be run by old buses. He said:

Further, this service is to be provided not in a new type of bus but in very old buses.

That is entirely inaccurate: I have checked on this. First, Transway is to use 2 VAM70 buses. These are new buses being constructed at present by Freighter Industries Limited; each bus is 8ft. 2½in. wide and seats 48 people. Further, Transway is to use 2 VAM5 buses. These are 1967 models made by the same firm; each is 8ft. 2½in. wide and seats 45 people. In addition, Transway is to use 3 Bedford S.B.3 buses. These are 1965 models made by Freighters; each is 8ft. 2½in. wide and seats 40 persons. Finally, Transway will use one S.B.3 bus that has a Commonwealth Aircraft Corporation body and seats 37 persons. The last six buses mentioned are already in service on other routes in the Elizabeth area.

It is completely incorrect to say, as the Leader said several times, that this service is

to be operated by very old buses. I hope the member for Gawler and other members opposite and the community at large, particularly people in the Elizabeth area, will now know the true facts. I said I would comment on the subsidy paid to Transway. I have figures that go back to the Playford Government's term of office. From July, 1962, to June, 1963, the subsidy paid was \$13,935; in the corresponding period ended June, 1964, it was \$13,198; in 1964-65, when the Labor Party was in Government, the figure dropped to \$6,019; in 1965-66 it dropped further to \$2,757; in 1966-67 it dropped to \$1,883; in 1967-68 it rose to \$2,648; and in 1968-69 it has fallen to \$678. Members opposite, when in Government, would have been familiar with some of these figures and would have known how Transway had made good over the last six or seven years, yet they would take the service away from it now that it is becoming a viable proposition.

I will not deal with all the other points made by the Leader because, quite frankly, they are not worth dealing with. He spent much time in canvassing the position of another company, Lewis Bros., which operates in an adjacent area. A fat lot of comfort this motion will give Lewis Bros., because I think that firm could see the same fate befalling it! Like that of Transway, its service would be taken away if the Opposition had its way. The Leader quoted the following passage from a letter from Lewis Bros.:

Since this was a scheme in which we were most interested, we contacted the Minister in writing, and verbally contacted the Municipal Tramways Trust, telling them of our interest in this matter and requesting conversation when more facts were known. Both the Minister and the M.T.T. agreed to this.

I am instructed that that is not the case. Another point made by the Leader relates to safety. He quoted from a letter that said that 340 old M.T.T. buses operating anywhere in South Australia would present a dangerous situation because of their width. These buses, which have been sold to private operators, may operate only on routes within the M.T.T. area and approved by the M.T.T., so it is inaccurate to say that they will be going anywhere in South Australia.

Regarding the selling of buses by the M.T.T., the last purchase by Transway was of 14 A.E.C. Mark IV buses in June, 1968, at \$4,500 each, with 10 per cent deposit and the balance payable over 57 months at 6 per cent per annum on the amount outstanding. A bill of sale over the buses plus a personal guarantee

by one of the shareholders of the company were required as security for the transaction.

Mr. Corcoran: Is that why the M.T.T. wanted Transway to have the contract?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, and I will answer that in the words of the M.T.T. When selling buses, the trust aims at securing the highest possible price but, because of the limited market for its buses, it is sometimes advantageous to give buyers terms instead of requiring cash. In the past terms have been extended to several purchasers of M.T.T. buses, at the purchasers' request. Terms similar to those given to Transway would have been extended to any other reputable bus operator who wished to purchase a number of buses, had the M.T.T. been so requested. It is the trust's policy to foster the development of bus services in expanding areas which may not otherwise be adequately served with public transport. The sale of buses on terms to private operators providing services in the Adelaide metropolitan area, under licence from the trust, is in line with this policy.

I hope that the suggestion or imputation that has been made that the M.T.T. had some vested interest in Transway because it sold its own obsolete buses to only that company is now refuted. I do not think there was really much more in the Leader's speech that called for a reply. I can sum up the position by saying that the Party opposite did nothing about this matter during its time in office. We have now taken action, and members opposite have seen fit to criticize us on the ground that we have allotted the service to Transway rather than to the M.T.T. The proposal of members opposite would be to take away from Transway altogether the service both within Elizabeth and to Adelaide. This is in line with their own Socialist theory.

We, on the other hand, consider that Transway ought to be given a fair go to run as far as Adelaide with a service that it has been pioneering for 12 years, and that is what we intend to do. Furthermore, this is the recommendation that the Government received from the M.T.T. We did not make a decision in contradiction of a recommendation from the M.T.T. Our decision is in line with the recommendation from that authority, which controls routes in that area, yet we are criticized by the Opposition. We consider that we have done the right thing. Above all, we propose to provide for the people of Elizabeth a service for which they have been asking for years and which was denied them by the Party opposite when in Government.

Mr. CLARK secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNFAIR ADVERTISING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 1420.)

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): If one looks at this Bill, which was introduced by the Leader of the Opposition, one finds that it is a slight adaptation of clause 8 of the Unfair Trading Practices Bill which he, as Premier, introduced in 1967. That Bill was so appalling in its effects that even the Labor Government did not pursue it. The provision which the Leader has now incorporated in the separate Bill that he has introduced was one of the less objectionable provisions: in fact, I think I can go so far as to say that it was about the only clause that was unobjectionable.

I was amused when the Leader, giving his second reading explanation, referred, with some pride of authorship, to the drafting of the measure and said that he had some responsibility for it. When the 1967 Bill was drafted, the Leader had the advantage of the professional help of the Parliamentary Draftsman. I suspect that it was not altogether his own work in 1967, work for which he took credit a fortnight ago when he introduced the Bill now before the House. The amusing thing is that already, in accord with his usual practice, he has placed on file a couple of amendments to his own Bill. However, that is just by the way and I would not have mentioned it if he had not referred to it in his explanation.

The provisions of this Bill, which were made public in 1967, are referred to in the Adelaide University Law School Report on the Law relating to Consumer Credit and Moneylending, and the Leader, I think with some pride, quoted from chapter 5 of that report, headed "Misleading advertising." I am prepared to accept what is stated on this matter in the law school report. I do not think anyone in the community would condone misleading advertising. It is something which, unfortunately, occurs from time to time but which none of us condones. The real difficulty is to know how to deal with it.

The Leader, in his speech, and the authors of the law school report state that the provision in the Bill is based on a Statute of the State of Florida in the United States of America. I was there a few months ago and did not notice any difference between the advertising techniques in that State and those in any other State of the United States or in Australia, and I did not hear anyone, in discussing this matter, saying whether or not this particular Statute was effective. Whether it

is or is not effective remains to be seen. The gist of the Bill is contained in clause 3, and subclause (1), which contains the most relevant phrases in that clause, provides:

... which advertisement contains any assertion, representation or statement that is inaccurate, untrue, deceptive or misleading and which such person knew or might, on reasonable investigation, have ascertained to be inaccurate, untrue, deceptive or misleading.

That is wide and rather vague. My own doubt is as to the effect of this provision, whether it will be either too wide and vague to be effective or, on the other hand, whether it could possibly be oppressive. This depends very much on the way such a provision as this would be interpreted.

Mr. Jennings: It would have to go a long way before it could be oppressive.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not know about that. I suggest to the House that we should accept the Bill, vote for the second reading, and consider the measure in Committee, with a view to amending it. I think that the Bill should be amended in relation to two matters. I suggest strongly that we should provide that it be a defence to a charge under the Bill, in the case of innocent misrepresentation, that the advertisement in question was not intended to mislead or to deceive or that the deception was of such a trivial nature as for it not to be reasonable to expect that anyone would have acted on it. I think that safeguard should be inserted.

Mr. Burdon: How would you define what was trivial?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is a matter for the court. Certainly, South Australia is entering into a new legislative field, and it is a field in which it is fairly difficult to legislate effectively. I think this must be regarded as being in the nature of an experiment, and I am prepared to undertake the experiment proposed by the Leader, but I think we should have some such safeguard and, more importantly, we should also provide that there should be no prosecution except on the authority of a Minister. A Minister is responsible in this House for his actions and this, too, would be a safeguard against the oppressive use of such legislation as this, as it would mean that a person in a responsible position (and I use "responsible" in its technical sense) would have to authorize a prosecution under this legislation. As this is experimental legislation and as it is as wide as it is, I think this also is a desirable safeguard. As I am at present advised, if these two amend-

ments were made I would not oppose the third reading, and I suggest to honourable members that we should support the second reading, and in Committee consider the Bill with a view to inserting the amendments I have suggested.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

RIGHT OF PRIVACY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 1427.)

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): In supporting the Bill may I say that I am grateful for the support that has been indicated by Government members. Although the Attorney-General grudgingly supported the Bill, and in his normal fashion attempted to establish that something was wrong with its drafting, he could find nothing wrong with the Bill's intention and, despite his normal child-like attitude in this respect, he seemed to believe that the Bill's intentions were desirable. Enough has been said about the desire of members of the community to retain their rights of privacy, their rights to undertake private conversations, and their rights to act as they wish in private without the forms of snooping and other intrusions that confront people, particularly in America.

After arriving in Adelaide yesterday morning in my motor car I turned on the wireless to ascertain whether any new industries had been announced by the Premier and, although finding that there were not, I left my wireless switched on. In doing so I was given an example of the surreptitious use of a microphone, and this strengthened my support for the Bill. Apparently, a well-known radio announcer's house had been entered by some of his colleagues, who surreptitiously placed a microphone in or near his bathroom and recorded his singing in the shower.

Mr. Clark: What was the singing like?

Mr. BROOMHILL: It was disgusting, and I believe the announcer, after hearing himself, telephoned the radio station and threatened his fellow announcers with violence if they played the recording again. However, his threats did not stop them playing it for most of the morning. If people are to be subjected to this type of action in the future we must ensure that we do what we can to stop it. I believe that, until members study the literature that is available in the Parliamentary Library on this subject and the problems that confront the community in the United States, they will not realize how

serious this problem can be. Most of the material in the library was prepared in 1964 or 1965, but since then there have been considerable improvements in the techniques and the use of electronics, and it is staggering to realize what can be done by people who wish to listen to conversations that take place in a room, in a house, or even in a building.

Reports from the United States indicate, regrettably, that considerable advantage is being taken of this equipment by many people. Employers have placed microphones in rest rooms and toilets in order to check on their staff, and business people have placed this equipment in interviewing rooms so that when people come into the room to make a purchase the salesman excuses himself and then listens to the private discussion of the purchasers, so that he can ascertain what they are saying and then decide on the line of sales technique he should apply. Advertisements published in the United States suggest to children that for a small sum they can buy a hearing aid that will enable them to hear what is going on in any part of the house, and also suggest that the children can have much fun with these devices.

Mr. Hudson: You would not like your children to use such a device?

Mr. BROOMHILL: No, I would not, but I am thinking not of my children but of those of the member for Glenelg. In some circumstances I should think that if the member for Glenelg could stoop so low (that is, if he could) he would install such a device outside the rooms of the Sturt Football Club in order to hear the tactics that were being discussed for use in next Saturday's game. We should commend the Leader of the Opposition for introducing this measure before we in South Australia are subjected to this objectionable sort of thing. In the Victorian Parliament, where this matter was discussed, it was suggested that advertisements had appeared in some Eastern States newspapers offering some of these articles for sale. I have not seen this occur in South Australia, but no doubt the equipment could be purchased or made in this State, so that this is an appropriate time to consider this measure. Reading the literature available, I notice that many hundreds of people are engaged in manufacturing this equipment in America, and this fact speaks for itself in relation to the claim that it is being used widely in that country. I consider that no such problem exists in Australia at present, because most of this equipment is imported.

Mr. Hudson: That might be one of the industries the Premier has in his bag.

Mr. BROOMHILL: This could be so, but it would be the first. I should like to speak briefly on one or two clauses of the Bill because of the Attorney-General's criticisms in relation to its draftsmanship. It appears that he might have influenced one or two of his colleagues who also raised questions on which they had been misled by him. The Attorney-General attempted to tell us something about the matter, and I will quote him verbatim so that he cannot complain. He said, at page 1255 of *Hansard*:

I am also tossing up about whether I should suggest any amendments (and this is a case where perhaps it could be by permission of a court) to allow other persons to use these devices in any circumstances. This matter has been canvassed from time to time. We know, for example, that private inquiry agents use these devices. In most cases perhaps it is not desirable that they should . . .

I am pleased that the Attorney-General at least concedes that, because I believe it is not desirable that private inquiry agents should be able to use these devices. However, the Attorney continued:

. . . but in some cases it may be desirable that they should. The member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) is shaking his head as though in disagreement. Let me give one example of cases in which moving photographs are taken now and in which I think it is desirable that they should be taken. In many actions for compensation, either for injuries that have been sustained in an accident or for workmen's compensation, it is the practice to check on the party—

The Leader of the Opposition then interjected:

This does not prevent anything that is going on now.

The Attorney-General replied:

Yes, it does, because of the definition to which I have referred of "private act", which the Leader has inserted in the Bill. It does prevent that happening at present, and it is altogether desirable that the facts should be established.

Other speakers followed up this line by the Attorney-General and said that in some circumstances, perhaps regrettably, insurance companies find it necessary at times to check on people making claims for compensation, where perhaps a person could be claiming that he suffered an injured back, thereby preventing him from stooping or performing any work. This is one of the unpleasant jobs that private investigators must at times do: they have to snoop around the houses of such persons and take photographs from the street of persons in their backyards either chopping wood or hanging out clothes. Such photographs are then produced to prove that the person involved

can do things for which he or she is claiming compensation.

It is recognized that this practice goes on at the moment. The Attorney-General points out the desirability of this continuing, but he claims the Bill will not permit this type of activity. However, he is wrong in this respect. Perhaps the other members who supported him might carefully examine the definitions of the Bill. The Attorney-General referred to the definition of "private act", which means "any act by a person in a place other than a public place in circumstances in which that person is not visible from a public place and can reasonably expect that his action is in private". Apparently, the Attorney-General did not read the definition of "public place", which includes "every road, street, footway, court, alley or thoroughfare which the public is allowed to use, notwithstanding that that road, street, footway, court, alley or thoroughfare is on private property". Therefore, a private investigator could photograph people in their backyards or front gardens because, although the definition of "public place" includes those places to which I have just referred, the definition of "private act" concludes with the words, "and can reasonably expect that his action is in private".

If a person is in his front garden or backyard chopping wood, gardening or hanging out clothes, he would not reasonably expect that his actions would be in private. I therefore hope that the Attorney-General notes this point carefully and realizes that there is no real reason why he should pursue the course he adopted earlier. It could well be that this is why the Attorney-General has not placed his amendments on the file, because after studying the criticisms that he made earlier he could well have realized that he made a fool of himself once again by claiming that the amendments were designed—

Mr. Hudson: Are you suggesting that the Attorney-General deliberately made a fool of himself?

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes, he must have done it deliberately, because I am certain he would not set out to do this.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: That is a rather contradictory statement, isn't it?

Mr. BROOMHILL: The Attorney-General also said that the definition of "listening device" was wide enough to include an ordinary hearing aid. However, it is certainly not the Leader's intention to ban the use of hearing aids, which, of course, would be ridiculous.

The Bill does not have this effect but, as it seems that the Attorney-General has difficulty in understanding legislation, I suppose Opposition members will not object to his adding words that he thinks will clarify the issue. The definition of a "listening device" is as follows:

"Listening device" means any electronic or mechanical instrument, apparatus, equipment or other device capable of being used to overhear, record, monitor or listen to a private conversation or words spoken to or by any person in private conversation.

Perhaps the Attorney-General does not know what a hearing aid is designed for: it is used by a person who is hard of hearing, and it does not provide such a person with the opportunity of turning up the tones of a voice to such an extent that he can hear what another person is saying from the other side of the room. Because of a person's weakness in hearing, he uses a hearing aid so that he can hear what a person with better hearing would normally be able to hear.

Mr. Evans: Could a person with good hearing make use of it?

Mr. BROOMHILL: I would think not, but the point is that "listening device" still refers to listening to conversations of a private nature. The other point to which I wanted to refer briefly was in relation to the Attorney-General's attitude to clause 8 (1), which provides:

A police officer may apply to a judge on evidence on oath that he has reasonable grounds to believe that in the circumstances he deposes to the use of a listening device or a visual intrusion device or a combination of them will lead to the detection of serious crime, for a warrant permitting him to use a listening device or a visual intrusion device or a combination of them.

The Attorney-General seemed to consider this to be some form of attack by the Leader of the Opposition on the Police Force, but I am unable to ascertain why he came to that conclusion. He certainly made the charge but did not add anything to it. It is regrettable that the Attorney has to take this sort of attitude on matters introduced by the Leader of the Opposition. The Attorney-General said:

I suggest these devices may be used by the police only on the authority of the Attorney-General. I do not think it is desirable to cause the delay which will be necessary in going before a judge.

He does not refer to the problems that might arise in regard to approaching the Attorney-General, just as the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) last week could not find the Attorney-General or half the other members

of the Ministry. The Attorney-General tried to tell us what might cause a delay in going before a judge, and he went on to say:

But the Attorney-General is a Minister of the Crown and is answerable for his decisions here in the House. I think this is the most satisfactory protection which we could give for the use of these devices. I know the Leader will not like this. He does not, I think, like to help the police much in the discovery and prevention of crime . . .

Why he believes that the provision sought here by the Leader would hamper the police in detecting crime the Attorney-General does not say; nor can I find any good reason for his saying it. I believe any thinking member of the community will agree that this provision is a desirable one. It is reasonable that police officers should be able to use this sort of equipment in apprehending criminals, provided they can convince a judge of the necessity to use such equipment. I am surprised that the present Attorney-General believes he should have the power to authorize its use, because I should have thought it was a power and a responsibility that a Minister would not care to have, in view of charges that might arise subsequently. I think the Leader of the Opposition, recognizing this fact, has so provided. The following, an extract from an article that appeared in the *West Australian*, refers to certain people's attitudes to and interests in this matter:

Some lawyers claim that the Victorian legislation, now before State Parliament, will be open to abuse because it does not contain enough safeguards to protect the privacy of innocent people. The Victorian Government had the difficult job of deciding where to draw the line between the importance of privacy of the individual and the need for more effective measures to prevent and detect crime. The provision that allows State police to use the devices for ordinary crime-detection work on the authority of or above the rank of inspector has brought most criticism.

The only other people who will be permitted to use the devices under the legislation as it now stands are customs officers and Commonwealth security police. The customs officers, who will have to be authorized by the Comptroller-General of Customs, are being given the privilege of using the devices mainly to help them in their fight against drug racketeers.

Mr. John Bennett, a lawyer and secretary of the Victorian Council for Civil Liberties, believes there is no real need for State police to use bugs. He said the only people who should have the use of such devices were the Commonwealth police after they had obtained the consent of the Attorney-General and then only if national security was being threatened. There was an urgent need for suitable regulating legislation giving only Commonwealth security police the right to use bugs and

banning all other people from having anything to do with them. In the United States the use of listening devices was completely out of hand. Most major corporations brought in anti-bugging equipment before holding their meetings in order to ensure that they were not being overheard. "We have nothing like the same situation here," Mr. Bennett said, "but adequate laws are needed quickly to stop this trend from developing in Australia."

If the Victorian Government insisted on giving State police the right to use the bugs they should be made to obtain a court order, preferably from a judge, before they could go ahead and bug a person's house. Mr. Bennett said there should be further safeguards. The court order should state the length of time that the device could be used, where it could be used, and should also require any information found to be irrelevant to crime detection to be destroyed.

Mr. Bennett, who is a lawyer and perhaps known to the Attorney-General, expresses the same view as that expressed by the Leader when he introduced the Bill. I do not know whether the Attorney-General would care to label Mr. Bennett (and perhaps anyone else who may disagree with him) as a police hater. However, I think the article establishes the fact that there is general concern about the rights of the police in regard to using certain devices and that a real case should be made out to a judge before police officers are allowed the right to use those devices. The Attorney-General said he thought that careful consideration should be given to this matter, particularly regarding private investigators.

I was disturbed to hear him say he believed that in some cases these people should be given the right to use the type of equipment in question. I believe private investigators should not be given any right to use this equipment, and I certainly hope that the Attorney-General does not intend to introduce amendments that would enable them to do so. I support the Bill and repeat that I am grateful that Government members have indicated their intention to support its second reading.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

DOG-RACING

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. McAnaney:

That in the opinion of this House, betting by means of a totalizator, operated by the Totalizator Agency Board, on dog-racing, conducted by licensed clubs under the Dog-Racing Control Act, 1967, should be introduced in this State as soon as possible,

which Mr. Virgo had moved to amend by striking out the words "by means of a totalizator, operated by the Totalizator Agency Board,".

(Continued from September 3. Page 1433.)

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): This afternoon, the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) asked me a question to which I said I would reply when speaking now to this debate, as I wished to make sure exactly what I was reported in *Hansard* as saying when I last spoke to this debate. As members may be aware, at the time I was suffering from influenza and possibly should not have been in the Chamber. However, when commencing to close the debate a fortnight ago, I said:

I have for many years been a member of both the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the Animal Welfare League, but they have not said that I am doing the wrong thing.

That statement was absolutely correct: no approach had been made to me at that time other than from an executive member of the Animal Welfare League whose remarks to me are reported in *Hansard*. Having given out prizes at a greyhound meeting, she had made certain remarks, and the quotation appearing in *Hansard* on that day is absolutely correct. I am also reported in *Hansard* on that occasion as saying:

The organizations take a dim view of such statements as, "I will bring out 50,000 brochures if you introduce this Bill. I have unlimited money at my disposal and I will see that you are not a member of Parliament any more." This is one of the most regrettable things that has happened to me since I have been a member.

Actually, I said that I took a dim view of this, and I still do. Anyone can come to me, whether he be Liberal or Labor, black, pink or yellow; I listen to what he may have to say and form an opinion on any constructive arguments he may advance. I take exception to what has taken place regarding this motion. As I said last Wednesday week, Mr. Colley (Secretary of the R.S.P.C.A.) has said that the society has no complaint about the coursing association or its members. Those exact words are contained in a letter from a lawyer representing the R.S.P.C.A. The society has said that, as a body, it believes it has nothing to do with this motion. The R.S.P.C.A. gave evidence against tin-hare racing when legislation to permit it was before Parliament. The Animal Welfare League has also indicated that it is against tin-hare racing, and we must accept that.

I did not vote for the Bill, which provided for tin-hare racing, when it was first before

Parliament. I point out that the opponents of tin-hare racing have not given publicity to the stringent provisions in the Bill dealing with cruelty to animals. I have already quoted those provisions twice. Yesterday, a gentleman who had been the Assistant Secretary of the R.S.P.C.A. in New South Wales told me that he had been one of the leaders in the raids on the coursing grounds and had seen evidence of cruelty to the dogs. However, he said that when he saw this there was no registration of coursing tracks and the penalties for cruelty were small. He told me that I could say in the House that he now had nothing against dog-racing provided the safeguards against cruelty were satisfactory. I believe that all members who support this motion will also support any subsequent amendment to the Act to prevent cruelty to dumb animals. I am sure all members could say unequivocally that they do not favour cruelty to dumb animals. This Parliament having decided that the National Coursing Association may have tin-hare racing, in the interests of British justice this association should be given the same opportunity for betting as is provided to trotting and horse-racing interests. Until the association breaks any of the stringent provisions in the Act it is entitled to be given a fair go.

Actually the motion deals only with betting on tin-hare racing, Parliament having already said that tin-hare racing may be conducted in this State. As I am not a heavy bettor, I will probably never have a bet at a coursing meeting, but in Parliament we try to move with the times. I believe that if, five years ago, a Gallup poll had been conducted in South Australia on the question of off-course betting, 60 per cent of the people would have been against it. However, when Victoria got off-course betting and South Australia was the only State without it, there was a swing in favour of it. A Gallup poll taken only a month or two ago showed that the Australian average of people in favour of off-course betting was 58 per cent, but South Australia, which had been the State most against it, now had 60 per cent in favour of it. As most South Australian people now favour things such as lotteries, totalizators and so on, who are we to say that they are wrong and that people should not use them? We are dealing with grown-up people who must make up their own minds on these matters.

One member spoke about a case of a man's paying only \$1 off a chemist's bill while spending more than that on lottery tickets. However, many people pay \$10 for cosmetics, etc., and do not necessarily pay their other bills.

People spend money in various ways, and as a Government we take a third of people's money. Surely the people have a right to spend what they have left on what they wish; whether they spend it on cosmetics or on a dog they do not get much out of it, anyway. I do not think we should say what people can and cannot do with the money that Governments leave them now, and the money they have left is being reduced all the time. An amendment has been moved to provide for bookmakers at dog-racing meetings. As I have said many times, I think that horse-racing would be better off without bookmakers. This has been proved in Paris and New Zealand. Many leading jockeys, such as Bill Pyers, say that racing is far better without bookmakers. The National Coursing Association has not asked for bookmakers. If it decides later that it wants them, it can then apply to the Government for them.

Mr. Virgo: Why should it have to come back to Parliament?

Mr. McANANEY: Perhaps the motion is worded wrongly in that it provides for totalizators to be operated by the Totalizator Agency Board. At some small country courses a totalizator may be used that is not operated by the T.A.B. However, this could be easily dealt with by an application to the Government. Not more than eight dogs participate in dog races. With so few in a race, it is easier than in horse-racing or trotting for those with a big interest in the betting to arrange the result of races. This has been done in the other States. As the people involved are asking only for totalizators, I think it is better to have the totalizator alone, in whatever form it may be.

An active campaign has been conducted by the Anti-Tin-Hare League. Its letters do not indicate whether it has a committee or who is its Chairman. However, the letters say that it has a Secretary and about 246,000 members in South Australia. If the organization can prove to me that it has that many financial members in this State and is a properly constituted organization, I shall be happy to give \$100 to the R.S.P.C.A. I think there is every justification to carry this motion. In the interests of justice, these people are entitled to enjoy what other sections of the community enjoy by way of betting. I ask members to support my motion and not the amendment.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (7)—Mr. Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Hudson, Hurst, Langley, and Virgo (teller).

Noes (28)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Broomhill, Casey, Clark, Coumbe, Dunstan, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, McAnaney (teller), McKee, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, Rodda, Ryan, Teusner, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 21 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Evans, Freebairn, Hudson, Hurst, Langley, McAnaney (teller), McKee, Rodda, and Ryan.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Ferguson, Giles, Hall, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings (teller), Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, Teusner, Venning, Virgo, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Loveday. No—Mr. Riches.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

THE BUDGET

The Estimates—Grand total, \$328,261,000. In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 16. Page 1534.)

THE LEGISLATURE

Legislative Council, \$45,615.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): When progress was reported last night I was dealing with some of the comments made by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans). I should like him and the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) to stay and listen to a few home truths.

Mr. Evans: I will sit down and stay until—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will not only sit down but he will keep quiet.

Mr. VIRGO: Since last night I have had the advantage of reading the galley proofs of *Hansard*, and the more one reads them the more one is convinced that, if there were 39 members of the House of Assembly similar to the member for Onkaparinga, we would have one of the worst Parliaments of any State or country in the world.

Mr. Hudson: That is not very complimentary.

Mr. VIRGO: It is not meant to be. Last night the member for Onkaparinga was not very complimentary to the people who were trying to educate his children and other people's

children. In fact, what he said was an affront to those people carrying the burden of education.

Mr. Rodda: Rubbish!

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member can say "rubbish" as often as he likes, but what the member for Onkaparinga said and what the member for Victoria said by interjection are downright affronts to the people attempting to educate the citizens of tomorrow.

Mr. Edwards: In what way?

Mr. VIRGO: If the honourable member will just sit quietly I will tell him. First, the member for Onkaparinga said:

Although I agree with many that education is an important part of our life—

that was a gracious admission to make—

I do not consider that it should be placed before health.

Well, I concede that health matters are very important, but the situation becomes very difficult if we start arranging State services in a schedule, as the honourable member has sought to do. Whilst I concede him the right to make that observation, I think we should remember that he is clearly out of step with the Premier. There is nothing new about this: we find that even Ministers are out of step with each other. However, the member for Onkaparinga was obviously out of step with what the Premier was reported as saying in yesterday's *Advertiser*; the member for Onkaparinga quoted from this paper, but he did not quote the following lines:

During an inspection of the area—

the new Murray Park teachers college—

the Premier said education was a top priority in Government thinking, and the proposed new college would be an example of this emphasis.

Compare this statement with what the member for Onkaparinga said—that education is not as important as health!

Mr. Hudson: But the Premier is only paying lip service; at least the member for Onkaparinga is honest about it.

Mr. VIRGO: Another person paying lip service to education is a Party colleague of the member for Onkaparinga, but I do not think he will ever be a Parliamentary colleague. In a pamphlet he says:

If asked what particular function of Government should have priority above all others, I would reply "Education".

The author of this pamphlet aspires to represent the Commonwealth electoral district of Hawker. If members read his literature carefully they will find that he is standing for the

seat on behalf of the Liberal and Country League, but the literature must be read carefully because the gentleman has been very meticulous in trying to show that he is a good guy for the district. So, here are two people who obviously have a different view from that of the member for Onkaparinga. The smear that the honourable member used when talking about people associated with universities was one of his most irresponsible statements. He said:

Many of those within universities who want to change our way of life and society (including many teachers, although not all, because many are responsible people and I respect them as a profession) take no part in community life.

What is the honourable member trying to prove? He is saying that many of them are responsible, so presumably he means that the rest are irresponsible. I hope that that answers the question raised by interjections by the member for Eyre. Last evening the member for Onkaparinga charged members of the teaching profession with being irresponsible citizens, and the member for Victoria agreed with him.

Mr. Edwards: That's only your interpretation.

Mr. VIRGO: I am only saying what has already been said by the member for Onkaparinga, as reported in *Hansard*. If the honourable member wants to quarrel with what is in *Hansard*, he can go ahead and do it, but I do not.

Mr. Edwards: It's only your interpretation.

Mr. VIRGO: If I am not interpreting the remarks correctly, the member for Eyre may be able to give a better interpretation. The member for Onkaparinga created another false impression when he stated:

South Australia spends more a head of population on education than any other mainland State in Australia.

I think the honourable member made a grave blunder there. He did not check what he was quoting from before he used the material, because he concluded by stating:

The figures that I am using are those from the latest Commonwealth Year Book.

One cannot quote figures without expecting that they will be checked. Those figures are from the 1968 volume of the Commonwealth Year Book, which is the latest issue, but the honourable member did not tell the Committee that the figures were for the year 1966-67. In that year the present Premier, the present Treasurer, the present Minister of Education, and the present member for Onkaparinga did not have one iota to do with the position.

It is pleasing that the honourable member, out of his own foolishness, commends the previous State Labor Government for doing more in the field of education in the three years it was in office than the Government before that had done or the present Government has done.

The mere quoting of those figures is not sufficient to justify an attitude of complacency and a statement that, merely because we are spending more than any other mainland State is spending, everything is all right. Australia is not spending enough on education: this is our trouble. This morning I was able to obtain figures from the United Nations Economic, Scientific and Cultural Organization Statistical Year Book for 1965. Those figures show that Canada (which the member for Onkaparinga rubbished last evening, as members will recall) spends a higher percentage of its national income on education than does any other country. It spends 7.4 per cent.

Then follows Japan, with 7.1 per cent, Norway with 6.9 per cent, and the United States of America with 6.3 per cent. Then we come to poor little Australia, with 3.4 per cent, yet the member for Onkaparinga and other people say that we are doing enough in the field of education, that there is no crisis in education, and that the campaign has been whipped up by a fellow named Harris, whom members opposite seek to rubbish for no other reason than that he was a Labor candidate who went close to defeating the Minister of Lands. We should not consider expenditure on education on a head of population basis, because we are not educating on that basis: we are educating on a pupil basis. Here we find that South Australia's record leaves much to be desired.

This is what we must consider, and we must also consider the general overall position in Australia. The plain fact is that the Commonwealth Government has failed dismally to provide this State or any other State with sufficient funds from the national purse to pursue properly what is desirable and what is required in the field of education. The member for Onkaparinga also stated:

I do not believe that all teachers are dissenting. I was fortunate to be able to visit the Royal Show, where nine teachers spoke to me and not one of them mentioned more money for education.

I suggest that the nine teachers who saw the honourable member apparently were so imbued with Liberal Party ideas that they were not prepared to raise the question or, alternatively,

that perhaps the member for Onkaparinga was able to mesmerize them. Surely the member for Onkaparinga, like all other members, has received many letters from schools expressing the concern of teachers at the position in education. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Venning) spoke at a school and then tried to tell us that all the teachers were happy. That statement soon backfired. The teachers soon let everyone know that they were not happy.

Mr. Broomhill: I think he was misquoted: I don't think he said that they were happy.

Mr. VIRGO: If the honourable member was misquoted, the *Hansard* reporters would apologize to him. However, they seem to get down accurately what is said. I do not know the nine teachers of whom the member for Onkaparinga spoke, but I have a few letters. One letter, from a high school in my district, states:

At a meeting of the South Australian Institute of Teachers members at this school held on Thursday, August 7, matters concerning education in South Australia were discussed. As a result of the discussion the following resolution was passed unanimously:

This school probably has about 50 teachers, and they unanimously carried a motion that the Minister of Education should accept that there was a crisis, yet the member for Onkaparinga tells us that all teachers do not support that.

Mr. Edwards: How many teachers were at that meeting?

Mr. VIRGO: That is the most stupid question one could ask. I have read the letter.

Mr. Edwards: You don't know how many were at the meeting.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not even know how many teachers are at the school. I said that I thought there were about 50 teachers at that school, and the motion was carried unanimously. I will quote from a letter sent to me from a school that is not in my district, because the member for the district in which the school is situated may not speak in this debate, and I think members should be made aware of the contents of the letter, which is as follows:

The staff of the Waikerie High School has unanimously carried the following resolution—that this meeting of the S.A. Institute of Teachers teaching at the Waikerie High School endorses the statement of the institute executive that the reply of the Minister of Education dated June 27 cannot be accepted as a satisfactory answer to the call for immediate action which was made to the Government last May in relation to the matter of serious deficiencies in education.

We have a genuine concern for the quality and needs of education, one evidence of which is that in addition to our ordinary responsibilities in regard to teaching and administration in this school, we, together with parents and students, have given hundreds of hours of our leisure time assisting to raise money to build an assembly hall-gymnasium at our school, but we consider that the Government has not demonstrated the same concern, is not fully accepting its share of responsibilities to education and, therefore, is not inspiring confidence.

That letter was signed individually by each staff member. I have many other letters all in the same vein, so that it is useless for Government members to say that there is no crisis in education. An article in last evening's *News*, headed "Teachers' case—Money given up for Pupils", states:

Teachers had given up some of their hard-earned salaries for the sake of the school-children, an Institute of Teachers spokesman said today . . . The \$25,000 being spent by the institute on the campaign would be just enough to put three people through teachers college. The institution is investing \$25,000 in a public information service in the hope that State and Federal Governments would supply millions of dollars to rectify the problems.

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

Mr. VIRGO: Members of the South Australian Institute of Teachers are sincerely and virtually unanimously behind the campaign that is currently being waged. I said last evening, when speaking on this motion, that Opposition members wholeheartedly supported and agreed with that campaign. The honourable member for Onkaparinga earlier referred to various aspects of advertisements inserted by the institute in the daily press, and I challenge Government members to say whether they agree with him that no crisis in education exists. Do they agree that the picture that the institute has used is that of Adolf Hitler? Is that what they are reducing education to?

The case made out by the institute ought to be sufficient to energize the Government into specific action. Surely if it is told that over 70 per cent of secondary school classes are too big, that 211 mathematics and science teachers are urgently needed, and that 92 per cent of primary school classes comprise more than 30 pupils, the Government should be spurred into doing something more in the field of education. It is no good passing off this matter by saying that some teachers do not agree with it, as the honourable member for Onkaparinga did. Government members should read the views and comments columns of the daily press. I have not taken any particular paper because it

suitied my purpose: I picked up at random today's *News*, which has been supplied to all members. I found no fewer than three letters in the "Letters to the Editor" column, the writers of all of which supported the institute.

Mr. McKee: And that sort of letter appears every day.

Mr. VIRGO: That is correct, and these things just cannot be brushed aside as though they are of no consequence. This means something: that there is a crisis in education and that the present Government has failed dismally to arrest the current position. I do not think it behoves anyone to suggest, as the honourable member for Onkaparinga did last night (aided and abetted by the honourable member for Victoria), that this is something that has been whipped up merely by a person named Bob Harris. I hope the honourable member for Victoria will get back into his seat and tell me more about it. I remind him to look carefully at any one of these advertisements, because he will find printed at the base of each of them "Inserted in the interests of better education by the South Australian Institute of Teachers". Is the member for Victoria reflecting on the teachers of this State by implying that someone who is incompetent has been appointed to a position? Is this the view that he and his colleague from Onkaparinga have?

Mr. Rodda: Not necessarily.

Mr. VIRGO: I suggest that the member for Victoria should make his own position a little clearer than he has done. He is reflecting not on Mr. Harris but on the Institute of Teachers and every one of its members.

Mr. McKee: They couldn't all be wrong.

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member says they are; I cannot see how any other construction could be placed on what he said. To provide a proper and decent education we have to have a Government that will give the finance necessary.

Mr. Rodda: I think it was your agents that prepared this advertisement.

Mr. VIRGO: The further the member for Victoria goes the more stupid he becomes. That is an insulting remark to the Institute of Teachers and the member for Victoria should withdraw it in the interests of education and decency. He is reflecting on an organization that does not have the right to express an opinion in this place. Mr. Harris is an agent of the Institute of Teachers. I suggest that the member for Victoria should heed his senior colleague, the Minister of Works, and keep quiet.

Before I leave this rather vexed question, in addition to the letters from the schools, the unanimous resolutions passed and the letters appearing continually in the press, I want to refer to a comment made by the member for Onkaparinga that the wooden classrooms that teachers are required to use are not all that bad. The member for Onkaparinga said:

I am not saying that school accommodation is perfect or that at times teachers do not work under poor conditions. I know that they do and that many accept this knowing the Government is doing all in its power to rectify the position.

He went on later to refer to wooden classrooms. By interjection the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) told him that all the schools in the United States were of timber construction and that this made it right. I want to refer, as I have done on numerous occasions before in this place, to the Ascot Park Primary School, where the conditions are appalling. According to the replies I have received from the Minister of Education, she is completely unmoved by the untenable conditions existing at this school. The Headmaster operates from an office suitable only as a broom cupboard. Teachers are trying to instruct children in wooden classrooms that are so close to the Marion Road that they have to stop every now and again so that they can be heard above the traffic noise. The traffic noise drowns out a teacher's voice. Members ought to know what the conditions are at this school. This is an extract from a letter that the school committee wrote to the Minister:

Several classrooms—

and the numbers are given here—
do not have sufficient fire escape provisions.

Fancy the Minister and the member for Onkaparinga saying, "No problem with education; we are spending more than the other States a head of population"; yet there are children in wooden classrooms without effective fire escapes! What is the Government doing—waiting for the children to be incinerated before it acts? The second point in the letter is as follows:

The antiquated toilet facilities for both girls and boys and teachers could well be described as archaic.

These are not my words but the school's, yet Government members are laughing their heads off about it; they think it is a joke. This is the view expressed by the Ascot Park Primary School Committee to the Minister. I think it is just what the Minister did, too, when she got the letter: she laughed and put it in the filing cabinet labelled "W.P.B.", commonly

known as the wastepaper basket. The school committee raises about seven matters urgently needing attention and receiving exactly nothing from the Government. Yet we are told there is no crisis in education!

It is a tragedy that we are faced with this situation. The main difficulties confronting us at present are not only the ineptitude of the present Government but also the complete disinterest of the Commonwealth Government in South Australia. Surely the State Government should be a little moved by the statement in this morning's newspaper that for the second year in succession Commonwealth funds allocated by the Commonwealth Department of Works for spending in South Australia are lower than those allocated to any other State. Yet, when this matter was raised by one of my colleagues this afternoon it was brushed aside as being of no consequence. The whole trouble is with the Commonwealth Government. I have no hesitation in saying that any people, including members of the Government, who advocate a return of the present Commonwealth Government to Canberra are traitors to South Australia. I do not want to make this a Commonwealth election speech.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This is not a Commonwealth Budget, either.

Mr. VIRGO: I know, and I know it is not a Commonwealth election meeting; but I say to members opposite that they should seriously consider their position in relation to the forthcoming elections. I am not surprised that the Premier has decided that Parliament should not adjourn for those elections. He is producing an excuse for not participating in the Commonwealth election campaign by saying that Parliament will be sitting in the weeks before the election. I can only hope that the Premier will take the extra step and go out and openly tell the public that in South Australia's interests we must have a better image in Canberra. We will never get a fair deal from the present Commonwealth Government, and we never got a fair deal from previous Liberal and Country Party Governments in Canberra. This situation must change before we will get a fair deal.

Regarding the treatment that was meted out to me as a member of Parliament by the Minister of Roads and Transport, I do not think members opposite realize the gravity of the position. The Premier said time and again that information would be available and that every possible assistance would be given to people wanting to make alternative suggestions

to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan. However, we find that when information is sought to facilitate this work the door is effectively slammed by the Minister and his protégé, the Attorney-General, who is not prepared to do anything about it. Is this the way a minority Government operates? What is it trying to hide? Is it afraid that the plan will not stand up to the test? We know that it will not; this is shown by statements made by authorities in the United States of America, by the Assistant Commissioner of Highways (Mr. Flint) and by statements in the editorial columns of the *Advertiser*, all of which are frivolously brushed aside by the Premier.

Mr. Broomhill: The Hills Freeway was cut out today.

Mr. VIRGO: It was cut out about two months ago, but the catch is that it can be restored at any time. This applies to the Foothills Expressway, too. The Noarlunga Freeway has been approved in principle, but no-one knows where it is going. And this is a Government of decision!

Mr. Rodda: Do you know where you're going?

Mr. VIRGO: How can we know where we are going, with such an incompetent Government in charge of South Australia? I am disgusted with the way the Government has handled the whole question and I am disgusted to find that people have gone to the Highways Department seeking information but have got exactly nothing. On the other hand, when the Secretary of the Liberal and Country League in Plympton telephones, Mr. Flint is sent out personally to see her at her home.

Mr. Corcoran: Is that true?

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, yet members of Parliament and the public are denied information that the Premier says is readily available.

Mr. Corcoran: I wonder whether that's in the docket.

Mr. VIRGO: I doubt it.

Mr. Rodda: And you complain when we talk about Mr. Harris?

Mr. VIRGO: If the member for Victoria wants to malign Mr. Harris further, that is up to him. However, I assure the honourable member that, if the attempts to do so, he will get it right back where it belongs, because I will never subscribe to using this place to malign people. I will have more to say about the Highways Department when we get to the relevant lines (I am sorry this is amusing members opposite) and I also intend to say more about an action by the

Government that I consider to be contrary to the Constitution.

When we get time to peruse the Auditor-General's Report, it will be interesting to see whether he has commented on this matter. This Government is subsidizing private enterprise to keep up the profits of the shareholders. I am referring to the subsidy being paid (I understand it has already been paid) to the Adelaide Steamship Company to subsidize the running of the *Troubridge*. In fact, that company is a profitable concern. It is no wonder that the member for Onkaparinga supports private enterprise! Furthermore, he will use the Government's finance to boost the profits of shareholders. However, this matter can wait until we discuss the appropriate line. I cannot be enthusiastic about this "do nothing" Budget. It marks time and does not meet the urgent needs of the State.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I am pleased that the member for Edwardstown has resumed his seat. I find it a very great relief on one's ears and on one's spirit and intellect. We no longer have to keep searching for something that he may say, because his oration is finished. The member must admit that he made only three points. If the member for Onkaparinga had not spoken, the honourable member could not have made three-quarters of his first point. Then, if we take one-half of the remaining part of the speech, in which he blasted the Commonwealth Government, we have left only a fraction of the whole speech, and most of the matters in that part referred to the Metropolitan Transportation Study and the Minister of Roads and Transport, matters that were dealt with in Question Time yesterday. Really, the honourable member said little.

Mr. Langley: Don't you reckon he ought to blast the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. WARDLE: I would be all for getting more money. I do not think there is any question of that here or in any other State. All States should receive more money from the Commonwealth Government. My mind goes back to the half hour from 9 to 9.30 last evening. I am not generally tempted to pass comment about a previous speaker, other than perhaps about the principles with which I disagree, but I must say one or two things about the speech of the member for Edwardstown in addition to what I have already said. I have said before that this honourable member (and I am sorry he will not be here to hear what I have to say) has a particular list

of hackneyed and completely worn-out adjectives that he thinks are emphatic, to the point, and descriptive. He had not been speaking for more than two minutes last evening when he began to use these words and I started to tick them off my list. About 40 words are on his list, and when the honourable member has been through that lot of adjectives he then gets on to "scurrilous attack", "coward's way out", "gutter-type tactics", "filthiest statement", "hypocritical", "got the gall", "coward's castle", and "haven't got the courage"—

Mr. Langley: I will have something to say, too.

The CHAIRMAN: I am pleased that the member for Unley has given the Chair notice.

Mr. WARDLE: I am not calling the member for Unley or any other member these names, but I remind him that this is how the previous speaker sets about his business of debating the Budget. When I first came into this Chamber as a member, it was suggested to me that the member for Edwardstown was probably the best debater that the Labor Party had thrown into the ring for many years, and I was inclined to believe that. But my original impression has worn thin; in fact, it has left me, especially after his exhibition yesterday and this evening. If one examines the speech of the honourable member it is obvious that he did not debate the Budget. I remember, after hearing an oration, that a lecturer said that the speaker had a diarrhoea of words but a constipation of ideas. Perhaps that expression is corny, but I thought it was appropriate because the member for Edwardstown made only three points in his speech. The Leader, in his speech, did better when speaking about the Commonwealth Government. I appreciate what he said and I support him. Today, the member for Edwardstown had no need to refer to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study because he spoke about it yesterday and he only went over the same ground again.

The member for Edwardstown made much about replying to what had been said by the member for Onkaparinga, but he did not speak about many things to which the member for Onkaparinga had referred. Although I do not agree with some of the points made by the member for Onkaparinga, there were some points in his speech to which I thought the member for Edwardstown would reply, but he did not. As a back-bencher I consider that the Budget is a subject on which one will surely make a better contribu-

tion after one has been here for some time. It is a formidable document, and to a new member it is not always obvious where to find things. This criticism is not of the document itself but the difficulty is caused by inexperience. I thought the statement by the honourable member for Glenelg was educational, and I give him credit for it. He pointed out to me many things that I was pleased to learn and, while I did not agree with all he said, his speech contained much thoughtful material that kept all members continually on the alert and concentrating on his contribution.

Mr. Clark: That is a difficult job in some cases.

Mr. WARDLE: It is, but I am sure the honourable member and I were doing just that. What I have to say will be parochial to some extent but I want to make several points regarding the Budget generally. Although I agree with the Leader's sentiments, I thought he used the situation to make a suitable speech prior to the coming Commonwealth election.

Mr. Corcoran: That has already been said.

Mr. WARDLE: I am sorry to repeat it, but that is my impression, irrespective of who might have said it earlier. I commend the Treasurer on the Budget.

Mr. Corcoran: Why?

Mr. WARDLE: I know that a tremendous number of people in my district are saying to me now, "From the point of view of balancing the Budget, considering the economics of the State and knowing that South Australia will continue to roll on and develop financially, the finances of the State are in good hands."

Mr. Corcoran: Did you say, "Balancing the Budget"? What does the Budget do this year?

Mr. WARDLE: When I said that, I was not referring entirely to making one side of the balance sheet come out to within one or two dollars of the other. However, I am satisfied that within 12 months we will see whether the Treasurer is able to do a little better than he says he will be able to do. I am satisfied that, even with a deficit, which this State will probably have—

Mr. Corcoran: I thought you said the Budget was balanced.

Mr. WARDLE: I was not referring to balancing it from the point of view of getting down to the last dollar.

Mr. Corcoran: But \$2,000,000 is involved in this.

Mr. WARDLE: I am satisfied that, even with a Budget deficit, most South Australians are happier to have the State's finances in the hands of a Liberal Government than they would be to have it in the hands of a Labor Government.

Mr. Corcoran: That's your usual line.

Mr. WARDLE: I am not ashamed of what I have said; it is true and I will undoubtedly say it again.

Mr. Corcoran: But you said the Budget would be balanced.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Millicent will have a chance to say something later on.

Mr. WARDLE: I should like to refer to taxation on motor vehicles. I noticed from the Auditor-General's Report that there was an excess over last year's receipts of about \$390,000 and a net profit of about \$8,000,000, which, as honourable members would know, is directed to the Highways Department for its use. I want to make again a point I made some months ago in this place: that I hope that some day (and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will agree with me) some portion of these particular funds will be provided to councils to extend tourist amenities. I know that this matter has been discussed over the years by various groups and Governments.

I guess these finances have been jealously guarded by the motoring fraternity in this State, but I believe we have reached the stage when, although councils seem to be able to use all the grants made to them by the Highways Department, the standard of roads has reached the point where the time is now appropriate for some of the funds to be transferred to councils to be used to erect conveniences and amenities for lookouts and so on to add to the many fine tourist attractions the State already has. I throw again into the discussion the figure of 2 per cent, which would represent \$330,000 and which could be used by councils for this purpose.

Much has been said about education. Having three of my family of four involved in education, and having met teachers from various schools in my district, I can say frankly and openly that, from my earnest discussions with them, it appears to me there are many great needs in education. In my discussions one of the foremost of these needs that arose was ancillary or secretarial help. It appears that at present headmasters require their teachers to do an enormous amount of stencil cutting and duplication and distribution of lessons for

students, and this is time consuming. As I know that one particular teacher in a fairly large school of 22 or 23 teachers spends many hours at night preparing this work ready for the next day, I can see that secretarial help is needed. When I visit my own children and find that the amount of time they can spend with me during the evening is limited because certain things have to be done (marking and so on) before the next morning, I realize that there are needs in education. I am pleased to see that the Government has provided in the Budget for secretarial or ancillary help. It will be interesting in 12 months' time to see the reaction in those schools that have benefited from this type of help. By that time I believe members will know to just what extent this type of help has to be increased.

I am also pleased to see the increase in student teachers' fees and allowances. A member of my family is involved in this situation and, although he was not greatly disturbed at the change that took place about 12 months ago (and I believe that change was for the good), I think that, with the adjustment in salaries early in the year and the adjustment in salaries and allowances in the Budget, he and other young people in this particular group will consider that they are certainly up with the Australian average. I am pleased that these increases have been given.

I come now to free school books. Many families in my area have benefited from this assistance, which is continued and extended in this Budget. In certain circumstances where there is real financial hardship, especially for a widow or a deserted wife, the supply of free school books is very important. While the sum may not appear from our point of view to be great, it is considerable from the point of view of the mother or parents concerned.

I am also pleased to note the extension of the service given to mentally and physically retarded children. It is good to see there are more and more classes throughout the metropolitan and country areas where these mentally and physically handicapped children can have personal instruction from teachers specially trained for this type of work. Even in a smallish town like my own, 11 children who come in from places up to 25 miles away receive an enormous benefit from this type of class or group. I am pleased also that an excellent taxi and bus service is used to gather up these children and bring them to these special schools.

I come now to the provision for hospitals, and I shall be parochial to the degree that I notice that the allocation to the Mannum District Hospital for maintenance has increased by \$1,835. This is a great help in a place with a small population, where it is difficult for the hospital because it has not sufficient beds to make it an economic unit. I believe there is a point where the number of patients, on the one hand, and the amount of income, on the other, make it possible to afford certain qualified and junior staff: this point is about the 24-bed or 25-bed hospital.

Maintenance is a large item for a small country hospital. It does not seem fair that people in small country hospitals should pay greater fees than people in larger hospitals pay, so I am pleased there is an increase of \$1,835 for the maintenance of the Mannum District Hospital and that a capital grant is made to the hospital in Murray Bridge, which is largely a base hospital for the whole of the Lower Murray area. Added to this, an increase of \$1,220 in the maintenance grant for the hospital at Tailem Bend (the Lower Murray District Hospital). This hospital, too, is to get an additional maintenance grant because it is in much the same circumstances as is the Mannum hospital.

I now refer to capital grants to the St. John Ambulance Brigade, which were referred to in the Auditor-General's Report. I give credit to the work of this great organization. In the period from 1952 to 1968 the total assets have grown from \$13,500 to \$1,168,000. The brigade's annual report deals with the number of miles travelled and the number of patients carried, and it shows that the brigade's work is nothing short of fantastic.

Many people use their spare time exclusively for themselves, but the thousands of dedicated people in this organization are prepared to give up their spare time for the benefit of humanity. According to the annual report, brigade membership increased by 240 to 2,955. I understand that the present total membership, including cadets, of the brigade in this State is the second highest of any State in the Commonwealth. The number of adult divisions is the highest in the Commonwealth; this is very heartening news, particularly when we consider the relative populations of the States. It is pleasing that an additional \$39,000 has been provided for the brigade's maintenance grant, which now totals \$303,000. The capital grant of \$60,000 is the same as in the previous financial year.

A question was asked today about increases in subsidies to aged citizens clubs. I believe that much more must be done in connection with education of the aged and education for retirement. When we are 30, 40 or 50 years of age, we may feel that we are not concerned with this question and that life will go on as we are now experiencing it.

Mr. McKee: What about improving the standard of living?

Mr. WARDLE: I believe that this is a vital part of the problem of improving the standard of living. Much more thought must be given to the education of people for retirement. Far too many people come to the end of their working lives thinking that it will be very nice to sit back and rest and that it will be a great change, but that is as far as it goes until the actual day comes.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Do you mean that they rush into retirement?

Mr. WARDLE: When retirement is reached it is nice not to have to rush off to work. People who are well prepared for retirement say that they do not know how they used to find time to go to work, because they have become involved in other activities. Such people are adequately prepared for retirement, but many people who go into retirement become completely lost after two or three weeks. They probably get in the way of their wives at home. Gardening does not charm many men, particularly when they are in retirement, so these people have time on their hands. The woman of the house continues to carry out and enjoy her duties, whereas the man is lost. I think it is important that he should join an aged citizens club. Encouraging people to do so should be part of normal education for retirement. I am pleased that money is still being made available for the erection of these clubs and I hope that the Treasurer will be inundated with applications.

I refer to the item headed "Public institutions, chaplaincy service, \$20,000". I have not completed my homework on this item and I have not referred back to the 1966-67 Auditor General's Report. However, if my understanding of what is involved is correct, I appreciate the value of that grant. This is an important service. Some people are taken away from the type of life to which they have been accustomed and are placed in an institution and, having regard to the type of person ministering to institutions at present, this service will be greatly appreciated by those with the capacity to do so. The service does the State credit.

The Murray Valley Development League, of which I think most members have heard, basically comprises district councils covering the area from the Snowy Mountains to the Murray River mouth, involving the three States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. The league's work is divided into six regions (four in New South Wales and Victoria and two in South Australia) and its object is to have a population of 1,000,000 in the Murray Valley. The present population is about 333,000. This organization, which has been in existence for 22 years, has helped tremendously to overcome many anomalies affecting the three States.

Some of the matters dealt with have been comparatively minor, such as the granting of fishing licences, but many other matters dealt with have been extremely important. The league played no small part in the final construction of the Snowy Mountains scheme, and it participated prominently in the discussion some years ago about snow leases, when graziers were deprived of the right to graze stock on the highest mountains and, consequently, much of the natural growth has returned on those mountain tops. The South Australian Government, under the leadership of Sir Thomas Playford, was the first of the three Governments to contribute to the league's work, having made available \$1,000. I am pleased that the grant has been increased this year to \$1,500.

I now comment on the state of primary production in Australia, and the matter of the Budget and the Treasurer's suggestion that the Land Tax Act will be amended next year in order to give relief from land tax on rural land when the new assessment is made. Primary production in this State is in an acute position at present, and if this situation continues it will become calamitous. I will now quote a small portion of an article entitled "Rural Industries in Trouble" appearing in the publication of the Institute of Public Affairs for last financial year, in which the statistics and figures are provided by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The article states:

After a decade of falling export prices and rising costs, Australia's rural industries are facing serious difficulties and are posing special problems for the Commonwealth Government and other authorities concerned. In the current financial year (that is, last year), farm income is expected to fall to \$830,000,000, a decline of over 40 per cent from the figure of \$1,455,000,000 reached in 1963-64. This year farm income could sink to 4 per cent of the net national product—

the net national product referred to is after the deduction of depreciation—

the lowest ever, even below 1930-31 when it slumped to about 5 per cent because of the collapse of world prices. The existing absolute level of farm income is, of course, much higher than in 1930-31, in real as well as in money terms, and the percentage fall is due in no small measure to the tremendous expansion in the secondary and tertiary industries. During the early post-war years, farmers enjoyed exceptional prosperity—because of world shortages and high export prices. (Over the three years 1948-49 to 1950-51, farm income averaged 22 per cent of the NNP.) It seemed inconceivable that the farming community would ever again confront a situation remotely resembling the 1930's when practically every rural industry had to receive Government support.

But it is happening again. World prices for wool and wheat are now, along with sugar, dairy products and fruit, below average costs of production as assessed by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The only rural industry exporting at a profit appears to be beef. This extraordinary turnabout in the fortunes of the rural industries has not had the same impact on the economy as in former years when the farm sector was a much larger employer of labour and contributor to the national product. At the 1933 census 531,000 or 1 in every 4 males worked on the land. In the 1966 census, only 359,000 males recorded a rural occupation—1 in 10 of all males. This trend is, admittedly, not peculiar to Australia; in fact it is less marked here than in most other high-income countries. All over the world, farm labour is drifting to the cities, principally because farm products represent a progressively smaller proportion of total consumer demand. Farm mechanization and the superior attractions of expanding city occupations have also contributed . . . Notwithstanding a great increase in farm output, there has been a remarkable decline in the relative importance of rural production in the domestic economy since 1948-49.

This is illustrated by a statistical table, and I ask leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

FARM INCOME AS PROPORTION OF NET NATIONAL PRODUCT

	\$ million	per cent of NNP
Average 1948-49 to 1950-51	1047	21.7
Average 1951-52 to 1953-54	1047	14.7
Average 1954-55 to 1956-57	979	11.1
Average 1957-58 to 1959-60	894	8.7
Average 1960-61 to 1962-63	1041	8.4
1963-64	1455	9.9
1964-65	1326	8.2
1965-66	1049	6.2
1966-67	1270	6.9
1967-68 estimated	830	4.5

Mr. WARDLE: While this is only portion of the article to which I have referred, I have found that many of my producers are greatly

interested in the article and the facts and figures contained therein. I have read sufficient of it to prove the point that I appreciate what the Treasurer has done in trying to relieve the burden to some degree of the man on the land, whose produce is depreciating in value and whose costs are continually rising. I support the first line.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I intend to speak on education, a subject that I notice has become singularly attractive to members over the last few weeks. Members who I thought had no interest in education at all have suddenly found that it is an important subject. I believe this to be true and I believe also that the subject of education should always have been considered to be important. As members know, I was a teacher for 25 years, and I have often thought, particularly in recent years, that it might have been a good thing if I had remained a teacher, particularly when I see that some of my old colleagues whose promotion prospects were the same as mine are now headmasters of class 1 schools. However, I would, had I followed that course, missed much by not having come to this place, because I have learned much here. If I were to blame anyone for my coming here, I am afraid I would have to blame the member for Hindmarsh, who had much to do with it. Although it is 17 years since I left the Education Department, it often seems much longer than that. Naturally, my interests stay to a large extent with the subject of education, with the people engaged in that profession, and particularly with the children in our schools.

I was most interested in the remarks that the member for Murray made, and, without being condescending, may I say that I consider his speech was the best he has made in this Chamber. Certainly it was the best speech made by a Government member so far in this debate. Let me add that I do not think that really means a great deal because, in my opinion (although I could be wrong), the speeches made by the members for Stirling and Onkaparinga were, to put it mildly, pretty poor. I certainly believe the member for Murray did a particularly good job. I know that in the first part of his speech he rather took to task the member for Edwardstown, but I also know that the member for Edwardstown would have been disappointed had the member for Murray not done so. The honourable member then apologized for dealing with parochial matters concerning his district. However, I say to him and to other members that there is never a need for any member to

apologize for speaking about parochial or parish pump matters, for I have always believed that if a member tries to do his best for his district he will be a good member.

As usual, my remarks will not be political unless I am enticed into making them political. Before I commence the main tenor of my remarks, I want to take to task two members who have already spoken in the debate. Although I know the member for Edwardstown dealt with this matter at some length, I want to deal with the case of Mr. Bob Harris from a slightly different angle, and what I have to say will be right out in the open. Mr. Harris's name has been dragged into this debate and I think some most unnecessary remarks have been made about him. Particularly unnecessary was the remark yesterday evening by the member for Onkaparinga, who obviously grabbed an opportunity to reply to an interjection from, I think, the member for Edwardstown, and made a disparaging remark about Mr. Harris. As the remark had nothing to do with the interjection, it appeared to me that the member for Onkaparinga was simply dying for an excuse to make it.

However, what he said was perfectly excusable compared with some interjections made yesterday by the member for Victoria. I should have thought that, as a Parliamentary Under Secretary these days, he would not suggest that, merely because Mr. Harris was on the staff of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, the institute's campaign for improved education facilities is a political campaign. I do not think that remark should have been made in this place at all, especially if no-one is prepared to say it openly. It has not been said openly but has been made by way of snide and, I think, filthy interjections. I believe such suggestions as these are deliberate political lies motivated by the dirtiest possible political motives.

One might ask why this sudden objection has been taken to Mr. Bob Harris by a few members of the Government. The member for Victoria, normally a bright, happy fellow, suddenly became bellicose and ferocious by way of interjection, and he seemed at that stage capable of saying almost anything. Indeed, to my great regret, last night, you yourself, Mr. Acting Chairman, stopped the honourable member when he was at last about to make a forthright statement that could be caught with regard to Mr. Harris. Unfortunately, he only got as far as "Mr. R. G. Harris", or whatever his initials are.

What is the reason for this? Before I try to answer that question, let me say that what has hurt me particularly as it has hurt many teachers who have written to me over the last few weeks is the fact that some Government members seem to agree with the suggestions and the innuendoes made by the member for Victoria. The tone of the letters written to me about the remarks already made in this place and the interjections impugning Mr. Harris's integrity indicates that, although teachers, they did not know the member for Victoria. Naturally, not knowing him, they took it for granted that, as he was the Government Whip and a Parliamentary Under Secretary, he could well be speaking for the Government. Had they known him, they might not have been so credulous as to believe that.

Let me say what I believe to be the facts of this case. It is well known, I suppose, to all members that Mr. Bob Harris (I have met him only twice; I do not know him particularly well) was an A.L.P. candidate at the last State elections. For a young man, he performed particularly creditably. It appears to me that certain Government members (and in particular the member for Victoria) have taken it on themselves to consider that, because Mr. Harris was, and still is, a member of the A.L.P., by some magical means he has managed to influence all senior members of the institute, and all other members who have voted for this campaign and are paying their hard-earned cash to further the cause, by ramming A.L.P. principles down their throats. That, however, is absurd.

Many thousands of teachers are known to me personally. We all know that, as is the case with any large group of people, their politics are different and varied. I know there are members of the teaching profession who are members of the A.L.P. while others are members of the Liberal and Country League. I have no doubt that other political Parties are represented, too. I throw the lie back in the teeth of anyone who says that this campaign organized by the teachers is political. There is no suggestion of that at all. For anyone to suggest that Mr. Harris, because he happens to be a member of the Labor Party, is coercing all the teachers in the State to run a political campaign in this case is too absurd for words. I only wish the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) had not been called away from the Chamber for I particularly wanted to ask him whether he was prepared to say openly by way of interjection that

he did in fact think that Mr. Harris was doing this. So far he has said it by innuendoes—and not very clean ones at that. I wanted to ask him, if and when he spoke in this debate, whether he would give his opinion openly instead of by snide suggestions.

Mr. Jennings: He won't speak, anyway.

Mr. CLARK: I hope he will speak and talk about this openly on the floor of the Chamber. Although I have been interested in education all my life, after I first became a member of Parliament I did not speak about education at all for a while, because I thought I was a little too close to it. Since that time, however, I have spoken about it. On one occasion, after I had spoken for a rather lengthy period, the then Minister of Education (Sir Baden Pattinson) came over and congratulated me.

In those days there was a greater spirit of friendly rivalry in this Chamber than there is today. I remember another instance with much pleasure. When I was first elected a member of Parliament I received a letter from the then Minister of Education (Hon. Reg. Rudall), a man whom I greatly respected, even though I sometimes did not agree with him. He wrote to me the kind of bright and breezy letter that he used to write, and members who knew him well will realize that it was characteristic of him. He congratulated me on my election and said that there were two reasons why he would have preferred that I not be elected: first, he would have preferred a member of his own Party to win the seat; and secondly, as Minister of Education he did not want to lose a highly qualified teacher from the Education Department. I appreciated that.

In those days such remarks could be made in this place, but in recent years the feeling between members on the two sides has seemed more like the politics in other States. This is perhaps because the Parties are so evenly divided and because members on this side believe that, but for an unfortunate circumstance, they would still be in Government. I advise younger members that, after they have been here for 15 or 16 years, they should look back at the speeches they made soon after they became members of Parliament: they may be surprised, as I was, at the things they said. It is rather saddening for me to look back on my earlier speeches, particularly those that dealt with education, because I advocated so many things in all sincerity that should have been done, but so few of them have actually been done. I find that so many promises made

by Liberal Governments have not been fulfilled. Of course, new problems are arising and awaiting solutions.

I have always been interested in education, because any teacher worth his salt becomes fond of the children and becomes more interested in what can be done for the children than in what he is actually getting for doing his work. I have also been interested in education as a parent and have been a member of a high school council for more than 30 years. I think I can say that I have tried to keep in touch with education, although it is not possible to keep in touch with education methods, because they have changed enormously over the years. In the latter part of my teaching career I was teaching grade 7 and at that time the children sat for an external qualifying certificate examination at the end of that year. Frankly, this involved a type of cramming that we have not known since. I am pleased that the teaching process today is completely different.

I consider that I have managed to keep up with the progress, or lack of it, in school building. The Public Works Committee sees many schools, some of which are in extremely bad state, and it seems to me that it will be a long time before anything is done about the bad ones. I am not ashamed of having been accused of being biased as far as education is concerned. I have tried to be non-political when speaking on education, because I consider the subject to be above politics.

Mr. Jennings: What have you to say now about the member for Victoria?

Mr. CLARK: I regret that the member for Victoria missed what I said about him. However, he can read *Hansard*, and I ask him to do that.

Mr. Rodda: I thought you might repeat it.

Mr. CLARK: No, I do not believe in doing that. Some years ago when I attended a New Education Fellowship meeting in Adelaide I jotted down some words about education that impressed me. Although they are idealistic, they should impress everyone. At that meeting Dr. Beatrice Ensor, a world-famous educationist, made a long speech and, when speaking mainly of teachers, said:

A child is born into the world with infinite possibilities. Ours is the task of developing and encouraging those tendencies which make the kind of adult who will co-operate in bringing about this new social order. To do this we must envisage the primary function of education as opportunity for the growth of the individual and the developing in him of qualities of character. The first essential is a common philosophy of education; we

must agree in principle on what we are educating for. The second essential is to educate public opinion to realize the importance of education.

That is the very thing that the South Australian Institute of Teachers is trying to do in its campaign and, from what I can see, it is doing it successfully. The quotation continues:

We must be prepared to spend more money. Australia spends on education too little per head of population. Money can always be found for industrial development, for research, for defence, and yet it is on the quality of the human material of the country that its future depends. The prestige of teachers must be as high as that of other professions (law, medicine, church or business). They must be well paid so as to attract to the teaching profession the best type of men and women.

I think those remarks are as true today as they were when spoken a few years ago.

Mr. Freebairn: Should we be concentrating on increasing expenditure on tertiary education?

Mr. CLARK: This is being done. Sometimes we tend to say that the Commonwealth Government is doing nothing but, fortunately for the Education Department and for this Government, during the last few years the Commonwealth Government suddenly realized, or had enough pressure placed on it to make it realize, that public opinion tended this way, and it has devoted much money to assist tertiary education and to building teachers colleges, libraries, and so on. I think that the money has mostly been given as an advertisement, because the Government has given it in the field where it shows most and can be seen easily. I hope that money is given for all section of education in all States. At the conference to which I referred, another pertinent remark was made by Sir Cyril Norwood, at that time a visitor from the United Kingdom, who was the President of St. John College, Oxford. He said:

Democracy is a noble and difficult ideal; in its perfection if you like, unattainable like the Christian ideal. The only power that can make it what it is capable of being is education in the full sense of the term; that education of body, mind and spirit, that can make democracy safe for the world. We must seek qualities which are the reverse of those sought in the economic spheres in that they are increased by being shared. The more you have of them, the more there is for everybody else.

They may seem to be idealistic words, but when we examine them we realize they are not; they are completely true, and why should we not be idealistic for once in a good cause? Dr. Ensor said that we must have more money for education; I agree, so does the institute and so do most parents. But where do we

get it from? I believe that the only way we can get it is from the Commonwealth Government. I was surprised to notice in yesterday morning's *Advertiser* a report stating that the Premier had attended an L.C.L. meeting at Naracoorte in the South-East, and we know that almost anything can happen at a political meeting. The Premier was reported to have said:

We have reserved \$12,000,000 which would otherwise be used for building schools and hospitals.

When this matter was raised a few weeks ago in debate, although the Premier had been given notice of this subject, he did not seem to have heard of this money that had been salted away. He knows about it now, and came to light with it at an L.C.L. meeting.

Mr. McKee: He is worried about the High Court judgment on taxation.

Mr. CLARK: Of course he is.

Mr. Rodda: What L.C.L. meeting are you talking about?

Mr. CLARK: Although I was not there, the honourable member, who is a loyal south-easterner, was: I think the honourable member is verging on the ferocious-interjection mood again. I rather like him when he gets into that bellicose, ferocious mood, because he may then put his foot in it right up to the elbow. I have no idea what L.C.L. meeting it was. I am completely uninterested in them because they bore me to tears. I quoted from yesterday's *Advertiser* of a report of a meeting at Naracoorte.

Mr. Rodda: It was a public meeting.

Mr. CLARK: Yes, it was. I assure the honourable member that a public meeting held by the L.C.L. is normally attended by L.C.L. people only: no-one else could possibly take it. I return now to the campaign being waged by the South Australian Institute of Teachers. When I entered the Education Department some years ago this course of action would have been completely unheard of; at that time the teachers would not have been game to rise up and, within the boundaries of legal rights, state their point of view reasonably freely.

Mr. Rodda: Poor old Murrie fell on his face.

Mr. CLARK: That is a good subject not to be discussed, because many people still hold varying views on it. However, my mind has been made up for a long time. I believe the institute is to be commended on its campaign. I wholeheartedly agree with everything it is saying; indeed, this State would have been

much better off if some of the things that are being said now had been said long before.

I should like to read an editorial that was written by the President of the Teachers Institute, Mr. W. A. White, who is very well known to me. He was headmaster of the Gawler school for a while, and I assure those members who say this is a political campaign that Mr. White is not a fanatic: he is an educationist whose chief interest in life is the profession of teaching and particularly the children who are being taught. His remarks sum up in a sensible way the feelings of teachers at this stage in the life of the Education Department. Only a few weeks ago, towards the end of the second term, he wrote the editorial, which reads:

As the second term has progressed the staffing situation in our secondary schools has become more and more acute due to the resignation of teachers qualified to take Leaving and Matriculation classes and to the very serious shortage of science and mathematics teachers. The resignations of many infants and primary teachers, together with the increase in enrolments due to the mid-year intake of five-year-olds, has caused a strain on the staffing resources of both primary and infants schools.

How critical one regards the present situation depends on how closely one is involved in the educative process or is affected by it. Teachers, many of whom have been carrying a heavy teaching load for a very long time, believe that there is a limit to what should be expected of them. They want to provide the best education they possibly can for their students; they want to be available to their students for individual help and to give remedial teaching; they want to prepare their lessons carefully; they want to use the most appropriate methods and employ the most effective teaching aids; they want to keep up with their reading and they do want to be both mentally and physically fit for their job.

What about the students in our schools? One of the factors which has strained our resources during the past few years, has been the increasing desire by our pupils to stay on at school past the compulsory attendance age. More and more young people have come to realize the value of education and they want the best in education. Are they getting it? Every time a class is left without a teacher, or has a teacher simply supervising because he/she is not qualified to teach the subject at the level required, or the students are "shared" among other classes, the pupils in such a class are being denied a quality education.

The parents, through their generous donations, by which so many teaching aids and amenities are provided for our schools, by their work on committees, at fetes and working bees, and by their actions through such bodies as the South Australia Public Schools Committees Association, show that they want their children to have the benefits which can come from education. Our departmental officers,

who are aware of the situation in the schools, do whatever they can to spread the resources, which are available to them, as equitably as they are able. The increasing publicity, which has been given to education over the last few months, is making the public more aware of the factors which are affecting the quality of Australian education. It is not wishful thinking, surely, to believe that the people of Australia would be willing to see more of this country's resources, human and material, being devoted to the education of its young people!

I think that sums up the situation particularly well. There is no need for me to summarize Mr. White's remarks, for they are particularly cogent.

I want to say something about the feeling of parents and friends and their organizations. We hear much about what the teachers think about education but seldom do we hear what parents think. Recently I have received a couple of not very long letters from mothers, who are constituents of mine. Although they are not known to me, as is the case with all members, as the member for the district, I am known to them. The following letter from Elizabeth Park sums up the point of view of a sensible mother regarding education:

I would like to add my voice to the plea for more money for education. Something must be done and soon. My son has been taught for the last four years in cramped overcrowded temporary buildings. As an example his classroom now is in a temporary building with over 40 boys sitting cheek by jowl, and not even separate desks, and they mark each other's work. Now my son is 16 and at a very important stage in his life: he is hoping to become a teacher and is having a fight to get a decent education. His own teacher says there is every possibility of him getting to university providing he gets taught correctly now. The school he attends has a good main building and his idea of heaven is a desk of his own in a classroom in the main building.

These things are his right and every other child's right, and it is time the Government got cracking right smartly and spent some money to ease the desperate and chaotic situation. Can you visualize the situation in five or 10 years' time? I ask you to spend some of your valuable time in furthering the cause of more money for education, in fact it should be of the utmost concern to everybody and absolute top priority, otherwise instead of "Advance Australia Fair" it will be "Advance Australia Where".

I have a letter of a different type from another parent which, too, shows the feeling of parents about this matter. These are only two of many letters I have received—and I hope other members have received similar letters. This letter, which comes from Salisbury North, reads:

I have been reading and watching with interest the ads. on T.V. and in the newspapers

regarding the situation in the schools, and find that I agree with many of the things they say. It is very true that classes are overcrowded and teachers are unable to give each child the necessary attention. The average class is 30, but many times it is more. Because a higher standard of education is becoming more and more necessary, it is very important that our children receive a proper education. We need more teachers, more schools, and better facilities in these schools; but we mothers and fathers cannot be continually putting our hands into our pockets to provide these things.

When a child goes to school, even though textbooks are "free", pencils, exercise books, etc., have to be paid for. Each month a voluntary contribution card comes home to be returned accompanied by money. Then there are the countless gala days, sweets days, barbecues, etc., for which mothers must work and provide materials needed, and then after that expense they must find money to spend in buying back the things they've made. And, of course, there are outings to be paid for. This works out to quite a substantial sum over the school year, and with each schoolgoing child the amount increases as they reach a higher grade, and as they grow up the younger children reach schoolgoing age and the whole thing starts again.

The "temporary classrooms", although not the best type of classrooms, only come about fourth in the list of things that need improvement. However, as they are supposed to be temporary, wouldn't it be better to build permanent classrooms in the first place? I believe that, as the teachers themselves have considered the matter so important that they have personally supplied the money to provide these ads., the situation must be very grave. Because of this, I wish to add my pleas as a mother of two children—one at school and one to begin next term—for any improvements to this situation to be done as soon as possible. I don't mind working for and helping the school—in fact, I enjoy it—but this constant demand for money is very hard to cope with, especially with the cost of living so high that one never has enough money to go round in the first place. Can you please do something about getting more of the national and State income to be used for education? If, as the papers say, Australia is the highest taxed country in the world, I cannot understand why we do not have better education and other facilities.

I have read those two letters only to give the Committee an idea of the feelings of some parents. There are other letters that I would not quote because some of them were, to put it politely, rather abusive regarding what has been going on in education.

What is the prime motive of the campaign that has been and is being conducted by the institute? I believe it is the welfare of the children in the care of the teachers. I believe sincerely that, if teachers and children can work together under the right conditions so that there are happy schools with conditions

as near perfect as we can get them, our education will become better and better. All this we know. I do not need to be told that this will cost plenty; I know it will. We are all asking whether there is an answer and, if there is, what it is. I return to what I have been saying for many years in this place. Without boasting, I may say that I was one of the first members of Parliament in Australia to advocate this extensively: the only possible hope is to get more money from the Commonwealth Government. Let me now quote the final paragraph of Mr. White in the *Teachers Journal*, which I did not quote before. It reads:

What, then, is needed? Our State Government to be willing to adopt an imaginative and ambitious programme aimed at the provision of a first-rate standard of education in all of our schools; and to demand of the Commonwealth Government that sufficient finance be made available to it to carry out such a programme!

That is the only answer: I completely agree with Mr. White. I am not saying that the Commonwealth Government has done nothing with regard to education, although until a few years ago that could truthfully be said. However, in recent years public opinion has forced the Commonwealth Government to give assistance to secondary and tertiary education, particularly tertiary education, where—if I may say so—it shows most.

Mr. Venning: Do you support aid to independent schools?

Mr. CLARK: Of course—any sensible person does. However, I am not certain that the aid given in the recent Commonwealth Budget is the way to do it. However, that is a complicated matter. We must demand that grants be made to the States specifically for education, with no strings attached. I am certain that the State education authorities know the priorities for spending such grants much better than does the Commonwealth. The more voices raised in this place and outside it demanding that this be done the more chance there will be of obtaining money for education from the proper source. In this way all States will be able to get out of their difficulties in respect of education. I support the first line.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): It is obvious that the Budget is a very good document and that the Treasurer has done an excellent job with the money available to him. The speeches we have heard from members opposite only confirm this view, because most of them have made very little mention of the Budget

itself. In recent weeks education has been the subject of much comment not only in this place but elsewhere. Increased funds are being made available for education and help is being given to schools through ancillary staff. The provision for an additional 550 teachers and for an intake of 1,550 student teachers is a big step towards overcoming the teacher shortage. The annual boarding allowance for students in their first, second, third and fourth years of secondary schooling will be increased from \$150 to \$180, and for students in their fifth year from \$200 to \$230. All these items will have a great bearing on the ability of students to receive a better education, and assistance is being given by the Commonwealth Government. A grant of \$45 will be made for each student in primary school and \$70 for each student in secondary school. The provision regarding equipment for teaching aids in mathematics may seem small but it represents valuable assistance given completely by the Education Department. The various school committees had to find much money under the subsidy scheme and now these committees will be able to devote their funds to the provision of other amenities.

In my district, new primary schools have been built at Berri and Renmark. The Renmark school, with its vast lawn area, will require much maintenance, and groundsmen are an important part of school maintenance these days. The Treasurer's Financial Statement also refers to Aboriginal affairs, for which \$1,794,000 is provided, compared with \$1,688,000 last year. This provision, together, with an increased grant from the Commonwealth Government, will enable this department to extend its activities. The Select Committee of the Legislative Council on the Welfare of Aboriginal Children, in paragraph 70 of its report, dealing with administration, states:

A submission has been made to the committee by the Upper Murray Aborigine Welfare Association requesting that statutory provision be made for the establishment of regional advisory boards. The association contends that the voluntary involvement of the local community, operating through a legally constituted advisory board, could be of considerable assistance to the Minister in his administration of the Aboriginal Affairs Act. With their wide knowledge of local conditions such bodies could bring practical experience and judgment to their recommendations. The proposal is sponsored by representatives of churches, service clubs, local governing bodies, business and professional people: it is supported by Aborigines residing both on and off the southern reserves. The committee commends the work of this association and concurs with

its submission, considers that advisory bodies should also be set-up in other areas of the State.

I think the point of that paragraph is local involvement in this department, and that is the strength of the Aboriginal Affairs Department. I hope that the Minister will give considerable thought and consideration to the recommendations of this Select Committee concerning advisory boards. This would be the means by which Aboriginal people would have someone on the spot with local knowledge, because the board would comprise people from all walks of life who could help Aborigines with their day-to-day problems. This would greatly assist in assimilating the Aborigines in this State. This method has been carried out somewhat differently in New South Wales.

I refer now to the Engineering and Water Supply, Lands, and Agriculture Departments, three departments having a close liaison but operating completely independently. The actions of one department can affect the effectiveness of another department: for example, the water supply of this State is completely controlled by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, whereas the fruit-growing industry is controlled by the Lands Department although, from an advisory point of view, it is under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Department. The action of the Engineering and Water Supply Department in providing water has a marked effect on the ability of the Lands Department to supply water, as required, to growers. The time has come when departments have to recognize the effects of some of the past policies on our flora and fauna, particularly in the Murray River and river flats areas.

Mr. JENNINGS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I cannot hear one word the honourable member is saying, and I wonder whether I am missing something.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Chaffey.

Mr. ARNOLD: I am sorry if the member for Enfield does not know anything about the country.

Mr. Jennings: No: it is your ignorant mates who are singing out and drowning your voice.

Mr. ARNOLD: If the honourable member listens carefully—

Mr. Jennings: It isn't worth it.

Mr. ARNOLD: —I will try to use words the honourable member can understand.

Mr. Jennings: No, I'll go out.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. ARNOLD: Policies that have existed for several years have had detrimental effects on the river flats, a condition that has been brought about by the need of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to provide the maximum quantity of good water. This has been done by trying to retain the flow of water in the river proper, and many of the backwaters, anabranches and small creeks have been blocked off and silted up over the years. This has resulted in their being turned into saline areas, and it will be necessary for some of these areas to be opened up either by means of controlled flow pipes with lockable gates or by some other system.

In periods of unrestricted flow, the river can be channelled through these backwaters and creeks to reduce the salinity therein, at the same time reducing the salinity in the river flats. In many of these areas old-established gum trees and natural vegetation are dying out only because of one reason: this land is becoming more and more salty. Action will have to be taken before the damage becomes irreparable. Some of the trees that are dying are about 300 years old, and there is no way they can be replaced. Action will have to be taken to safeguard these natural reserves so that they can be preserved.

Mr. Hughes: How close to the water are they?

Mr. ARNOLD: They vary in distance from the water. Martin's Bend, near Berri, is a good example of this. The river varies in width from being only a narrow strip in some places to being two miles wide at other places. Damage is more apparent close to the irrigation areas where the salinity is creeping down because of the continuous irrigation that has been carried out over the years and because the natural anabranches and creeks have silted up. This, in turn, has occurred because the river level is held within a few inches except during high river periods.

If these creeks and backwaters were opened up and more fresh water were allowed to flow through in periods of unrestricted flow, we could save these forested areas and conserve them for the future. A similar situation to that at Martin's Bend exists at Ral Ral Creek, from which the Lands Department pumps its water for the Chaffey and Coolong Divisions of the irrigation area, because an insufficient flow comes through that creek. The installation of new pumping stations on the Murray River at Renmark could solve the problem at Ral Ral Creek and good quality water could be maintained by connecting the

outlet of the creek to the existing feeder channel in the Renmark area, the water then flowing into the Renmark reservoir and out below Lock 5. In this way excellent water supplies could be maintained for the fruitgrowing areas of Cooltong and Chaffey as well as for meeting the requirements of the salty area surrounding the Renmark reservoir, which could be rehabilitated to a pleasant park area.

I now turn to the reference in the Auditor-General's Report about irrigation and reclaimed areas. The earnings of the undertaking for the year totalled \$1,025,791, whereas the expenditure incurred was \$1,249,103, leaving a deficit on operations of \$223,312. With such a deficit, rehabilitation of the areas is extremely difficult. Although the Government has embarked on a programme of rehabilitating the irrigated areas of South Australia, it is obvious that, with a section such as this running at a loss, it will be extremely difficult to provide sufficient revenue for the programme. In this day and age it is necessary that the irrigation system be rehabilitated so that water can be saved. For example, in the Cobdogla area, 2,500,000 gallons an hour is pumped, whereas the actual distribution to the grower is only about 1,750,000 gallons, so that about 750,000 gallons an hour is lost somewhere. It is important to consider the cost of pumping this water and also the loss of water.

Mr. Broomhill: What about Chowilla?

Mr. ARNOLD: Not Chowilla, Dartmouth or anything else will stop this cost. Although we have excellent pumping stations generally throughout the irrigated areas, a breakdown occurs in the distribution system. This system must be completely investigated with the end result of making representations to the Commonwealth Government to have a rehabilitation programme carried out, not on a long-term basis but on a short-term basis. If it were carried out on a long-term basis, the benefits to be derived from a modern system with the latest techniques could not be enjoyed until the distribution system was completed. The system being installed by the Renmark Irrigation Trust will enable it to use many modern techniques in irrigation involving a reduction in the quantity of water used and, therefore, a reduction in the cost of production. Besides a reduction in the quantity of water used there will be an increase in production with some of these new techniques, which cannot be put into operation with the old cement-and-earth type of channel that we have at present. What I have been saying is borne out by the concluding remarks of the Treas-

urer, in that the production on the Upper Murray through irrigation is largely exported and, therefore, world market prices are the controlling factor. The Treasurer said:

There are, however, some other clouds on the horizon. The constant and accelerating rises in internal costs of production affect all industries, but, whereas those industries which sell all or most of their production to markets within Australia can pass on the increased costs to a home market which has a correspondingly increasing buyer ability to meet them, this is not the case with those who rely very heavily on markets overseas. Clearly, and this fact must be stated and restated with emphasis, these rising costs are passed along the line until they come to rest on the export industries, who are caught between them and the prices they can realize for their products on markets which are fiercely competitive and generally falling, and in some cases also narrowing.

I think this is the situation that the fruit industry is facing. For example, about 80 per cent of the canned fruit products from the Upper Murray district in South Australia is exported. Most of the dried fruit, too, is exported. Unless we can combat these rising costs—and a more efficient irrigation system is one way in which the grower has an opportunity of doing it—we shall eventually be forced into a situation where only the very large grower can exist.

Mr. Broomhill: He may not have any fruit to worry about if we do not get Chowilla.

Mr. ARNOLD: It is no use producing fruit if it is produced at a price beyond that which can be obtained on the world market. Unfortunately for the fruitgrowing industry, the bulk of the produce in these areas has to be sold on the overseas market. Even the bulk of the citrus has to be exported to virtually every country to which an outlet can be found. It would be an interesting exercise if consideration was given to the 2,000 or so fruitgrowers in South Australia. If we follow this through to the financial implications for these 2,000 fruitgrowers and the ultimate financial effect not only on them but also on South Australia and the whole country, we shall find it branches off in a thousand different directions.

Many sections of industry are involved and are basically dependent on the 2,000 growers at the end of the line. Everyone along the line gets his cost of production and his margin of profit, but all are dependent on the 2,000 fruitgrowers, who must split up what is left, whether or not the operation is profitable. This problem is faced in all

forms of primary production. From the viewpoint of dealing with the Commonwealth Government, it would be an extremely good exercise to ascertain just what monetary value was involved in primary production and how many people in this country derived their living indirectly from those primary producers who today are in a difficult position. If we

want to refer to crises, there are plenty of them in primary production. I support the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 18, at 2 p.m.