

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 24, 1969.

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

PETITIONS: ABORTION LEGISLATION

Mr. CLARK presented a petition signed by 48 persons stating that the signatories, being 20 years of age or older, were deeply convinced that from the time of its implantation into the woman's womb (that is, six to eight days after conception) the fertilized ovum was a potential human being, and therefore worthy of the greatest respect; and that the termination of pregnancy for reasons other than the preservation of the life or physical and/or mental welfare of the pregnant woman was morally unjustifiable; that, where social reasons appeared to exist for termination of pregnancy, then the social condition rather than the practice of abortion should be treated; and that experience in countries where abortions were permitted on social or economic grounds indicated that such practice created many new problems. The signatories also realized that abortions were performed in public hospitals in this State, in circumstances which necessitated it on account of the life or physical and/or mental health of the pregnant woman. The petitioners prayed that, if the House of Assembly amended the law, such amendment should definitely not extend beyond a codification that might permit current practice.

The Hon. R. S. HALL presented a similar petition signed by 14 members of the Owen Church of Christ.

Mr. GILES presented a petition signed by 93 persons stating that the signatories, being 16 years of age or older, were deeply convinced that the human baby began its life no later than the time of implantation of the fertilized ovum in its mother's womb (that is, six to eight days after conception), that any direct intervention to take away its life was a violation of its right to live, and that honourable members, having the responsibility to govern this State, should protect the 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. WARDLE presented a similar petition signed by 174 persons.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE presented a petition signed by 64 persons, being 18 years of age or older, stating that, because it was impossible to be certain that the fertilized ovum was not a human being at least from the time of implantation in its mother's womb six to eight days after conception, they were deeply convinced that it was worthy of the greatest respect from that time. The signatories stated that they realized that abortions were performed in public hospitals in this State to preserve the woman from serious danger to life or physical or mental health; that, where social reasons appeared to exist for termination of pregnancy, the social condition should be treated rather than terminating the pregnancy; and that, furthermore, the experience in countries where abortion was permitted on social or economic grounds indicated that such practice created many new problems without solving existing problems. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would suspend action on the Bill pending a detailed study of the British experience following the introduction of its abortion legislation, and that if the law was amended such amendment should definitely not extend beyond a codification that might permit the current practice.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

LEGAL ASSISTANCE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Previously I have asked in this House whether the Government will take action in regard to age pensioners who have paid considerable sums for the life tenancy of cottages, for which moneys have been subscribed by the Commonwealth in addition to those paid by the pensioners, to be erected by approved organizations. One point of contention is that some of these organizations, instead of leaving the tenants in possession of life tenancy, have sought to extract rent from them at increasing amounts, and this has been resisted by the people who subscribed considerable capital sums originally. Many of these pensioners have saved towards their funerals; these are moneys that they keep

in bank accounts against the time when they die so that their funerals are provided for. Because they are then in possession of some cash assets, it appears probable that they would be refused the normal assistance of the Law Society, which considers that, as they have moneys in hand, they can pay for legal assistance against the board which is seeking to increase payments by them for maintenance to make them rental payments instead of the life tenancies for which they have subscribed. In the absence of the Attorney-General, can the Premier say whether the Government will take up with the Law Society the matter of granting to these pensioners legal assistance, regardless of the fact that they have in hand small sums in cash sufficient to cover the cost of their funerals?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Although I have heard my colleague speak of some endeavours in this regard, I will refer the question to him, and find out how far he has taken the matter.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I understand that the New South Wales Education Department is working on a project to encourage people to use school buildings at night and during vacations. The New South Wales Assistant Director-General of Education is reported to have said that it is a shame that school buildings, which represent such a tremendous asset and which are provided at such great cost, are not used beyond school hours. Will the Minister of Education indicate her department's policy regarding the use of school buildings outside of school hours?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I have not seen the statement to which the honourable member refers. Frankly, I do not know what is the position regarding this matter, but I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

FOXES

Mr. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands will be aware that on several occasions over the past few years representations have been made by landholders in my district and in other districts throughout the State about the elimination of the fox menace. While I was Minister of Lands, I received several letters about this, and I have written some letters to the present Minister. A new approach has been made to me recently that steps should be taken by the Minister of Forests to bait forest areas at the time of the year when pups are around, which I am told is the time when baiting is most effective. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Forests

to see whether something can be done in this regard? Secondly, late in 1967, I think, an experiment was carried out in a forest area in the South-East (I think it was the Caroline Forest) on aerial baiting with carrots impregnated with 1080. Will the Minister ask his colleague whether there are any recorded results of that experiment and, if results have not been recorded, will he obtain a report on the matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will refer this question to the Minister of Forests and also to the Vermin Officer of the Lands Department. Undoubtedly, foxes would live in forest areas and feed from farm lands. Having lived alongside a forest, I know that there are many foxes in forests, although I say without fear of serious contradiction that damage by foxes is usually exaggerated. Nevertheless, I will take up that matter. Regarding carrot baiting, I take it that the honourable member means baiting for rabbit destruction.

Mr. Corcoran: Yes, with 1080.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Much work has been done with carrots and oats and other means of baiting during the honourable member's term as Minister of Lands and my own and later and, as a result of the work done by the Vermin Advisory Branch, the unequivocal attitude is that carrots are not better than oats for this purpose. In addition, carrots are considerably more difficult to use and there are objections to them on safety grounds. There is a further development in the use of one-shot 1080; in other words, with oats impregnated with 1080 so much more richly that they can be mixed with clean oats in a fairly small proportion and without going through the more expensive pre-feeding systems. The one-shot oats are just laid out, and the effect in destroying rabbits is nearly as good. I will ask my colleague about aerial baiting. That matter is extremely controversial so far as dingoes are concerned. The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization has recently expressed considerable doubt about the efficacy of aerial baiting. I have read recently of that organization's work in Central Australia, but I do not know whether that type of work would apply to foxes. I shall have the whole matter examined by the relevant authorities.

CHANDLER HILL TANK

Mr. EVANS: The Minister of Works has told me that the Engineering and Water Supply Department will build a 2,000,000-gallon water storage tank at Chandler Hill at a cost of \$125,000. Will the Minister find out the

areas that this tank will serve, particularly as people on the southern side of Chandler Hill have been awaiting a water supply for some time?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I will find out as soon as possible what area this tank will command.

ANCILLARY STAFF

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked in her absence last week in which I sought details regarding ancillary staff that would be provided in schools of various categories and sizes?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Financial provision has been made on this year's Estimates to enable the equivalent of an additional 246 full-time officers to be employed in schools. This staff is in addition to the existing 527 ancillary and clerical staff employed at present in secondary schools, teachers colleges, and adult education centres. Officers of the Education Department, in conjunction with officers of the Public Service Board, are preparing currently a detailed statement of how and where the additional staff will be employed. In this regard they are working on an approval which has been given in principle for a new scale of clerical assistance to be provided in primary and secondary schools on the following basis:

| <i>Enrolment</i> | <i>Clerical Assistants</i> |
|-------------------|---|
| 1601-1900 | 4 full-time |
| 1301-1600 | 3 full-time |
| 1001-1300 | 2 full-time |
| 801-1000 | 1 full-time plus 20 hours part-time a week |
| 601- 800 | 1 full-time |
| 401- 600 | 1 part-time (30 hours a week) |
| 201- 400 | 1 part-time (15 hours a week) |
| 101-200 | 1 part-time (10 hours a week) |
| 50- 100 | 4 weeks annually |

This means that clerical staff will be provided in primary schools for the first time and all schools except those with an enrolment of fewer than 50 will have some form of clerical assistance.

HORMONE SPRAYING

Mr. WARDLE: Over the last 12 months I have sought and received information concerning legislation to be introduced to cover hormone spraying, and some weeks ago I was told that this matter was being discussed in another State by officers of the Agriculture Department. Can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say

how far the drafting of this legislation has proceeded and what is the present position?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This legislation has had a long history. It originally involved the problem of aerial spraying and it was discussed by the authorities for some years, but it was soon realized that ground spraying equipment was just as dangerous to sensitive crops such as glasshouse crops. Recently, therefore, an attempt was made to draft effective legislation to prevent damage to valuable glasshouse crops by agricultural spraying, whether from the ground or from the air, and as the honourable member has said, an officer of the Agriculture Department recently visited Victoria to confer on the drafting of legislation. The Minister of Agriculture, to whom I spoke earlier today, intends to introduce the necessary legislation this session. He points out, however, that, because the drafting of the legislation has not been completed, it has not been referred to the Government. The Minister hopes that it will be completed shortly and discussed by the Government so that it may be introduced this session. The Minister is treating this matter as urgent.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr. VIRGO: I have received correspondence in which it is claimed that tenders for the Modbury Hospital have been called and prospective tenderers restricted to firms which have either recently shifted from another State to Adelaide or which have their head offices in other States, and that South Australian building firms with many years' experience have not been invited to tender for this all-important project. In directing the attention of the Minister of Works to these facts, I hope he will be able to say that the information I have is completely incorrect. However, if he is not able to do so, can he say why South Australian firms were not invited to tender?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Once again the honourable member is wrong in his assumption.

Mr. Virgo: It is not assumption: it is information given to me.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: As the honourable member has asked a question, he should do me the courtesy of listening while I reply.

Mr. Virgo: It is not an assumption.

The SPEAKER: Order! One question at a time. The honourable Minister of Works.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The date on which tenders were to be called was

announced in the House some time ago. Offers of registration were then called for. The practice of the registering of contractors or builders operates in many parts of Australia. Most State Governments and the Commonwealth Government engage in this type of tendering, as do most of the larger organizations that erect buildings in this State privately, and in addition, several semi-governmental organizations do the same thing. It means that advertisements are placed in newspapers calling for offers to register. When these were received in this instance, they were considered by the Public Buildings Department, which made recommendations to me about five or six of the larger firms of builders that were prepared to tender for this job. On receiving that information, I approved of those firms and they were invited to tender for the job.

As tenders come in they will go through the normal process of being examined by officers of the Public Buildings Department and will then go to the Auditor-General for his scrutiny. They would then come to me as Minister for me to recommend to Cabinet the successful tenderer. This is a common practice that is gradually being used more and more. I understand from the slant of the honourable member's question that he is suggesting that firms from another State are the ones that have been registered, to the exclusion of South Australian firms. This is not so, however, and the Government does not intend to do this. I suggest that no Government would take such action. Of course, a Melbourne firm may be one of the tenderers, and it is also possible, probably likely, that there are several firms that have moved from Melbourne to this State and set up offices here that could be on the list.

The honourable member should realize that no Government can prevent any company from coming from Melbourne and setting up here. That is not necessarily a bad thing, because most of the labour these firms employ would be South Australians, and if we can give employment to more local people the better things will be. The honourable member's question refers to what is normal practice. Although it is not adopted in respect of all our tendering, it is a practice which is coming more and more into vogue and which was only last week re-endorsed by the National Public Works Conference in Canberra. This matter has been discussed in detail with the Master Builders Association of South Australia, which has given its imprimatur to the scheme.

TEACHER RECRUITMENT

Mr. McANANEY: My question, which is addressed to the Minister of Education, concerns the teacher situation. Some months ago it was said that many resignations had been received from teachers, but I understand that the position has now changed and that as at the last pay period there were 75 extra teachers compared with the previous pay period. Can the Minister say whether my information is correct and, if it is, whether it reflects a trend to an increasing number of teachers being employed by the department at present?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I have not seen the latest figures since the period to which the honourable member referred, but I will certainly get a report.

Mr. CLARK: A constituent and her husband, both schoolteachers, came to South Australia from the United Kingdom some years ago and are very happy here. Recently this constituent, when speaking to me about another matter, told me of an idea that she had been thinking about for some time. She said that she had many friends and acquaintances in the United Kingdom who were schoolteachers and who, she was certain, would be extremely pleased to come to South Australia. She suggested that many fully-qualified teachers in the United Kingdom would like to come to South Australia but that the uncertainty involved in leaving employment in one country and getting employment here, together with the costs involved, probably prevented them from coming. This lady suggested that, if a recruiting campaign could be conducted in the United Kingdom or someone sent there to recruit particularly mathematics teachers and science teachers (I understand we have a shortage of such teachers), such a campaign would be successful. In fact, I think that, if she were asked, she would be pleased to participate in the campaign, but that is by the way. When I was in the Education Department teachers were brought out from the United Kingdom. Can the Minister of Education say whether such a recruiting campaign has been considered?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The suggestion made by the honourable member's constituent is only one of a number of projects being pursued actively at present to attract more teachers to the profession in South Australia. We are awaiting advice from the Agent-General in London about how a campaign of this kind to recruit teachers could best be mounted in the United Kingdom. As the honourable member understands, there are problems

associated with the matter but we are considering projects and, if we are advised that this could be carried out with some advantage to the South Australian position, I will consider it further. I thank the honourable member for the suggestion he has made on behalf of his constituent.

WALLAROO HOSPITAL

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning temporary accommodation for nurses at the Wallaroo Hospital?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Tenders are expected to be called early next month for the temporary accommodation for resident nursing staff at the Wallaroo Hospital. Subject to the receipt of a satisfactory tender, every effort will be made to let a contract and to have the work commenced at the earliest possible date.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. EDWARDS: I address my question to the Treasurer in the absence of the Premier. A report is current that spam is to be marketed in Australia. Spam is canned spiced ham in chopped form that became almost a staple part of the United Kingdom diet in the Second World War. The report states that after an initial period this product will be made using Australian pig meats, but meanwhile it will be imported from the United Kingdom. Will the Treasurer obtain an assurance from the Minister of Health that pig meats in any form from the United Kingdom will not be allowed to be imported into Australia, because of the great risk of the dreaded foot and mouth disease, which we must keep out of Australia at all costs?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Stringent regulations are exercised by vigilant Commonwealth authorities over the importation of any foodstuffs likely to bring foot and mouth or other diseases into Australia. The honourable member need not fear that any product brought into this country from the United Kingdom or any other country will be permitted entry if there is a risk that it contains viruses responsible for any disease. I and many other ex-servicemen are acquainted with the product referred to by the honourable member and, if my reaction to it is similar to that of other people, I doubt that much of it will be sold. Nevertheless, the question is a valid one and I will direct it to the Minister of Health for his comments.

U4

WATER LICENCES

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of September 16 concerning the granting of irrigation licences?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I wish to have the list to which the honourable member referred broken into two sections, one from February, 1967, to April, 1968, and the other from April, 1968, until the present time. The following is a list of the names of persons or companies issued with an annual diversion licence in excess of 100 acres from February, 1967, to April, 1968:

| Licence No. | Name | Acreage |
|-------------|---|---------|
| 238 | J. A. Broomell | 200 |
| 267 | Swan Reach Irrigation Company | 200 |
| 273 | John Gordon & Sons | 500 |
| 277 | Angove's Proprietary Limited | 500 |

No licences have been issued since April, 1968, in excess of 100 acres. In addition to the above, licences were issued following the proclamation dated October 19, 1967, extending the Control of Waters Act, 1919-1925, to include the area between Mannum and the Murray River barrages. The list hereunder relates to licences issued to those people who were already irrigating an area in excess of 100 acres at the time of the proclamation. The honourable member will recall that when the ban on licences was introduced in about February, 1967, and the Act was subsequently extended to include the area below Mannum in October, 1967, people there, who had never previously had to be involved with licences, were granted licences, and the list that I have here refers to those. However, no other licences involving areas over 100 acres have been issued between April, 1968, and the present time. As the list to which I have referred is a long one and is completely statistical, I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

LICENCES

| Licence No. | Name | Acreage |
|-------------|---|---------|
| 297 | G. C. Beaton | 110 |
| 314 | B. M. & J. P. Thiele | 140 |
| 382 | Tomley Investment Proprietary Limited | 205 |
| 403 | Glen Lossie Irrigation Board | 475 |
| 414 | G. A. Vanderbrink | 120 |
| 451 | P. J. Leahy | 117 |
| 470 | P. M. Cellier | 140 |
| 583 | R. D. Latimer & Co. | 125 |
| 585 | C. D. Humphris | 103 |
| 596 | C. M. Griffin | 146 |
| 612 | W. G. & L. G. Cooper | 400 |
| 613 | D. L. Mead | 145 |
| 615 | L. C. Ohlsen | 200 |

LICENCES—continued

| Licence No. | Name | Acreage |
|-------------|--|---------|
| 618 | I. H. Lightburn | 180 |
| 620 | Amarco Pastoral Proprietary Limited | 400 |
| 621 | J. & H. Parik | 140 |
| 631 | W. G. Squire & Sons | 118 |
| 634 | Yakuri Pastoral Proprietary Limited | 300 |
| 637 | Southern Estates Proprietary Limited | 225 |
| 639 | G. J. & E. E. Dobie | 250 |
| 646 | R. Kennedy | 250 |
| 647 | Hector Bros. | 150 |
| 648 | M. L. Vercoe | 200 |
| 662 | R. A. Norris | 228 |
| 665 | B. & M. Nicolle | 106 |
| 676 | Kondaparinga Proprietary Limited | 200 |
| 683 | S. L. & E. Fartsch | 125 |
| 726 | Woodlane Irrigation Board | 330 |
| 731 | Toora Irrigation Board | 435 |
| 748 | Long Island Irrigation Board | 330 |
| 749 | D. W. Tilley | 170 |
| 756 | J. W. Wylie | 205 |
| 764 | Woods Point Irrigation Board | 874 |
| 770 | G. E. Jaensch | 160 |
| 782 | Dehy Fodders (Australia) Proprietary Limited | 2000 |
| 785 | Riverglen Irrigation Board | 616 |
| 865 | G. E. Schiller | 170 |
| 903 | W. H. McFarlane | 350 |

AFRICAN DAISY

Mr. GILES: As I have said before in the House, the noxious weed African daisy, which is spreading at a fantastic rate throughout the Adelaide Hills, is worrying many people there. I have asked several questions concerning whether any biological control work has been undertaken in connection with this weed but, hitherto, nothing seems to have been successful in this regard. I have received a report that a caterpillar, commonly known as the woolly bear caterpillar, is attacking a patch of African daisy in the Norton Summit area and is effectively controlling the weed there. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture to have his department check this report to see whether it is correct; and if it is correct, will he see whether the woolly bear caterpillar can be cultivated and used biologically to control African daisy in our State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will refer this question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him to give it his attention. I would also ask the honourable member to see the Minister of Agriculture and give him whatever supplementary information he has in order to help the Minister check the position.

TRAVELLING SUBSIDY

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on September 4 about the availability of a travelling

concession for a child who has to travel between Townsend House and his parents' home in the country?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Concession fares are available, on application by parents to the Railways Department, for children who travel between school and their homes at the vacation periods. The return rail fare for schoolchildren under 16 years is at the rate of two-thirds of a single adult fare and, for children 16 years and over, at the rate of a single adult fare. Schoolchildren under 19 years of age travelling by air pay half of an adult fare. The Education Department regulations, however, provide only for payment by this department of travelling allowances for children who travel daily to and from school. The Government makes substantial financial grants to Townsend House and this, of course, benefits the parents of children who board there. Because of the above circumstances the Education Department cannot provide any additional subsidy to parents of the children referred to by the honourable member.

SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICES

Mr. ALLEN: I understand that 14 female dental therapists who graduated in June, 1969, are now operating in Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Peterborough, and, in addition, clinics are being built at Renmark and Murray Bridge. As at present nearly 1,000 children are attending schools in the township of Clare, I consider that this would be an ideal centre for the setting up of a dental clinic to serve Clare and the surrounding area generally. Can the Minister of Education say whether the setting up of a dental clinic in Clare has been considered?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The school dental services are a branch of the school medical services, which come within the province of the Minister of Health. However, I will consult my colleague on the matter and see whether I can obtain a reply.

NORTHERN ROAD

Mr. CASEY: My question relates specifically to the road recently constructed by the Highways Department between Balcanoona Station and Arkaroola. On visiting this area recently, I found the road to be a super highway compared with the roads nearby. As this road is not on the planning road map of the Highways Department for the Far North will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport why this road was constructed, who will benefit by its construction, and whether its construction resulted from a Cabinet decision following discussions that took place

between the Minister of Immigration and Tourism and the management of the Arkaroola motel? Further, will he ascertain the cost of the road to the Highways Department, how long it took the department to construct the road, and whether it is planned to extend this road from Balcanoona to Blinman? If the road is to be so extended will the Attorney-General find out when this work is likely to take place?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask the Minister of Roads and Transport.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. McKEE: Last month I asked the Premier whether the Senate Select Committee on Air Pollution had submitted its report. The Premier then told me that the committee had completed its inquiries and was preparing a report. Has the Premier any further information to give the House concerning this matter?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not have any information with me on this matter. In looking at my question list, I find that there is no current question on it that has been asked by the honourable member. However, I will add the question asked today to the list and I will advance its priority in order to give a service to the honourable member.

WEST LAKES SCHEME

Mr. BROOMHILL: My question follows the one asked yesterday by the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) about the West Lakes scheme. In his reply to the honourable member, the Premier said:

A meeting has been arranged with the Director of Industrial Promotion, representatives of the Port Adelaide and Woodville councils (the Mayor, the Town Clerk and the City Engineer from each council) and the consulting engineers who are involved in planning the drainage proposals for West Lakes. The purpose of this meeting is to try to resolve amicably the financial obligations relating to external drainage costs of each party concerned.

I should have thought that the Henley and Grange council and possibly the Hindmarsh council would be involved in the drainage plan associated with the West Lakes scheme. Can the Premier say whether he has considered issuing an invitation to these two councils to be present or whether I am mistaken in my belief that they would have financial obligations arising from the scheme?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will find out whether these councils are involved and give the reply to the honourable member.

BANKSIA PARK STORAGE TANK

Mrs. BYRNE: The Minister of Works will be aware that a water storage tank is currently being constructed on the hills above the suburb of Banksia Park. I was under the impression that this storage tank was being erected to improve the water pressure in streets above Haines Road, Tea Tree Gully (and I refer particularly to streets such as Camelia and Lilac Streets and Farr Crescent, Tea Tree Gully), and for other purposes. I point out that doubt has been expressed to me by occupants of some of the houses in these streets whether, because of its height above sea level, this tank will improve the water pressure to these houses. Also, further development will take place in this area as it is subdivided. Will the Minister examine the matter and give an assurance that the water storage tank will provide a satisfactory water supply to the area?

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

ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently an advertisement in the *Advertiser* stated that a South Australian Government Committee of Inquiry into Road Safety had been formed and that written submissions could be forwarded to that committee. The advertisement said that members of the committee had been drawn from a wide range of disciplines and interests, and that a full inquiry into all aspects of the problem of road safety was planned. As road safety is an important aspect of everyday life and concerns many people and organizations, will the Attorney-General ascertain from the Minister of Roads and Transport who are the members of this committee?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will see whether this can be done.

GUN LICENCES

Mr. CORCORAN: An article in today's *News* reports that recently a five-year-old Salisbury boy was wounded in the head by a pellet fired from an air gun. I had a similar experience, although the result was a near miss.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Not deliberate.

Mr. CORCORAN: No, unintentionally I got mixed up in a local war.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Were your children involved?

Mr. CORCORAN: No, my children were not involved. I assure the Attorney-General that my children are under proper control and have not at this stage graduated to using a

daisy air gun, rifle or anything of that description. I point out that an expert at a city store said today that there were two types of air gun: one with a rifle barrel that had to be licensed; and the other a smooth bore type which, according to this person, was just as lethal as the gun with the rifle type of barrel. Apparently guns of the latter type are readily available to young children and do not have to be licensed. The mother of the boy injured has expressed concern about the situation, and I guess it is one that concerns the parents of all children. Incidentally, the accident occurred in a playground at Salisbury, and a similar accident could occur in any other playground if these guns are used indiscriminately. I am not sure whether the Attorney-General or the Minister of Lands is responsible for issuing gun licences, but will the appropriate Minister see whether sufficient grounds exist on which to take some action to control not only the rifle barrel type of gun (which is under licence now) but also the smooth bore type of daisy air gun in an endeavour to prevent this type of accident's occurring again?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think the question should properly be addressed to the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary. As it was asked of the Attorney-General or me, I will see that it goes to the Chief Secretary, and probably the Premier will reply in due course.

Mr. HUDSON: About two years ago the former Minister of Agriculture announced an increase in gun licence fees, I think from \$2 to \$4, and said that the extra revenues obtained would be used to develop game reserves. When the Labor Government was defeated I imagined that this commitment of an extra \$40,000 expenditure would be continued by the current Government.

Mr. Virgo: The Labor Government was never defeated.

Mr. HUDSON: True, but I am not allowed by Standing Orders to enter into a debate on that matter now.

Mr. Rodda: It just had a good old kick in the rump.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a debate.

Mr. HUDSON: You are absolutely right, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad you have drawn the attention of the member for Edwardstown to the correct procedure. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture when there will be an increase in expenditure on

providing and developing these reserves in line with the commitment made by Mr. Bywaters in 1967, and ascertain how much was spent under this heading in the last three financial years and the intended expenditure for this year?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will try to get the information. I am rather surprised that there should be any doubt about the game reserve situation. I will go back a little further in history and point out that, while I was Minister of Agriculture previously, I introduced the Fauna Conservation Act, which defined game reserves and gave them a niche in the legislation, and I was able to have the wild life section of the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department established, so that the Director had a staff of wild life officers looking after matters dealing with fauna protection generally. I had some connection with all these things. Since the present Minister of Agriculture has been in office, I know there has been considerable activity concerning game reserves. There is a game reserve at Bool Lagoon, one is being discussed and, I think, in the course of being established in the Upper Murray area, and another is in the Lake Alexandrina area. As I do not know offhand the expenditure figures, I will obtain them. I wish to correct any impression that activity in this field started with the Labor Government and stopped there: it started before the Labor Government came into office, and is certainly on a continuing and growing basis at present.

MONUMENTAL MASONRY

Mr. EVANS: In the Adelaide Hills recently, salesmen for monumental masonry suppliers have repeatedly annoyed people who have suffered bereavements. Although possibly only the one firm does this, it concerns me that people in this field go to the extreme every other week of visiting people, who have suffered a bereavement, to try to convince them it is time they took action to provide some improvements to the surrounds of the graves of their relatives who have been recently buried. Often such people are still waiting to receive settlement from their estate and may be in no financial position to carry out the improvements we all may think are desirable to the graves of people that have passed on. Will the Premier find out whether it is the general practice for all monumental masonry suppliers to send out salesmen to sell their wares under these conditions, or is this just the odd occurrence?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get a report for the honourable member, particularly as this matter pertains to his district, and let him have it as soon as possible.

ABORTION BILL

Mr. HURST: I was interested to read in this morning's *Advertiser* a report regarding the annual dinner of the Law Society of South Australia at the South Australian Hotel last evening, where Sir Douglas Menzies, a Justice of the High Court, responded to the toast proposed by the Attorney-General. The report states:

Sir Douglas Menzies, who was responding to the toast, "The bench and the legal profession", proposed by the Attorney-General (Mr. Millhouse), added that it was not for lawyers to form the canons of public policy that would determine what changes should be made in the law . . . Many of the substantial social changes made in the law were made by Parliamentarians who were lawyers, "but let them do it in Parliament," he said.

Can the Attorney-General say whether he committed a slight indiscretion at the Law Society dinner by trying to peddle his abortion law reform legislation at an inappropriate time, and whether that was the reason for the reply by Sir Douglas Menzies?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I did not even mention the matter in my speech; this was merely an illustration given by Sir Douglas Menzies in the course of his reply to my toast and did not spring out of anything I said. However, I should like to endorse what he said about the value of lawyers in the community and, in particular, about the value of lawyers in Parliament. What he said was, in my respectful opinion, absolutely correct, and he has been well reported in this morning's paper. One reason why the United States of America is such a progressive country is (as I found on my recent trip) that probably between one-third and one-half of the members of all Legislatures there are lawyers.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VIRGO: A short time ago I was extremely interested to read the President's address to the 119th annual general meeting of the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce and to find that the President is at one with members on this side about the urgency of building the standard gauge railway line from Adelaide to Port Pirie. The President stated:

We ask everyone involved to accept the urgency of building this line so that goods moving to and from Adelaide will not be affected by any break of gauge.

A report in the *Advertiser* a day or so ago, after the conference at Port Augusta, states that the first train on the new trans-Australia standard gauge railway will leave Sydney for Perth on February 23 next year, and this emphasizes the urgency of the matter. Although the Premier has given some information to the House from time to time, I hope he is not satisfied with the progress being made. In view of the announcement about the running of the first train on this line and other statements on the matter, will the Premier again press the Commonwealth Government to speed up the pending feasibility study so that Adelaide can be connected with the standard gauge line as soon as possible?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I gave the honourable member the wrong impression if I conveyed to him that I was not satisfied about the recent progress of work on this line.

Mr. Virgo: I said I hoped you weren't satisfied.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am satisfied to know that the Prime Minister stated, when in South Australia recently, that this was an essential work and would be completed. Doubtless, the honourable member could be excused if he has not got this matter in context, because he has been in this House only since the present Government has been in office. When the Labor Government was in office for three years, that Government was unsuccessful in representations to the Commonwealth Government about this line. The honourable member would realize from statements made in recent months that significant progress has been made, plans having reached the stage where consultants are about to be appointed to study the route of this line and matters associated with the standardization of this link, including such items as a line to Wallaroo and through to Gladstone. The honourable member will also realize, if he has read the material, that a date has been fixed for submission by the consultants of this report. Whilst I am sure every member desires that the line be completed as soon as possible, we must give the consultants sufficient time to complete their study, and the honourable member will also realize that the appointment of these consultants has broken the deadlock between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government about the project and has solved the problem which his Party faced during its term in office and which my Party faced early in its term. This is real progress with standardization of the line. In

my opinion, the project is well on the way, and all we are doing at present is settling the details of how and where the line will be standardized and the work accomplished.

WATER USAGE

Mr. WARDLE: In reply to a question asked in the Commonwealth Parliament, Senator Scott made the point that, if South Australia did not accept the offer of increased water from the Dartmouth dam, the State would not receive any more water annually than had been received since the original quota was established in 1915. Can the Minister of Works say how much water was taken from the Murray River by pipeline and through irrigation in 1915, and how much has been so taken in each decade since?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: As I can get this information for the honourable member, I will do so as quickly as possible.

TRAVEL PERMITS

Mr. CASEY: Recently I received a letter from the North-Eastern Branch of the Stock-owners Association of South Australia, which is located in my district. Representations have been made over the years to the Transport Control Board for special permits for station people living well away from the railway line in that area, and about two years ago the board gave permission for two such permits to be issued to the station property so that people could travel, after the permit had been countersigned, to and from Adelaide. For example, at present the station manager can only sign a permit for a station hand to travel to Adelaide, but he has no authority to sanction his return to the property. Will the Premier ask the board to allow the station managers who have been granted these two permits for their employees to countersign them so that the people who are in Adelaide can return to their normal place of abode or employment instead of having to contact the board when they are in Adelaide, because sometimes they have difficulty and they may not even be coming to Adelaide in some instances? It would be convenient for the people in these remote areas to have this matter cleared up so that there will be no problem in the future.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will speak to the Minister of Roads and Transport and see whether the honourable member's proposal is feasible.

SURREY DOWNS SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: On September 18, I visited the Surrey Downs Primary School in company with members of the school committee and welfare club, some of whom pointed out to me that the size of the asphalt playing area was not large enough, particularly in winter, when all the children were forced to share it. Will the Minister of Education investigate the possibility of providing additional asphalt playing area at this school?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to do that.

Mrs. BYRNE: This school, which is of Samcon construction, consists of three separate buildings, and it is necessary for the teaching staff and children to move from one building to another during the day. As this means that the staff and children have no protection from the weather (I refer particularly to wet weather), will the Minister of Education consider erecting a shelter, such as a covered walkway, to link the buildings?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes.

PAECHTOWN MILL

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Immigration and Tourism a reply to my question of September 18 about tourism in the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member asked a question about the possible separation from the township of Hahndorf of the old mill east of Hahndorf and a few old houses in Paechtown nearby as a result of the proposed freeway. I do not have a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport, but the Director of the Tourist Bureau, who knows something about this matter, has pointed out that the Highways Department took the trouble to consult the district council before it planned the road and that in this respect the department showed consideration to the local council, but whether it is possible to do anything about it remains to be seen. I await the Minister's reply, but I doubt whether the question warrants the relocation of an important freeway. It would be useful, from the tourist's point of view, to have the two places connected, but I think that that consideration must inevitably be outweighed by requirements of an important road. The old houses in Paechtown, which are not the only examples of early German architecture, are not in a good state of repair but are of considerable historic interest,

and there is an undoubted historic connection between them and the mill about which the honourable member has inquired. On receiving a further reply, I will bring it down to the House.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. VIRGO: Recently, I asked the Treasurer to inquire about two building firms, which were having difficulties with the Commonwealth Taxation Department, as to whether they were correctly insured for workmen's compensation. Has he a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member gave me privately the names of two companies. Investigations show that both firms have in operation current policies of insurance covering their workmen, as required by the Workmen's Compensation Act.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. HUDSON: In the Chowilla dam controversy the matter of the appropriate rate of evaporation for a large body of water in the Renmark area was a critical factor in determining the relative yield to Chowilla from New South Wales and Victoria. Members will also be aware that the changes in the evaporation estimates were made as a result of investigations at Lakes Hindmarsh, Hattah and Albacutya, in Western Victoria. I understand that the views on evaporation are different concerning the Menindee Lakes area: some estimates of evaporation obtained in that area suggest that the latest evaporation estimates for Chowilla are grossly exaggerated. For example, the lake known as Lake Speculation, which was filled during the 1956 flood but which for the subsequent eight years had no intake of water, other than natural rainfall, and which is in a clay pan so that there is no leaking from the lake, took over eight years to evaporate and its maximum depth is about 27ft. to 30ft. This suggests an average rate of evaporation, allowing for a 6in. to 8in. rainfall a year in that area, of 42in. to 48in. a year, which is a rate of evaporation well below the latest estimates that have been applied by the River Murray Commission's technical committee in the case of Chowilla. Other estimates obtainable from the Menindee Lakes area also suggest lower rates of evaporation. Will the Minister of Works take this matter up with the Menindee Lakes authority and inquire what information it has on evaporation rates in that area and, if the information obtained conflicts with the estimates used in the technical committee's latest report, will he, through the South Aus-

tralian representative (Mr. Beaney), ensure that this information is put before the commission?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I am not aware of the results to which the honourable member has referred in relation to the Menindee Lakes, but at his request I will have them examined as he has suggested. I point out to the honourable member that he is again casting doubt on the results of the technical committee's findings, which were presented to this House and which he has from time to time doubted despite the assurances given by members of this Government.

Mr. Hudson: The technical committee has changed its mind.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Let me finish: the honourable member has asked his question. The information I have been able to receive following the replies I have previously given to the honourable member, who is now casting doubts on the evaporation estimate for Chowilla, indicates strongly that the original investigation carried out at Chowilla on its original design showed that the figures were far below the actual results of evaporation and that the evaporation loss at Chowilla is likely to be greater than that originally expected. I gave the honourable member information concerning the other lakes in Victoria to which he had referred: there has been much study done on them and other basins, and I have studied many of these reports. The honourable member has now asked about the Menindee Lakes and, just as I did before, I will get that information for him, although I am not aware of the details to which he has referred. I emphasize that the position regarding Chowilla now means that evaporation could be over 900,000 acre feet compared with 15,000 acre feet at Dartmouth.

MARINO ROCKS RAIL SERVICE

Mr. HUDSON: Several times since I have been a member I have asked questions of the Minister of Transport in the previous Government, in particular, about the railway service to Marino Rocks. Most trains on the Brighton line terminate at Marino unless they continue to Hallett Cove. The replies given by the Railways Commissioner, when previous approaches have been made to him to improve the service to Marino Rocks, have stated that, when the population in that area increases and more frequent services are justified, the matter will be further considered. As it is about 18 months to two years since I asked the last question and there has been

a significant increase in the population in that area and, I am told, a significant increase in the patronage of the railway service from Marino Rocks, will the Attorney-General discuss with the Minister of Roads and Transport improvements to the train service to Marino Rocks, and also ask his colleague to undertake a further survey of likely increases in patronage that may occur in the next few years?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall.

MAIL BOXES

Mr. VENNING: As my question concerns a Commonwealth matter I direct it to the Premier. For some years the Postmaster-General's Department has been building new post offices in the northern areas of this State and has been renovating others. In doing so, the department has replaced private mail boxes at these centres. Will the Premier ask the appropriate authority to reconsider the installation of these new boxes, because they are considerably smaller than those they are replacing and this is causing some inconvenience?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As this matter comes under Commonwealth jurisdiction and is not something on which I can have a direct influence, I will take it up with the relevant authorities and obtain a report for the honourable member.

RAILWAYS

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent questions on railways?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have three replies on railways for the honourable member and, as I do not know which one he wants first, I shall give him the one on the Adelaide railway station. The improvements intended for the Adelaide railway station include the extension and modernization of the interstate booking office, which will also include an area for intrastate country bookings. The barber shop will be transferred from its present site to a frontage on North Terrace. The renovations are aimed at modernizing the country and interstate booking offices, and also utilizing for commercial purposes the North Terrace frontage. Necessarily, these changes must be implemented in stages. It is intended, during the current financial year, to move the country ticket windows from the present site in Railway Road to a temporary site on the North Terrace frontage, thus allowing work to be commenced to expand an

area for interstate and country bookings. Some walls will need to be demolished and temporary facilities constructed so that the existing interstate office can continue without undue inconvenience being caused by the alterations. My colleague has supplied me with sketch plans showing the intended modernization of the country and interstate rail booking facilities, which plans can be inspected by the honourable member should he so desire.

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General a reply for me on another railway matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member is happy, I do not know why he does not refer to the name of the topic, because I set them out in the note I gave him. However, I will give the reply on the railway accident that occurred at Violet Town.

Mr. Virgo: It does not matter which one: I just want a reply.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have them in strict alphabetical order. I am informed that there has been no speeding up of demotions in the South Australian Railways Department as a result of the railway smash at Violet Town. Train staff continue to undergo periodic and thorough medical examinations. Enginemen with 15 years' service on the foot-plate who fail to reach the required standard in eyesight, hearing, or colour sense, and for this reason are called upon to suffer a reduction in grade, are paid $\frac{5}{6}$ th of the rate applicable to the former grade. An engineman with similar service who is required to take a reduction in grade because of a heart ailment, is paid half the difference between his graded rate and the graded rate of the position to which he is reduced in addition to his new rate. This latter arrangement was offered by the Minister of Roads and Transport to the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen in June of this year, and later accepted by that union. In resolving that the offer be accepted, the council of the union expressed its appreciation of a significant step forward which had been the subject of negotiation spread over many years.

Mr. VIRGO: The Attorney-General has informed me that he has a reply to another of my questions on railways. If he wants to know the title, it is "Railways".

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I wondered whether the honourable member would be able to resist the temptation to have a dig at me. During 1968-69 the Overland ran on 356 occasions. It arrived in Adelaide on time on 98 occasions and was not more than 10 minutes late on another 42 occasions. In the

remaining 258 cases when the train was late it had previously arrived late at Serviceton on 244 occasions. In 97 cases time was gained between Serviceton and Adelaide. Generally, a combination of late arrivals at Serviceton together with speed restrictions and crossings in South Australia caused the late arrivals during the last year.

RELIEVING TEACHERS

Mr. HUDSON: As the Minister of Education can understand, the present position in relation to relieving teacher staff is creating considerable difficulties within schools and it is a matter on which teachers have strong opinions. It has been brought to my attention that some parents are disturbed about this matter, particularly as they have found that, when certain teachers at a school (I am not mentioning any specific school because there are several instances of this) are ill, the children may have to miss a science or a mathematics lesson on that day, because there is no competent replacement teacher available. Will the Minister obtain a report on the plans of her department to meet the problem by providing adequate relieving teaching staff, and will she indicate what long-term policies the department will be adopting in order to secure adequate relieving staff and to avoid the current problems that are created for staff and students alike when staff members become ill?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Even though we are facing a temporary problem with regard to the provision of teaching services, if the department is informed of the sickness or absence of any teacher steps are taken promptly to try to provide alternative staff on these occasions at these schools. I will get a report for the honourable member, but I assure him that we are trying to meet the problems at the schools when they arise.

GLENELG TRAM

Mr. HUDSON: The Premier will appreciate that, now that the Government has modified the railway proposals in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, the Glenelg tram can continue to operate. He has indicated previously in the House that at some stage the Government will make a definite announcement on this matter. Can the Premier now say whether the Glenelg tram service will be abolished, as was originally recommended in the M.A.T.S. plan? If this service is to be continued, as I think it should be, can he say whether a programme to replace and modernize the cars used on this service is to be instituted?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get a report.

GARDEN SUBURB

Mr. VIRGO: The Attorney-General, who, with me, has personal interests, from a district representation point of view, in the future of the Garden Suburb, will recall that I have asked many questions about this matter and have appeared before the committee and given evidence on it, as he has also done. The last information the House received on this matter was on August 19, when the Attorney-General said that, the committee having completed its inquiry, the matter would be considered by Cabinet. Will the Attorney-General say what decision Cabinet has made on this matter, which it apparently considered over a month ago?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No decision has yet been made.

MODBURY SOUTH SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: The Modbury South Primary School, which is attended by 424 children, opened on February 6, 1967. However, no canteen shell having been incorporated in the building, the canteen now temporarily occupies a book-room on the ground floor. This room, which was not meant for the purpose, is too small, with the result that inconvenience is caused to the canteen staff, many members of whom are voluntary workers. The Public Buildings Department intends to enclose the end of a shelter shed to provide for a canteen and money has been raised by the school committee and welfare club members for the school's share towards the cost of this project. Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report on this matter, if possible indicating when this work will commence?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Yes.

Mrs. BYRNE: Although this school is now in its third year of operation, the oval has not yet been developed, although an undertaking was given that it would be developed at the Education Department's expense, and a water reticulation system, also to be provided by the department, has not been installed. As this work will greatly improve the conditions at the school, will the Minister of Education find out when it is to commence?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes, I shall be pleased to do that for the honourable member.

NOARLUNGA FREEWAY

Mr. VIRGO: On August 26, the Premier undertook to get me some information detailing in categories the number of properties affected by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study route of the Noarlunga Freeway, as compared with the 1962 route. As I

have had no indication from the Premier that he has the reply to the question I asked on that occasion, I assume that he has not yet obtained it. However, as it is imperative to have this information before alternative proposals can be properly considered, can the Premier say when it will be available?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get information about the information.

RESTRICTED SPEED LIMIT

Mr. CLARK: I recently received a letter from the Secretary of the Salisbury Branch of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, which has a large and active membership in the area, informing me that at a recent meeting its members passed the following resolution:

The members of the Salisbury A.E.U. Branch request our M.P. to contact the Road Traffic Board on our behalf with a request that a 45 miles an hour speed limit be placed on the section of the Main North Road, Salisbury, between Frost Road and Stanbell Road. The traffic hazard on this section of the road has now been accentuated by the recent opening of a shopping centre on the corner of Stanbell Road and the Main North Road.

The resolution refers to the recent opening of the Lazy Lamb meat establishment, together with a fruit and vegetable store, I think called the Happy Apple, and other shops will possibly be opening there. Will the Attorney-General convey this resolution to the Minister of Roads and Transport, asking him to take up the matter with the proper authorities and to see whether the request may be considered?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will certainly do that and, as the honourable member will know from the answer I gave the member for Edwardstown a few minutes ago, the Minister is always particularly happy to comply with any request from unions.

SEAT BELTS

Mr. HUDSON: I address my question to the Attorney-General partly because he has been the promoter of seat belts in South Australia. It has been brought to my attention by a constituent that, in general, the Police Force in South Australia does not set the best of examples concerning the wearing of seat belts. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether a report can be obtained from the Road Traffic Board on the general advisability of members of the Police Force not only having seat belts provided in their cars but also actually wearing them?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I wonder whether the honourable member's expression

of opinion on the wearing of seat belts by police officers is well-based, but I will certainly ask the Minister whether he will refer the matter, as the honourable member suggests, to the Road Traffic Board.

SOUTH ROAD JUNCTION

Mr. VIRGO: I find myself in the unique position of agreeing with the context of a question asked by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) of the Attorney-General a week or so ago about a dangerous situation at the junction of South Road and Chandler Hill Road. There is an equally bad junction (or perhaps it is even worse) nearer Adelaide at the junction of South Road and Marion Road. A motorist is required to observe a "stop" sign on Marion Road before entering the dual highway of South Road. To make a right turn from Marion Road into South Road is extremely difficult. I believe there ought to be some form of traffic control, whether by lights, or some other means. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to refer this matter to the Highways Department so that it can make a proper assessment of this junction (it would seem convenient for this to be done at the same time as an assessment is made of the Chandler Hill Road and South Road junction)?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will certainly do that, but I point out to the honourable member that one significant difference between the two junctions of Chandler Hill Road with South Road and Marion Road with South Road is that the Marion Road junction is within the 35 miles an hour speed limit and the Chandler Hill Road junction is not.

BRIGHTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: On September 18, I asked the Minister of Works to provide information on the costs of the Brighton High School assembly hall project. In reply to a question I asked on July 30, the Minister originally said that he would let me know the likely apportionment of costs, and again last week he said that he did not have the information with him but that he would find out whether he could have it for me this week. Does the Minister have this information now?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I cannot give it to the honourable member at present. Following his question last week and the undertaking I gave him then, I am currently studying the problem, which is quite involved. If I possibly can, I will give him the information tomorrow.

RABBITS

Mr. RODDA: Press, radio and television reports last week stated that Senator Martin Cameron had made a rather glaring discovery in Canberra that the national capital was infested with rabbits around Parliament House. The Minister of Lands has distinguished officers in his department who are skilled and have paramount experience in the destruction of this pest. In view of the Senator's astounding discovery in Canberra, there might be rabbits in and around this Chamber. Therefore, will the Minister offer the services of his officers to the Commonwealth authorities, at the same time instituting investigations to see that this Parliament is not being similarly plagued?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The suggestion that there may be rabbits around the State Parliament comes as a thunderbolt, and I will have to consider it closely. I would not be interested in offering the services of State officers to the Commonwealth. That might be looked at as an excise, or the Commonwealth might recognize the high quality of our officers and try to pinch them from us. Although I am sure we can look after our own problems, I think we had better keep away from Canberra's problems.

TRACTOR SAFETY

Mr. HURST: A couple of weeks ago I was privileged to attend the opening of the safety exhibition, the first of its kind in South Australia. I would appreciate it if the Minister of Labour and Industry would convey to his department my congratulations on its initiative in opening this exhibition, which I think will have an impact on industrial safety in South Australia.

Mr. Broomhill: Didn't you initiate it?

Mr. HURST: I understand that the rate of accidents involving tractors is considerable and that firms are concentrating on making safety devices to protect drivers when tractors overturn. Will the Minister find out whether the department intends to try to extend the safety exhibition to include these other facilities, provided the manufacturers are prepared to co-operate?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: First, I thank the honourable member for his reference to the safety exhibition, which is the first of its kind in Australia. I noted the interjection of the member for West Torrens. When opening this exhibition, due credit was given by the Government to the member for Semaphore for his interest in the matter.

Mr. Clark: He wasn't anxious to take credit for that.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I recognize the interest of the member for Semaphore in this field and I give him due credit for that interest. As I have said in reply to other questions, tractor safety is a matter presently being examined. It is rather complicated, because statistics reveal that almost half of the accidents involving tractors have occurred on level ground and not on hilly terrain. This indicates carelessness either in the method of handling or in regard to overloading, with wrong adjustments being made to the attachments of the tractor for driving or towing. Having examined the legislation in New South Wales, I do not believe it is applicable here; I have sent copies of that legislation to rural organizations within the State inviting their comments. I rather lean towards an educational programme in this field. The question of an exhibition relating particularly towards tractor safety has not yet been examined, but I will look at it to see whether there is some means by which we can provide it, and this will particularly concern manufacturers. In addition, approaches have been made to tractor manufacturers by the Ministers of Labour and Industry in the various States.

SOUTH-EAST HOUSES

Mr. CORCORAN: Will the Minister of Housing find out whether the Public Service Board has yet received a report from his officers on the re-assessment of rentals of Woods and Forests Department houses at Mount Burr and other areas in the South-East and, if the report has not been made, how long it will be before a decision from the Board on this matter can be expected?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will certainly do that. The honourable member has been patient in this matter, as he knows the Housing Trust's difficulty in making this re-assessment. Because of that, I appreciate his willingness to co-operate, and I will follow the matter up as he requests and get him a reply as soon as I can.

MILK QUALITY

Mr. CASEY: When I visited the Far North recently, several constituents in Leigh Creek told me that the main store in that town purchased its milk from Golden North Producers Pty. Ltd. dairies at Clare. This milk is also supplied to the schoolchildren at Leigh Creek. Unfortunately, some milk received recently, which had not been stamped, was

stale. Milk from the same company's headquarters at Port Augusta, from which another storekeeper at Leigh Creek gets his milk supply, is stamped. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture to find out why the milk from Clare is not stamped to show the date on which it is processed? If it were stamped, people would know whether the milk was too stale for consumption.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, I will find out. The company concerned has a good reputation and I am surprised to hear it criticized. I will get the information and, doubtless, if the company deserves criticism the Minister will say so.

ELIZABETH

Mr. CLARK: I was rather disturbed this morning when I read in the press a quotation from an address by Mr. Geoff Giles, M.H.R., in which he was reported as stating that Elizabeth was no longer one of the finest planned cities in the world and was in limbo. Frankly, I am not sure what Mr. Giles meant, but citizens in the city of Elizabeth who have telephoned me today are not very pleased about this remark. Of course, I know Mr. Giles well and will take the matter up with him personally. However, as I think the Premier may have more influence with him than I would have, will he be good enough to, shall we say, chide Mr. Giles for his remarks?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shared the honourable member's concern this morning when I read of the city of Elizabeth being in limbo, and at first I thought that this must be some criticism of what is now developing into one of the well planned areas in South Australia. However, on inquiry, I found that Mr. Giles had made a speech which, on the report to me, had been reasonably well rounded, and this particular remark was emphasized to the detriment of the impact of the speech as a whole. Of course, any inference that Elizabeth has stopped growing would be wrong indeed, as the honourable member would know. In recent months there has been significant expansion at Elizabeth. I could give the House the names of firms that recently have entered into the significant expansion of new enterprise at Elizabeth, as honourable members would know.

Mr. Clark: The more we get, the better.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes. I can recall offhand such firms as Texas Instruments Australia Limited and Krommenie Floors (Aust.) Pty. Limited, and the extensions of Kenwood plant; the fastener company whose name I do

not remember, operations and planned expansion of Petbow Proprietary Limited and so on. All these make a significant addition to operations at Elizabeth, having established in the last year or so, and they contradict any suggestion of a decline or lack of growth at Elizabeth. I have mentioned this to the honourable member personally and, as I understand it, it was an emphasis on a particular remark that gave an unbalanced picture of his address.

MANNUM INDUSTRY

Mr. HUDSON: In the last few days members have been extremely disturbed to hear about the position that has developed at David Shearer Limited at Mannum. It has been reported that many employees of that firm have been dispensed with.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: How many?

Mr. HUDSON: I am not sure of the actual number: at this stage I am relying on information in the press. However, if the Premier can give a more detailed report about the position, I and all other members on this side will be pleased to hear it. However, whatever the true position is, any dismissals in a town like Mannum (which is, to a significant extent, I suppose, a one-industry town) will have a serious impact on the general well-being of people in that town, and commercial enterprise and other activities there must inevitably suffer. Can the Premier give the House any information about the real situation at Mannum, stating what action the Government is taking or intends to take to try to improve the position?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member has not given details of what he expects that the Government may be able to do to improve the position at Mannum.

Mr. Hudson: Well, the Government lets contracts, for one thing.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government is not in the business of buying reaping machines and, therefore, is unable to let contracts for them. The honourable member would also know, if he studied the Australian scene, that implement makers whose operations are based on the manufacture of harvesting machinery have had difficulty in recent times. This difficulty does not apply only to David Shearer Limited at Mannum: there has been a lowering of demand for farm machinery generally. This lowering of demand has had repercussions throughout Australia and in Mannum has resulted so far in the dismissal of, I think, about 40 employees.

Mr. Hudson: That's fairly serious for Mannum.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, I agree that this presents some difficulty for the town, but I understand that the Minister of Labour and Industry (Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe) has the matter in hand and that arrangements are being made for alternative employment of at least some of the retrenched persons. However, members of the board of David Shearer Limited have been to see me and I have discussed with them the full impact of the firm's present situation; and the Government is at present considering the situation.

Mr. HUDSON: In his reply the Premier indicated that he had met with the members of the board of David Shearer Limited. Can the Premier indicate, as a result of that meeting, the prospective employment position at that firm? In other words, are any further dismissals likely to take place in the next few weeks or months? Also, can he indicate what action the Government might consider appropriate as a result of his consultations with the board of that company?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I said, the Government is considering the submissions that have been made by the board of David Shearer Limited, and I will say no more than that at present. It would be improper for me to spread the company's affairs abroad, and an approach that has been made to me in private shall remain private.

Mr. HUDSON: In reply to the first question, the Premier indicated that the Minister of Labour and Industry had been able to find employment for some of the employees dismissed from the company. Can the Minister now indicate how many jobs have been found for those persons who have been dismissed from the firm and what the further prospects are for the provision of jobs for such ex-employees?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I cannot give the honourable member the numbers, but an offer was made to the company in this regard, and this is one of the matters being discussed with the company at present. However, I can tell the honourable member that I received a request yesterday from the Secretary of the Sheet Metal Workers' Union (Mr. Lean) for a conference on this matter, which I readily agreed to. When I received that request I said I would be happy to meet with the union representatives and to discuss the whole question with them. That conference will be held within a few days.

Mr. HUDSON: Can the Minister say whether any ex-employees of David Shearer

Limited have been placed back in employment as a result of the activities of his department?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I cannot answer that question, because I do not know. Offers have been made to the company on this matter, and I can ascertain what has happened.

Mr. Hudson: But—

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member should appreciate what I have told him. The Government has made an offer to the company, and negotiations are proceeding. Frankly, I do not have the results of them with me at the moment. That is the position, and the Government is trying to assist in this regard. I should have thought that the honourable member would be glad to assist the Government in this respect. I stress that the negotiations are at present proceeding, although I cannot disclose the results because I do not know them. However, I intend to pursue my inquiries to see whether we can get assistance in this matter.

A number of other organizations in this field are busy at the moment and, as a result, are expecting shortages of this type of employee in their industry. The types of employee to which the honourable member is referring are mainly women and men who are over the age of 65 years. I repeat for the honourable member's benefit that the Government is vigorously pursuing negotiations.

Mr. HUDSON: Can the Minister say whether the Premier's statement in reply to my first question on this matter that a certain number of those employees who had been dismissed—

At 4 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

MURRAY RIVER STORAGE

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

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.

(Continued from September 17. Page 1562.)

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I do not intend to speak at length on this motion, which the Leader of the Opposition and his Party will long remember and often regret as they look back to this particular wording and to

the activities in which they are now engaged in relation to South Australian water supplies. It is a foolish action which is putting the importance of politics before the needs of the people of South Australia and which is merely an endeavour to aggravate the situation in the community and to divide the latter on one of the most important issues that has ever come before it. It is aimed also at a number of disappointed people concerned with the previously promoted Chowilla dam. This matter has been argued right across South Australia, and I maintain that it has resulted in the South Australian public properly grasping the issues before it.

Mr. Casey: You were going to build the dam.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not want to follow the member for Frome back through the old arguments in relation to this State which have gone backwards and forwards and which the Leader and his Party have lost. However, it would perhaps pay me to go back a year or so: we could return to the time when the Leader of the Opposition, who was then Premier, altered the previous motion. Of course, he has already amended this one. Notice was given in a somewhat different form and, following his custom of 1967, the Leader has altered it again, probably to bring the matter to the attention of another section of the community that he believes could be aggravated by the words contained in it.

Mr. Hudson: He is not like you.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The purport of the motion is to tie the House on a future vote that it may have to take, a procedure which is, of course, just poor house management in any case. Why should this House today, next week or the week after tie its hands by a vote that may be taken later this year? Why should it give away its flexibility?

The motion ignores any new facts that could come to light in the intervening period, and for that reason it falls to the ground as a foolish motion. The Leader, in his motion, ignores his own previous position. I believe that he deliberately kept his argument short because to lengthen it would not have helped his case. The Leader goes on in his argument to say that we cannot have Chowilla after something else or that we cannot have something before Chowilla. While he does not say so in so many words, he seems to hark back to the old theme that we are talking about a South Australian dam. Again, although he does not

say so in so many words, this is the sort of theme with which he wants to surround his argument.

Mr. Ryan: You said you would build it, irrespective of what happened.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If we are going to refer back to what has been said in the past, let me refer to what the Leader of the Opposition said in his famous motion which was moved on August 15, 1967, and which can be found at page 1271 of *Hansard* of that year. It was as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, assurances should be given by the Governments, the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement, that whatever action is taken by the River Murray Commission concerning the Chowilla dam or any alternative proposal, South Australia will be provided with water in dry years to the extent intended to have been assured by the Chowilla dam project.

Not only is South Australia assured of at least the amount of water that Chowilla would have provided but it is assured of a significantly increased allocation of water in dry years. And the Leader does not want to accept it! Why? Is it jealousy? Is he being political? In all the specious arguments he has put before the House and in all his public statements he has never explained why he will not accept the increased allocation that he himself said was necessary.

It is a marvellous thing that his motion, if it ultimately resulted in an amendment to the River Murray Waters Act, would reject this immense benefit that this Government has been able to obtain for South Australia. It cannot be denied that South Australia has been offered an increase from 1,254,000 acre feet to 1,500,000 acre feet, and the Leader wants to refuse this offer! This is a foolish, short-sighted, ham-fisted and political motion. The Leader has tried to advance arguments about the Copeton dam, but his arguments do not stand analysis because the grant for that dam was equivalent to the grant given for the Keith main in South Australia.

The Leader said that the Chowilla dam was a South Australian dam, but we must realize that we are discussing a River Murray Commission dam. The commission will control the water in either the Dartmouth dam or the Chowilla dam. The water in a dam at Chowilla would inundate land in Victoria and New South Wales. This demonstrates the shallowness of the Opposition's argument—as shallow as the shallow waters of Chowilla itself. What else is there to say in the face of such a monstrous contention?

It has been contended that we should throw away the increased allocation of water that we have been able to negotiate. It may be galling for the Leader to see that this Government has successfully negotiated with three other Governments. It may be galling for the Leader to remember his interstate journeys at about this time in 1967, when he took a letter to the Prime Minister and other leaders and came back and said that he had received assurances that, whatever the alternative, we would get what we had expected to get out of Chowilla. The present Government was not satisfied to accept what we would have got out of Chowilla: it wanted more, and it put it on the line that it would get more.

Mr. Nankivell: They committed us to more.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: And we got it! As the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) said, we got it in a situation of over-committal of water resources in Australia, when growers in the river districts are in extreme danger in dry years of not getting the necessary amount of water for their products, when their livelihood is threatened, and when the negotiations that I conduct for industrial expansion are endangered because of the Opposition's attitude.

Will the Leader persist in his political attitude? Whilst it is extremely important to safeguard the livelihood of those who use the water for farming and horticultural activities, I remind the House that this State's industrial expansion will eventually provide employment opportunities for many more people. If we turn our backs on the increase of 250,000 acre feet of water, this State will stagnate, as the river itself will stagnate; it will be impossible for this Government or the Leader (if the people again make a mistake and put his Party into Government) to attract significant industry to South Australia.

Industrial leaders in this State and other States and overseas are acutely aware of South Australia's need for an increase in its assured water supplies, and this motion jeopardizes those supplies and this State's industrial expansion. It will undermine our future growth from this day onwards. The Leader is actively working for the downgrading of the industrial development of South Australia. This motion seeks to bind a future vote of this House. It dictates to the Commonwealth Government, the New South Wales Government and the Victorian Government by saying that we do not want what they have arranged to supply us: we want a little less,

and we want New South Wales and Victoria to share in the smaller amount of water—or let us build two dams. The Leader is on record as saying a few weeks ago that South Australia should not be financially involved, and that it was too great a stake for us. What do we find now? We find that there will be a Commonwealth election on October 25, so why not say that, as the Commonwealth Government spends \$100,000,000 here and \$200,000,000 there it should spend \$68,000,000 here? When this contention is not agreed to, the Commonwealth Government is labelled as a villain.

My criticisms of the Commonwealth Government in the past have been well directed—they have been connected with measures about which I feel acutely, and they have not been indiscriminate propaganda. May it always be that my criticisms are warranted, not the indiscriminate denigration we see in this motion. It should be thrown out because it binds a future decision yet to be taken in this House and is therefore entirely wrong. It says to this Government and to three other Governments that, after hard and realistic negotiations concluded to the distinct advantage of this State, we do not want that advantage. It is saying to those who would establish new industries in South Australia, "Keep out; we are not going to give you the water." I say to the Leader of the Opposition and his Party, stop messing around with the future of both the individual and collective citizens of South Australia.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): It is obvious that the Premier does not know much about the motion. He has reached the stage now where I think he believes that he does not need to prepare anything but that he can simply get up and lambaste us, say all kinds of ridiculous things, and expect people to believe him. That is not the case, because the Premier's credibility has been at stake ever since he promised the people of this State that he would build Chowilla. I do not think the people of the State take much notice now of what the Premier says about anything. He has made great play on the motives behind the Opposition's move in this matter and has said, "What a disgraceful thing for an Opposition to act in this manner." What a disgraceful thing for an Opposition to have to sit down and do nothing because the Government might happen to say, "You are acting with a political motive."

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You admit it, too?

Mr. CORCORAN: I do not admit anything. The Minister of Lands knows that, as an Opposition, we have a responsibility to the people of this State and to see that the State gets what it should have, and that is the motive behind this motion: to see that the State gets Chowilla, which was promised to this State, which was ratified in four Parliaments, which was fought for by a previous Premier of the State (and which is still upheld by him) and which was promised unequivocally by his successor, who said, "If we are returned to office we will build Chowilla." Along with him, we believed then that Chowilla was a must, not only because there was a legally binding agreement but also because we believed that we had a moral right to Chowilla.

Mr. Rodda: Who backed out of it?

Mr. CORCORAN: I will give the member for Victoria the history of this matter so that he may understand the position. He has been whitewashed or brainwashed as a result of statements made by members of the Government that have no foundation in fact.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CORCORAN: I could tell the member for Stirling the history of this matter, but I do not think that he would agree with what I had to say about it, because it does not suit his purpose, and he knows it. The member for Rocky River has said that he is concerned about the truth. I can tell him that I have never handled the truth carelessly, and it is about time that he knew and recognized it. The Premier had the temerity to criticize the brevity of the Leader's remarks but, if the Premier understood the procedures of the House, he would know that the Leader had a limited time in which to speak. However brief the Leader's remarks were, they were obviously effective because they stirred up the Premier and other Government members. The Leader's remarks have cut them to the quick, and they do not like it. The Premier said that one of the main objections he had to the motion was that a vote on it would tie this House in the future. What rubbish! What respect has this Government for resolutions that have been passed by the House? What about the resolution passed in the previous Parliament? Whether or not the resolution was altered, it was agreed unanimously that we had a right to Chowilla and that it should be built. What attention has the Government paid to that resolution?

Mr. Hudson: It was passed again last year.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, but what attention has the Government paid to it? The Premier said that, in his endeavours, he had gained for the State more water than Chowilla would provide, but he has not yet said what water we would receive in years of restrictions.

Mr. Hudson: We were promised that there would not be any restrictions.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's not what the other States say.

Mr. CORCORAN: No, they say something different from that. One of the most important facts about Chowilla, so far as this State is concerned, is that it is on our doorstep—not six water weeks away—and, if the water is there, it is ours: it will not flow back uphill to the other States. Why did the Government change its mind on this matter? This is an interesting point that I have not yet worked out. I know that, when it was reported that the Premier was likely to go against Chowilla in favour of Dartmouth, there was disquiet among his own members, who were not convinced that he was right in the move that he was making. Since then, they have been successfully brainwashed. Let us go back to the 1961 report that recommended Chowilla. How and why did that report come about? One only has to go back to the things that Sir Thomas Playford said in the 1967 debate to know the history of that. South Australia had been able to use certain waters that were diverted in the Snowy River scheme, and Sir Thomas Playford took out an injunction in the High Court to prevent certain action being taken until South Australia could obtain guarantees that it would get something in return for that water. As a result of that, the 1961 report recommended Chowilla. That is where the moral right comes into Chowilla: it is replacing something that this State lost many years earlier. Why, then, in 1969 did the technical committee's report differ so much from the 1961 report? It seems to me that it differs so much because of the basic assumptions which were made and on which the report was based. One of the most important of these was that, in the 1969 report, it was stipulated that there must be a 900 cusec flow at all times past Mildura. That assumption was not made in the 1961 report, but it meant that the yield from Chowilla to the other States was reduced substantially, almost to nil. Something must have prompted that assumption. Some people might blame Sir Henry Bolte and say that he was looking after Mildura or the Sunraysia area because he wanted the quality of water improved. Some

people might also blame the Minister for National Development, who was not unaware of the political implications of this matter.

In the minutes of a meeting of the River Murray Commission held on April 24, the President (Mr. Fairbairn, the Minister for National Development) is referred to as follows:

In opening the discussion the President referred to the decision that would have to be made regarding selection of the next dam site for the further development of the Murray River water resources, which was both a political and technical question. He quoted both major political Parties in South Australia as having undertaken to proceed with the construction of Chowilla—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That included us.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes—"both major political Parties". He continued:

—but felt that the Government of South Australia should be persuaded that storages at sites other than Chowilla could have the same effect and produce the same advantages to South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That was impossible.

Mr. CORCORAN: That is what the President said. This follows the meeting held, I think, in October, 1967, but the importance of the date of this meeting (April 24) is that the Labor Party had been out of office for only eight days. Prior to leaving office on April 16, this matter of the future of Chowilla had been before the Government and definite instructions had been given to our commissioner at that time about what he should do at the meeting on April 24, 1968. The first question that the Leader of the Opposition asked the new Premier when he took over as Premier was what stand he would require Mr. Beaney, our commissioner, to take at that meeting. He asked the Premier whether he would adhere to the instructions that the previous Government had given Mr. Beaney. The Premier said at the time that he had not had sufficient time to examine the matter, but he also said that he would be fighting for South Australia to see that it got Chowilla.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The instructions to Mr. Beaney were withdrawn.

Mr. CORCORAN: Obviously, because Mr. Beaney went to that meeting and did not create the dispute he had been instructed to. Indeed, Mr. Horsfall, the Victorian Commissioner on the River Murray Commission, said during the course of the meeting on April 24 that—

He hoped to convince Mr. Beaney informally at this meeting that an Upper Murray storage would be best for South Australia and that there should then be a breathing space of about six months for Mr. Beaney to convince his Government; this would fit in with the time requirements for feasibility studies by the Snowy Mountains Authority.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They had not been held then.

Mr. CORCORAN: The minutes state:

The President expressed his concern at any further delay in making a decision on a site for the next reservoir when irrigators were agitating for more storage.

That is what Mr. Horsfall said at that meeting: he said it about our commissioner, and obviously what he said was put into effect because he convinced Mr. Beaney informally and a breathing space was allowed for Mr. Beaney to convince his Government, which he did so effectively. Mention was made of the delay in the building of this storage, because irrigators were looking for more storage. Why? Somebody said that we, when in Government, did nothing about controlling the amount of irrigation in this State.

Mr. Hudson: The Premier said that.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, but it is completely false, and the Premier knows it. We took steps. This afternoon the Minister of Works when replying to the member for Gawler told us that we took steps in 1967 to bring the river below Mannum under control. The fact is that we did not issue any further irrigation licences after March, 1967, except where firm commitments had been made.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: But we took the first step to control irrigation.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes. Let us now look at the situation in the other States. Who are we to concern ourselves about the other States, particularly when we look at the background of Chowilla? The other States, because of uncontrolled development and irrigation, have placed themselves in a situation where they need more water—but that is not our fault. If they had taken effective steps in the past to control development, they would not have got themselves into a situation where Dartmouth was extremely important to them, if the yield from Chowilla were as the technical committee of 1968 said it would be. That is why they are concerned. That is the situation created through their own lack of administration or control.

Whilst we must recognize that, I do not think we should forgo something that has been promised us and ratified by four Parliaments since 1963. Let us remember we are now

almost at the end of 1969. I think this motion is perfectly reasonable and fair. It sets out the position clearly. The Premier made great play of the fact that the Commonwealth Government was not likely to give us \$68,000,000 to build Chowilla. He knows it would not cost \$68,000,000, because \$5,200,000 has already been spent. He knows, too, as the Leader pointed out last week, that the Commonwealth Government if it cared to could build both dams. It could make finance available to the States on such a scale that it would be possible for both dams to be built. It depends entirely on the Commonwealth Government. Because of the history of the whole matter and the advantages that Chowilla compared with Dartmouth would give South Australia (irrespective of what members opposite say), we say we should have Chowilla.

Members opposite talk of the salinity problem, but even the technical committee recognized that from South Australia's point of view Chowilla would be a better proposition than Dartmouth, taking into account the control of salinity. If we built Chowilla, we would have on our front doorstep a large body of fresh water that could not be taken away from us in a year of restriction; this State would have a better supply of water than if Dartmouth was built without Chowilla being built. These are the things that are important to thinking South Australians—not only those people in the river districts but also those people living in the metropolitan area and near the industrial complexes of Spencer Gulf, which are supplied from the Murray River. It is all very well for the Premier to stand up and say, "We will get more water from Dartmouth." In years of plenty we shall, but we are concerned about what we shall get in years of restriction—and heaven alone knows how bad these years may be in the future!

This move has been made by the Opposition to draw the Government's attention again to the way it has approached something—in fact, to the lack of government in this House. We as an Opposition believe that Chowilla should be built before any other storage on the Murray River system. The reasons why we have moved this motion are that the Commonwealth Government may see fit to provide the finance it should be able to provide (because, as the Leader pointed out last week, it will have a net income of \$42,000,000 a year from the Snowy Mountains scheme—money paid by the taxpayers of this State although we derive no direct benefit from that scheme, having lost some water because of it)

and that there is a report stating that Chowilla is feasible and should be allowed to South Australia. Government members may be afraid of the political aspects, but we are not. I support the motion.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): As usual, when the Premier speaks Opposition members scream about doubting his word. What Premier has come before this House in the last few years with a policy that was enunciated before the election and within a year nearly everything stated in that policy has been carried out?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We are talking about Chowilla.

Mr. McANANEY: When the Labor Party came into office four years ago there were many things it intended to do, but they were not done in three years. The Labor Party said that it would balance the Budget, but it did not. In our case, everything has been put into practice in a short time, except Chowilla. Every time the Premier speaks he is criticized by Opposition members, and this practice gives Parliament a bad odour when Opposition members doubt his credibility. Everything that the Liberal Party said would be done has been done, except the building of Chowilla. It takes a big man, after he has said that he would do a certain thing, to change his mind and do something else that he thinks is better.

Mr. Corcoran: Whom has he convinced that it is better for the State?

Mr. McANANEY: If Opposition members are not convinced by now that Dartmouth will provide more water, they should do their homework. Have they studied the flow of the Murray River and its tributaries? How much water is obtained out of the Darling River in a dry year? A leading member who wants both dams built said that Chowilla must be built because of the water that we get out of the Darling River. In the last four years 600,000 acre feet has flowed down this river, only enough to satisfy the evaporation from hungry Chowilla for eight months.

Mr. Corcoran: Wrong again.

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member is always saying that we are wrong: he has had the time to prove it but he will not speak about figures.

Mr. Corcoran: There is no need to do that: the member for Glenelg has asked the Minister of Works many questions.

Mr. McANANEY: Mr. Hudson a politician! Even the member for Eyre is suspicious of Labor members because they are not accurate. I take serious objection to criticisms of the Premier who has done a terrific job since assuming office, but every time he speaks Opposition members accuse him of not telling the truth. This practice is getting the House a bad name among the people of this State, and I suggest that if Labor members wish to disprove what the Premier says and does they should produce figures, and not throw wild statements here and there.

Mr. Hudson: That is all you do.

Mr. McANANEY: I do not think that the Leader of the Opposition has made a lengthy speech when he has had the opportunity to do so this session. The Hon. Frank Walsh always gave an analysis of what he thought of the Budget and other topics, but we have not had one speech of that nature from the Leader during the life of this Parliament. The matter of Chowilla dam was referred to experts by the Labor Government when it was in office, and it has been said today that the report was not available until we assumed office. A team of experts was studying this matter and South Australia had agreed to the taking of those studies. Surely Labor members would agree that the report should be examined. If it had not been for the drought Chowilla would have been half built by now, but during that drought the river became stationary and was only a lake and not a river. Much consideration had to be given to difficulties that would arise in a dry year. As this matter was referred to a technical committee by the Government, we must listen to the advice of the experts even though they argue that it would be better to build the Dartmouth dam.

We will try to do our best. We have to accept the fact that we will get no water from the Darling River in a dry year. Normally, we would not get enough water from that river to satisfy the expected evaporation from Chowilla. I have lived on Lake Alexandrina nearly all my life, and I know what evaporation is in a cool climate. In January the lake level will probably drop 1ft., although water is flowing into the lake. I realize the difficulties that people living around this lake will have, and that the lakes will have to be drained to minimize evaporation. Perhaps this scheme will not be implemented in the foreseeable future, but Lake Albert will probably be drained in my lifetime and Lake Alexandrina later. Whatever happens, Lake Alexandrina will be

reduced in size, and the shallow parts of the lake cut off by the use of dykes and dams, as is done in Holland. The water that would normally evaporate from the shallow parts of the lake will be used to irrigate the area rather than have it float into the air.

Why build a dam on flat country that would create more evaporation? From the figures quoted by the Minister of Works it is obvious that 10 per cent of water coming down the Murray River will be spent in evaporation. Figures for the last 10 years show that the decrease in the volume of water flowing down the river has been considerable, and this could have been caused by a drought in the river basin or increased use of water upstream. The evaporation in the last 10 years would be nearly 20 per cent of the water flowing down the Murray River. An expert in Canberra said that, because of our water situation, we should not increase the population, and that it should remain static after the year 2000. I do not agree with that theory, but water is precious and it should not be allowed to evaporate at Chowilla. The Leader of the Opposition made a recent oversea tour and returned with many ideas, but he has not said in the House that he has seen many dams on flat country in Alabama, or in the lower reaches of the Mississippi, or anywhere else in the world. Obviously, dams are not built on flat country: they are built in the mountains. Other than the Menindee Lakes, which are situated on flat country, there is practically no important dam in the world that has been built on flat country.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Is that what you said when you were speaking to previous motions on Chowilla?

Mr. McANANEY: I have said many times that we should not refer to what a member said 10 years ago. If we do not learn by experience we are not playing an important role in this world. Last January I was a 100 per cent Chowilla man but, when the position was assessed about what it meant to South Australia, I re-examined the situation and, using my experience of Lake Albert and Lake Alexandrina, which are a part of the Murray River, I came to a definite conclusion, and I changed my thinking because of the last drought. We do not have to worry about water coming down the Murray River for eight or nine of the 10 years. It is only for one or two years out of 10 years that little water flows in the river, but we must have a guarantee of water for these years. Obviously, the best storage is a reservoir in the mountains

with a 600ft. high wall, with deep water and little surface area, so that there is little evaporation and, in the years when it is needed, water is available.

Many more cases have been examined, including an examination of what the position would have been over the last 40 years and what would have happened in dry years, and the additional studies have shown that Chowilla would not have been worth a cracker in the really dry years. However, with a reservoir up in the mountains, water can be drawn off much more readily. The Mitta Mitta River in the mountains has a much more reliable flow than that of the Darling and can be used in drier years.

Mr. Casey: If that is the case, why isn't the Hume reservoir full every year?

Mr. Nankivell: It overflows every year.

Mr. McANANEY: I think it has been claimed by someone who should have known better that the Hume reservoir had been full only a certain number of times. The River Murray Commission's report refers to the river's flow over the last 10 years near Albury. In 1959-60 the flow was recorded at 2,900,000 acre feet; in 1960-61 it was recorded at 5,400,000 acre feet; in 1961-62 it was 2,500,000 acre feet; in 1964-65 it was 5,800,000 acre feet; and in 1966-67, 3,200,000 acre feet. These are some of the driest years ever experienced in the catchment area.

Mr. Nankivell: Are the figures cooked up? That apparently is the implication.

Mr. McANANEY: Everything is cooked up according to the other side. The flow out of the Murrumbidgee is recorded at 1,400,000 acre feet on average over the last 10 years. Although this includes water that would possibly be caught in Chowilla, the source belongs to New South Wales. If more and more dams are constructed, there will certainly be surplus water in the wet years, but in dry years there will be little or no flow and in storages such as Chowilla the water will evaporate within a reasonably short period. It has been suggested that, with the construction of Dartmouth, water will not be available for 10 years and that that dam would have to be full before water could be obtained from it. However, there would be sufficient water in the system to supply the quota for the States in a dry year, and there would be little evaporation. Surely, this is the sensible approach. The member for Millicent has referred to the control of water in Lake Alexandrina. However, the late Hon. Frank Walsh granted a licence to one farm involving 8,000 acre feet,

when sufficient water was just not available and would not have been available even with Chowilla. Indeed, it possibly would not be available even with the construction of Dartmouth. The quantity of water involved would have been sufficient for 200 dairy farms situated around the lake.

Mr. Nankivell: It involved 8,000 acres of irrigation.

Mr. McANANEY: I said that that would supply 200 farms each consisting of 40 acres for irrigation. If it were good land, 20 acres each would possibly be adequate, so that a total of 400 dairy farms could receive this water.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will kindly address the Chair.

Mr. McANANEY: I think we have pretty well covered all the points raised. The member for Albert will possibly speak later and confirm what I have said about the lake. What will happen to the lake, from which water is pumped to Adelaide? Sufficient water must be available to flush out the lakes. However, if nearly 1,000,000 acre feet were lost in evaporation each year from Chowilla, an insufficient quantity would be available for flushing Lake Alexandrina when necessary. There is still 800 parts a million salinity at Meningie, and last year the level rose to 1,300 grains in the river near the barrages, while it has been even worse than that in Currency Creek. Sufficient water must come down the river to flush out this area if fresh water is to be pumped out at Murray Bridge and brought to Adelaide.

I think we have shown that the Premier has fulfilled all the promises he made in the policy speech, except that in this case he found that it was a more practicable proposition, and that water could be obtained more quickly, if Chowilla did not proceed. He pointed out that with the construction of a concrete dam we would not have to wait until it had been built up to a height of 500ft. or 600ft. but that water could be caught in the first or second year in the bottom of the storage. Indeed, I was told this only about two weeks ago by the Minister of Works. The flow that has occurred in the last 10 years will be increased with the build-up of water that will inevitably take place, and we can then use our quota. It has been said that additional water will mean more vineyards to be established in Victoria: surely Victoria and New South Wales learnt during the last drought that they had to provide for South Australia more water than we were entitled to under the quota.

Although extra water may have entered South Australia merely because of the need to freshen up the river in those States, we nevertheless received more than our quota. The River Murray Commission's report indicates just how Murray River water is controlled. Sir Henry Bolte, who shoots off his mouth just about every day, said that he was going to stop ships from coming into South Australia in association with the Wheat Board, but he has no more control over the Wheat Board than he has over the River Murray Commission. The Leader, when he was Premier, helped postpone Chowilla, because—

Mr. Broomhill: What nonsense!

Mr. McANANEY: Read *Hansard*! He said that if we got the equivalent amount of water an alternative would be considered. He referred the matter to experts, who said that the present proposal was the better one. All praise should go to the Premier, who has been big enough to change his mind when the facts and figures have been proved. The Premier has the interests of this State at heart; he is a statesman, not a politician who is always screaming about things for political purposes, as is the case with certain members in this House.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): Having listened intently to the member who has just resumed his seat, I am amazed to think that members on the Government side get up almost at the drop of a hat to praise their Premier, saying that he has done everything that he said in his policy speech he would do, except for one thing: he would not do what he said he would do regarding Chowilla. We did not hear a thing at all in the policy speech about taxation.

Mr. Broomhill: Yes we did; he said—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Frome.

Mr. CASEY: It was pointed out by the Leader prior to the last election that the Liberal Party would have a nice big paper bag on which would be marked the words, "Open up at some future date and find out what is inside". That is exactly what transpired, for the whole paper bag was full of surprises, namely, taxation measures, not one of which was referred to in the Government's policy speech before the last election. Let us not have any more quibbling about this. At no stage has the Government fulfilled its obligations to the people of the State as set out in its policy speech. As the Deputy Leader has pointed out this afternoon, what this motion contains was

ratified by this Parliament last year, when we passed a motion stating that Chowilla must be built. However, now the Government is going directly against that.

Apparently the Government does not know where it is going. Government members are now trying to back their Premier. However, when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier several years ago many members who are now following the present Premier blindly followed Sir Thomas, yet he was the greatest exponent in this State of Chowilla. We gave him full marks on that score and supported his proposals for Chowilla, and we still support them, although members opposite do not.

Mr. Lawn: No, they switched.

Mr. CASEY: Yes. I would bet any money that, if Sir Thomas were still Premier, Chowilla would be to the forefront and every member opposite would support Sir Thomas in pressing for it.

Mr. McAnaney: Oh!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stirling has made his speech.

Mr. CASEY: I defy the member for Stirling to say otherwise. On television the other evening I saw Sir Thomas reminiscing about his early days, and even on that programme he said he favoured Chowilla. We wholeheartedly support him. If he was still Premier, members opposite would be lying back in their seats saying, "Yes, Sir, we agree wholeheartedly to Chowilla," but they do not have a man of the calibre of Sir Thomas in charge now.

Mr. Rodda: Don't bring personalities into it.

Mr. CASEY: I am not reflecting on any one person; I doubt whether any member on the Government benches comes within cooe of Sir Thomas.

Mr. Rodda: That's not what you used to say about him.

Mr. CASEY: If the member for Victoria checks *Hansard* he will find that I always respected Sir Thomas as a gentleman, although I did not always agree with his policies. Let the honourable member ask Sir Thomas whether that is true, and I believe that Sir Thomas will agree that it is. Let us have no more of this ridiculous chit-chat. It is a pity members opposite cannot raise their standards when debates on matters of this type are taking place. Members opposite have to become personal, and I object strongly to that.

Mr. Rodda: I've seen you get personal.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CASEY: Looking through a speech made by Sir Thomas Playford in 1967, I see that he said that Chowilla was an absolute

necessity. I advise members to read that speech thoroughly, because Sir Thomas outlines the whole situation. After reading through it several times, I am more convinced than ever that Chowilla is a necessity for South Australia. Members opposite often talk about drought years and say that Dartmouth will provide water in a dry year. Let me remind them that Australia is a drought-prone country, and we have no guarantee that when there is a drought in South Australia there will not also be a drought in New South Wales and Victoria. That is the whole crux of the problem. If there is a drought in New South Wales, Victoria or South Australia, the whole Murray River system suffers. The intake in the mountains is not as great as usual, so the quantity of water required for future needs in South Australia is not available. We must plan for the future.

The Minister for National Development seems to think that Dartmouth is absolutely essential. He has made no secret of the fact that his interest is partly political, for his constituents on the river need more water for irrigation. I say let him have Dartmouth, but not at the expense of South Australia. Dartmouth will not give South Australia what it needs to increase irrigation, particularly in drought years, and this country is susceptible to drought. For irrigation the quality of the water is important. As we know, through having gone over the matter so often, the water pumped from Dartmouth will be six weeks away, and it will come through areas where it will pick up salt and will be saline by the time it reaches South Australia.

Mr. McAnaney: That's not correct.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has made his speech.

Mr. CASEY: The building of Chowilla will greatly eliminate this saline water problem; the water will then be at our doorstep. As Sir Thomas said in his speech in 1967, droughts may apply to more than one State at the same time. Even now South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales are enjoying wonderful seasons whereas Queensland and much of Western Australia are experiencing drought conditions. Next year it could be our turn to have a drought and this type of cycle has applied in Australia ever since records have been kept, which is for only about 150 years, not a long time when the history of the world is considered.

I was surprised to hear the Premier's poor attempt to reply to the Leader. All he was concerned about was trying to rubbish the

Leader, and he made no contribution to the debate. He said that we had heard about the money handed to the Victorian Government for the Copeton dam and we got something similar for the Taillem Bend to Keith main. He did not say that the Victorian Government got \$20,000,000 for the Copeton dam, whereas we got only \$6,000,000 for the Taillem Bend to Keith main. In the last three years the Commonwealth Government has provided more than \$53,000,000 for the water resources development programme initiated in 1966. Of that amount, we have received \$6,000,000. Sums of \$20,000,000 have been allocated for the Copeton dam and \$4,000,000 for the King River project, both of which are in Victoria; \$750,000 has been provided for the Cressy-Longford scheme in Tasmania. This leaves a large sum for the Emerald scheme in Queensland and for salinity control schemes in Victoria.

It is futile for the Premier to say that we are receiving for the Taillem Bend to Keith main an amount proportionately as good as Victoria has been given for the Copeton dam, because I always thought that \$20,000,000 was more than three times \$6,000,000. When we come to grips with the Chowilla scheme, we realize what we have had to forgo to preserve the agreement and what lengths Sir Thomas Playford went to by taking out a High Court writ against the Commonwealth Government to do that. Sir Thomas could see the necessity for the Chowilla scheme and he would go to any lengths to get it. He realized that it was absolutely essential for the future development of South Australia. In 1967 he said that the estimated cost of the Chowilla project was not prohibitive and was to be shared by four Governments. That is still provided by the River Murray Waters Agreement.

The cost to South Australia would have been about \$15,000,000 on the basis of the old figure. Even in those days Sir Thomas said that we had been spending more than that amount on the Morgan to Whyalla main. This shows how important Chowilla is to South Australia, and the amount of money that should be made available is only a drop in the ocean compared with what the Commonwealth Government is making available for other schemes. It is reported in the *Advertiser* this morning that the Commonwealth Government has now sanctioned the payment of more than \$300,000,000 for the purchase of F111 aircraft.

Mr. Virgo: That's only because an election is coming up.

Mr. CASEY: I do not think the Commonwealth Government had any alternative but to accept the aircraft, even though the decision was not in the interests of the people. The Commonwealth Government can spend \$300,000,000 on aircraft that have not been proved, and surely the water resources of Australia are more important. As I understand that 24 aircraft will be purchased, the cost of each aircraft is about \$12,000,000, and we could build the Chowilla dam for the cost of five of these aircraft. These matters must be considered in perspective.

I have my opinion, and other members probably have different opinions. Some members refer to figures on acre feet and to salinity. However, considering the matter from a practical point of view, the Victorian Government wants the Dartmouth scheme (and it is looking to that dam for its own future needs) and, even though that Government says that, if there is anything over, South Australia will be guaranteed so much, I prefer to have the dam on our own doorstep so that we could use it when we wanted to. It could be flushed out in good seasons. The scheme is practicable, and men of the calibre of Sir Thomas Playford have supported it and recognized the need for it. I suggest that members opposite consider these matters carefully and see the merit of protecting South Australia in future. I support the motion.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): As I think this is the first time I have spoken on any motion in this House regarding Chowilla, I cannot be said to be twisting my point of view or changing my mind. At the same time, I have considered this matter and have followed closely all the arguments about it. We must bear in mind not the past situation but the present situation and how it affects and will affect South Australia. To me, this is far more important than any other question that may be construed as being political or otherwise. It well behoves this House to consider some of these matters from that point of view. If the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have changed their minds, it is entirely their prerogative to do so, but I do not think either of them has done so without considering the facts at the time.

I consider that, when the Premier changed his mind this time, notwithstanding that he had made a commitment, he considered the undeniable facts which he had and which had not been available when the previous decision was made. The only way in which we could insist

on our rights to Chowilla was by going to arbitration, and I think both this Government and the previous Government accepted that such arbitration would have failed. I consider the statement that we could get justice by going to arbitration to be a political toy. The hard fact is (although this is denied in this House) that we do not control the Murray River. Since 1915 the river has been controlled by the River Murray Commission, on which the Commonwealth and the other member States have representatives. Too many suggestions have been made in this House that we can control the water in the river and that we can use water from a dam at Chowilla as we choose. We know that that is not so.

The River Murray Commission will regulate and control whatever water is in the river in future, as it has done in the past. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) said that we could flush out Chowilla, fill it up, and use the water as we wished. Some of the matters that we need to consider include the need for another storage on the river at all, other than the one already constructed (the Hume reservoir), which was provided simply to make better use of water under the control of the River Murray Commission. That reservoir holds about 2,500,000 acre feet. The records show that, except in odd years, it would fill more than twice in every year. It is rubbish to say that it never fills. On the average 4,500,000 acre feet of water flows past Albury that has been released from it. So, we know there is a surplus of water above the Hume dam under the control of the River Murray Commission that it can release and control for the people in the States represented on the commission.

So, there is no question about the supply of water being available at the headwaters of the Murray River and about the control of this water: it would be controlled by the commission itself, not by Sir Henry Bolte's commissioner or the Commonwealth Government's commissioner. History shows—a long history—that nothing has been done to fiddle with the water resources under the commission's control. The water available has been released under the contract.

Mr. Hudson: If it has been available.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Water cannot be released if it is not available: this is elementary. I contend that it is just as likely to be available in the headwaters as in Chowilla. We are presuming that we will always have flows in the river that will fill Chowilla, but there were

three or four years in the 1940's when Chowilla would have been bone dry.

Mr. Hudson: But that was based on phoney assumptions about evaporation.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The honourable member can speak later on the phoney assumptions to which he has referred. A figure we do not consider to be phoney is the figure for evaporation established over a long period for Lake Victoria, which, after all, will be partially submerged if the Chowilla dam is built.

Mr. Hudson: Any evaporation estimate for a lake like Lake Victoria is only an estimate of inflow and outflow.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NANKIVELL: I think I would be correct in saying that the commission would have evaporimeters. However, if it is working only on the basis of inflow and outflow, surely this also is some indication of water loss. I presume that most of the water loss would occur during the evaporation period in the summer.

Mr. Hudson: The evaporimeter measures only evaporation from a pan, and you have to apply a coefficient to that.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I think I could have lost the honourable member on these matters a few years ago: my forte in science was the question of evaporation and its effect on soils and water surfaces. I admit that these things can be related to a coefficient of evaporation, but that is only a red herring. Lake Victoria receives and loses a certain amount of water: Chowilla would receive a certain amount of water, and Chowilla would lose a certain amount of water, provided there were no other seepages. If we used an empirical basis of analysis we could say that this was the evaporation. I am not worried about evaporation in this instance: all I am saying is that flows in the river would not allow Chowilla to retain the amount of water.

Mr. Hudson: That is not so unless you make these higher evaporation estimates.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The honourable member will be able to tell the House in good time what his authority is and who the people are who have made the assessment on which he bases his information that this so-called figure for evaporation is not correct.

Mr. Hudson: Ask the Minister.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Minister has quoted the figure of 900,000 acre feet, and he has said that evaporation, on recent evidence, is

even greater than was expected when Chowilla was originally considered. I presume the Minister gets his information from his officers.

Mr. Hudson: That is the evidence he talks about, but this still involves estimates, and that is what we object to.

Mr. NANKIVELL: A committee is at present inquiring into the salinity problem. Unfortunately, we will not have its report until the end of the year, but I understand there is considerable seepage into the river at Chowilla. This is not uncommon all along the river, and in times of stress and low storage this would become a problem affecting Chowilla that is not being considered at present. Seepage occurs in springs all along the river. The northern end of the Murray basin has access to the river through the strata in the rock face of the banks of the river. There is seepage from these basins into the river and, when there is not sufficient hydrostatic pressure to hold it back, the flow increases.

Mr. Hudson: That is not the main seepage worry.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Everyone has conveniently forgotten that one of the biggest cost problems of Chowilla was to try to seal off the bottom so that salt water in underlying strata would not be forced into the river lower down. We never hear about the costly programme designed to draw this off. Everyone conveniently forgets the problems of salinity that existed in the original programme and of pumping this water inland and allowing it to evaporate. People are always saying that the water is 1,000 water miles away. What rubbish! Lake Victoria holds almost our full entitlement to flush out the river. It is on the South Australian border, but part of it would be submerged if the Chowilla dam were built. Arrangements will be made for the inflow and outflow from Lake Victoria to be improved. These points are conveniently overlooked in current discussions. We do not have universal support for Chowilla, and our chances at arbitration would be very dubious.

Mr. Hudson: They have not been tried.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I would not want to try them because I would not want to finish up with nothing. We want some improvement and some guarantee that we will never be worse off than we are now. The figures show that the Dartmouth dam will meet our needs for about 20 years. It also meets with favour from New South Wales and Victoria, because they want more water. If their supply of water was reduced by 30 per cent they would be in difficulties. Consequently, they are prepared

to help South Australia by giving it more water. There is nothing hidden or mysterious about this. It is a simple fact: New South Wales and Victoria will agree to this because of its advantages to them; therefore, under this arrangement they are prepared to increase our water quota. They would not increase our water quota, nor was there any provision to increase it, if Chowilla were built. Our quota would be the same as it was when the agreement was drawn up in 1915, namely, 1,250,000 acre feet.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: It is the entitlement that we are worried about.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes. It is our entitlement that is important, and also the quality of water that is available in the State, and if the entitlement is increased by 250,000 acre feet, the amount of available water will be increased by about 35 per cent. That is the important thing.

Mr. Hudson: You are wrong. It is the availability of water in a year of restriction, and the increase in the availability of that water that are important.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I want to hear a speech, not the honourable member's interjections.

The SPEAKER: The member for Glenelg is out of order.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is a question of the availability of water in a year when there is a reduced supply, and that is as important to us as it is to people in the other States. It has been said that because Chowilla happens to have a dam wall in South Australia our entitlement is protected whatever happens, but I do not believe that that is true. I believe that the water availability from that source in a year of high evaporation and when there was no flow into the dam would be restricted, the same as it would be restricted under any other arrangement for storage of water.

Mr. Hughes: You didn't say that before.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have not spoken before. I was not personally interested in this matter until I realized the impact on the lower reaches of the Murray River.

Mr. Jennings: You're a liar, the same as the rest of your mates.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I take exception to the honourable member's remark.

Mr. GILES: I ask that the remark be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Objection having been taken, the member for Enfield will kindly withdraw his remark.

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it at your request.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I still think that the remark was offensive, and I do not think that the withdrawal by the member for Enfield is satisfactory to me. I have never been called a liar before in this House.

The SPEAKER: I understood the member for Enfield to say that, in due deference to my ruling, he withdrew his remark. I think that that is in order.

Mr. Jennings: They were my words, virtually.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Is that without reservation?

The SPEAKER: I do not know that the member for Enfield put any reservation on it. What did the member for Enfield say?

Mr. JENNINGS: I said, virtually, what you said I had said: at your request, I would withdraw my remark.

The SPEAKER: I think that that is quite sufficient. The member for Enfield has obeyed the direction of the Chair as a result of an objection being taken. In deference to the Speaker he has withdrawn the remark, and I think that that is in order.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The main point I was making was that my interest in this matter arose from the repercussions it would have on my constituents. This matter has been made a political issue, but it was my concern for my constituents' welfare that prompted me to speak to the motion, not to join forces with others who support the Premier, although I support him in this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. RODDA: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I heard the member for Enfield refer to the Premier as a black bastard, and I object.

The SPEAKER: If he said that, those words are out of order. I did not hear them. If the member for Enfield made that remark, he must withdraw it.

Mr. JENNINGS: The member for Victoria has let his imagination run away with him. I certainly did not say that. Referring to the member for Albert, I said, "You usually referred to him differently."

Mr. RODDA: His words were clearly audible to me and to other members on this side of the House.

The SPEAKER: Objection having been taken by the member for Victoria, who said he distinctly heard the remark, I ask the member for Enfield to withdraw it.

Mr. JENNINGS: How can I withdraw a remark I did not make? The member for Wallaroo, who is much closer to me than any Government member is (and I do not think there is anything wrong with his auditory organs), tells me he did not hear it.

The SPEAKER: An objection has been taken. The honourable member disputes that the remark was made. The member for Victoria said he heard it, but the member for Enfield has said that the member for Wallaroo said that that remark was not made. As an objection has been taken, the member for Enfield should withdraw the remark that was heard.

Mr. JENNINGS: I did not say it, but if the member for Albert has some conscience about what has been said about the Premier beforehand, I will withdraw my remark.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I take objection, as the member for Enfield now implies that I said something, and I did not.

The SPEAKER: Order! There seems to be a difference of opinion. As I understood the proceedings, objection was taken by the member for Victoria to what the member for Enfield is alleged to have said about the Premier. It was not the member for Albert who took objection originally, so I do not think the member for Albert can take a stand on that point of order. I want the member for Enfield to withdraw the remark to the satisfaction of the member for Victoria. The member for Enfield just now, in deference to me, said he would withdraw his remark. In any case, from now on whatever has been said can be rebutted in debate. The member for Albert.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your assistance in this matter, and I want it to be made clear that I never used those words. It was imputed that I was the person who called the Premier by that term, and I categorically deny that in this House.

Mr. Jennings: You are a liar.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have been called a liar again. I do not like taking a point of order, but I take exception to what has been said.

The SPEAKER: If those words were used they are out of order. The honourable member must withdraw them.

Mr. JENNINGS: I withdraw my remark unreservedly. I cannot deny it on this occasion.

Mr. NANKIVELL: My interest in this matter arose as a result of its implications for the people who live on Lake Albert and who are now supplied with water surplus to the

River Murray Waters Agreement because no evaporation provision is contained in the agreement. As the member for Stirling has pointed out, the whole future of the lakes area is one of uncertainty. The questions I have asked in this House have indicated that it is believed a reduction in flow in the river as a result of Chowilla being built would reduce the amount of water flowing into the lakes below the replacement necessary for evaporation. For this to happen, people, who have water licences now and who depend on irrigation and on not only the quantity but the quality of water, would have their livelihood jeopardized. It was suggested by Sir Thomas Playford, when he was Premier, and by Mr. Dridan, when he was Engineer-in-Chief, that Lake Albert would have to be drained.

It has been suggested again, although the Minister tried to skirt around a direct reply to a question, that this would be the future position if Chowilla were built. In order to maintain the levels of water in the lower reaches of the river and to protect the quality of water there, some of the surface area of the lakes would have to be drained and this would mean, inevitably, that the first to be drained would be Lake Albert. Our surplus water in the proposed arrangement for Dartmouth would be about 700,000 acre feet, and it is believed that this quantity of water is necessary to flush out the whole of the Murray River in South Australia. It is believed that the quantity of water now provided for this purpose would be inadequate to prevent a build-up of salinity, and the quality of the water in the river would deteriorate. It is important on this ground that additional water be made available to South Australia. This quantity of water would more than make up the normal evaporation from the lakes and would ensure the continuity of their existence, as water surfaces from which irrigation would take place in South Australia.

People in the lower reaches of the Murray River as well as those on the upper reaches are critically affected by this proposal. I am concerned that we have a storage that gives us more water. We need storage on the Murray River and we need more water. It seems to me from the evidence we have before us that the only way this can be decided legally and constitutionally is to construct Dartmouth, and it seems improper to insist that we build another dam before a storage at Dartmouth is constructed. No guarantee is available that we could build the other storage and we would have to contest at law our rights to Chowilla,

whereas we have an agreement, which I believe is binding and which can be put into effect, to construct the storage at Dartmouth. Because we need the water, and because this storage would provide it and the extra water to be supplied under the agreement would meet our minimum requirements, I oppose the motion.

Mr. ARNOLD 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 17. Page 1569.)

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): For two reasons I do not intend to speak at length on this motion: first, because I have a bad cold and my throat is suffering and, secondly, because the Attorney-General, when he spoke on this motion last week, did not debate it at all. He used the motion for specious political purposes and used vivid figments of his imagination in his so-called reply. It seemed that he had little idea of what the motion was about, so that it may be wise in the interests of the House if I read it again. It states:

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.

I support that motion wholeheartedly. Naturally, I am extremely concerned about this motion because I have represented this area for many years. I believe that a bus service to Elizabeth, and indeed farther than Elizabeth, has been justified and necessary for many years. Also, every member would know that I have worked for this for many years, and so have many other people. Because I am the elected representative of the people of that district my efforts may have been highlighted compared with the efforts of many others, who have remained in the background but who have tried in many ways to obtain a bus service. I have approached both the Liberal Government and the Labor Government on this point for many years, with the same unsatisfactory result. I am pleased that some form of bus service is now to be established, but I am not happy with the service that is intended. Having been a member in this House for many years I have learnt, as other members have learnt, that often one has to be satisfied with a little bit when one would like a lot, and that it is better to get something rather than nothing.

However, I am concerned that (and I have been most reliably informed and believe it to be so) with the introduction of a bus service to Elizabeth (and I am the last one to oppose it, because I want it) it is estimated that the Railways Department will lose at least \$100,000 a year in revenue. I am convinced that if one form of Government transport is to lose that sum we should make an effort to recoup some of that by another form of Government transport, such as the Municipal Tramways Trust. They are the terms in which this motion is couched, and I am 100 per cent for it. As with other members who have been here for a long time, when thinking back about the speeches of the Attorney-General (both as Attorney-General and for a long time before that as the member for Mitcham) I can remember him occasionally making a good speech.

Last Wednesday, while having a cup of coffee, I said to one of my colleagues that becoming a member of the Cabinet had done much for the Attorney-General. It seemed to me, and my friend agreed, that it had brought maturity to him, and his style in debate was different from what it had been when we were in Government. Indeed, it needed to be, too. Many people (and not only members) said that when we were in office the gentleman who is now the Attorney-General and is still the member for Mitcham had an attitude that was straightout political. Unfortunately, last week, when speaking to this motion, the Attorney-General returned to his previous form, not at all successfully, except that he succeeded in irritating members sitting opposite him. His speech was purely political; indeed, his great glee in making such speeches is apparent to everyone.

Mr. Freebairn: The honourable member is almost without charity.

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

Mr. CLARK: Although I have been knocked back many times, I have always had hopes in this matter, as well as much faith, and I suppose that to some extent that is why there is to be a bus service to Elizabeth. However, having listened to the remarks made last week by the Attorney-General, I am afraid there is not much hope left in me, regarding this particular issue at any rate. At one stage the Attorney-General freely admitted that, as the member for Gawler, I had been trying to get this service for years, both during the term of a Labor Government and during the term of Liberal Governments, and of course that

is true. However, I wish the Attorney-General would go to the trouble of asking the Minister of Roads and Transport to read through his files to see whether I had done anything about this matter, for the Minister seems to have shown a total ignorance in this regard.

A few months ago some of the press reporters telephoned me and said there was much interest in the proposal for a bus service to Elizabeth but, as they had found it impossible to get any information from the Minister of Roads and Transport, they asked me whether I would be prepared to make a statement on the matter. I said that the time was right for a bus service to run to Elizabeth, and I said it ought to be run by the Municipal Tramways Trust. Following that, the Minister who made a trip to Elizabeth by train, was asked to comment on my remarks. The following is a report of that interview which appeared in the *Advertiser* on June 6:

Mr. Hill replied to a comment made on Tuesday by Mr. Clark, M.P., who advocated a road passenger service, "I don't know what Mr. Clark did about it when the A.L.P. was in Government for three years."

This was an insult designed merely to be a political weapon to try to influence people who did not know any better. But the Minister should have known better and, if he bothers to read the speech of the Attorney-General last week, full of inaccuracies as it is, he will see that the Attorney-General went to the trouble of quoting from the file. Neither my colleagues nor I particularly appreciated the way in which the Attorney-General quoted from the file. He brought with him not the complete file but some notes which, of course, were accurate, and he attempted to delude us when referring to these notes. Indeed, that was the basis of his argument. However, he did quote from documents to show that, even when our Government was in power, I did something about this matter.

The Attorney-General said that I had obtained a copy from the Minister; as a matter of fact, I got it through the Premier. It is a large file, because agitations for this bus service have been going on for a long time. If the Minister of Roads and Transport bothered to look at his own file, he would apologize to me for the remark he made to the press, but that does not mean that I expect an apology, for I think that that would be most unlikely. For years, I was told by the former Playford Government that the time for a bus service to Elizabeth was not ripe. We were told then, as we have been told ever since, that

it could not possibly be done, because it would result in the loss of too much revenue to the railways. Elizabeth is a city which did not merely grow from private subdivision: it was planned and developed by the Government, and I believe that an excellent job has been done there. However, the obligation regarding transport to Elizabeth should have been fulfilled a long time ago. I could not really argue with the Treasurer when he said that a bus service to Elizabeth would cost the railways too much: I just had to put up with that statement and, within a few months, begin agitating again for a bus service.

The worst example of politicking in the Attorney-General's speech was when he made a terribly vigorous, although not confident, attempt to suggest insultingly that the M.A.T.S. Report was, in fact, in the hands of the Labor Government before it went out of office. I think the Leader, when he made a personal explanation following the statement made by the Attorney-General, answered this matter thoroughly, and I do not intend to repeat what he said. I point out, however, that, in the first week in which the present Government took office, the new Minister of Roads and Transport was asked by a colleague when the M.A.T.S. Report could be expected, and he said:

I can remember in this House—

and I am glad that he could remember—asking the then Minister rather critically when the M.A.T.S. Report would be available, and he gave me the reply that I must give now. The issue of the report is delayed, and I regret the fact that it is not already available. It is expected that it will be available on or about August 12.

In fact, I think the report became available on August 18. Let us bear in mind that this was four months after the Liberal Government came into power, so that the Attorney-General's innuendo that we had the M.A.T.S. Report before we went out of office is not correct. As a member of the Public Works Committee, I recall on at least two occasions, when we were concerned about the possibility of freeways running past schools, thereby creating a danger to schoolchildren, that we took evidence from departmental officers, who suggested what the M.A.T.S. Report was likely to contain. I have no doubt whatever that gentlemen such as the Railways Commissioner and the Chairman of the Tramways Trust would have had some knowledge of what was likely to be in the M.A.T.S. Report in connection with their enterprises. However, we were accused of knowing all about the report when, in fact, members opposite could not

release it until months after they came into office. I think it is safe to say that the Attorney-General sought to make political capital out of an argument based on a completely unjust and even untruthful tactic. In the United States, unfair tactics used by legal men in particular are referred to as shyster tactics, and I think that might be a good word to apply to the Attorney-General's tactics in this place. One redeeming feature in the Attorney's speech was that he told the House I had worked for this bus service for years.

I have said that I have always received the same reply to my queries: I admit that freely. I went into much detail over my approaches about the matter, and the reply I received was that the State could not afford this means of transport because it would result in a great loss to the railways, and so it would. On being advised of this fact, reluctantly I had to admit that that was so. Let me make it clear that I want this bus service, but the railways will lose \$100,000 or more a year. I have the firm conviction that if one Government transport instrumentality loses on this service, at least we should make some attempt to recoup the losses by running Tramways Trust buses to Elizabeth. This city will be a much larger one before it is finished, and the area to be served will be much larger in the next few years than the present area of Elizabeth, Salisbury, Smithfield Plains and so on. I believe the only sensible thing to do regarding transport for the area is eventually to have a large Tramways Trust depot in the area, and then transport can be provided to the city by the Tramways Trust.

I am not rubbishing Transway Services Proprietary Limited. Having travelled on Transway buses, I believe this service, although possibly not perfect, is adequate. I want to make it perfectly clear that people in the area and I will now begin a new struggle towards providing a bus service to areas that will not be served under the present arrangements. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 5.59 to 7.30 p.m.]

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Legal Practitioners Act, 1936-1964; to repeal the Poor Persons Legal Assistance Act, 1936; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to make two very important provisions in respect of the practice of the legal profession in South Australia. One is to provide some recourse for members of the public who may suffer by reason of defalcation or negligence. The other is to provide financial support for the increasing burden on the legal profession of the legal assistance scheme, a scheme which has been voluntarily conducted by the legal profession in this State since 1933 for persons who cannot afford to pay for legal assistance in the normal way. In New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia legislation has been passed over the last few years whereby, as a measure of protection for the public and to provide legal assistance for those otherwise unable to afford it, interest on part of the trust accounts of solicitors has been allocated for this purpose.

Whilst South Australia has been comparatively free of trust account defalcations, the possibility exists, as the profession increases in size in this State, that the risk of defalcations could increase, despite the rigid precautions taken to obviate this. Therefore, after some years of extensive and careful consideration of the position, the Law Society has proposed that a scheme along somewhat similar lines to the schemes operating in the other States should be introduced into South Australia to provide security for members of the public. The Law Society of South Australia, after examination of the position in the other States, has proposed a number of worthwhile improvements to the form of the fidelity guarantee funds established in other States. Whereas the other funds cover only actual defalcations in trust accounts, it was thought desirable to provide protection to the members of the public also against losses sustained by negligent legal practitioners who may not be able to meet claims for compensation which could be very substantial.

Although most legal practitioners maintain expensive indemnity insurance, there are some who do not do so and others who can afford only very small covers. It is not intended that the proposal should be in substitution of such indemnity insurance but rather that it should be available in a limited manner as a "back up" protection to the public. The solicitor concerned would still remain personally liable to the fund. The second improvement that is proposed is that the South Australian guarantee fund will be permitted to build up to a size larger than the funds in other States.

It is also proposed that the size of the guarantee fund will from time to time be directly related to the number of practising legal practitioners, whereas in the other States an arbitrary figure (ranging from \$100,000 to \$1,000,000) is fixed. To achieve this a formula is to be used. The maximum amount of the fund is to be the sum of \$2,500 multiplied by the number of practising legal practitioners. At the present time the limit would be about \$1,100,000.

It is further provided that there should be some limit on the size of claims in respect of any particular practitioner who makes a defalcation. This is inserted so that the Fund is not rapidly reduced by one huge claim to the detriment of others who might have claims in respect of another practitioner. Basically the South Australian fund is designed to protect the smaller claimant. To ensure these objectives, it is provided that the total amount of claims in respect of the defalcations of any particular practitioner is limited to 5 per cent of the fund at that time. At present, if the fund were at its limit, this would provide something in excess of \$50,000 in respect of such claims. Also provision is made for claims of under \$500 to be paid in full before apportioning the excess among the larger claimants. The society is directed, nevertheless, to take into account the relative degrees of hardship suffered by respective claimants. This is, of course, desirable because any automatic distribution could create hardship. So that all claimants are treated uniformly, any claims not paid within 12 months will carry interest.

It is stressed that it could take from between five to 10 years before the guarantee fund builds up to the desired limits but, of course, such estimate of time must depend on the size of any claims made in the meantime. This is one reason why a limit on the total size of claims in each case is required. When the fund has reached its desired size, it will then be possible at a later stage to review the limit on claims.

Reference is now made to the provisions in this Bill relative to the legal assistance scheme. Since 1933 the legal profession has voluntarily administered and serviced a legal assistance scheme which is the oldest established and of the widest application of any in Australia. In some States limited legal assistance schemes have only recently been introduced, but in each case they cover only certain limited types of legal work or they apply only to the very poorest citizen.

I should like to refer to the summary and report of the existing legal assistance scheme sent by the President of the Law Society (Mr. R. N. Irwin) to members of Parliament with his letter dated September 1, 1969. In 1934, the average number of assignments a legal practitioner was about 1.8, but in 1969 the average number had increased to 5.9. These figures are based on the total number of practitioners, irrespective of whether they were in private practice or in Government or university employment (notwithstanding that those in the latter two categories are not available for such work). In 1969, out of a total of 448 legal practitioners 48 were in Government and other employment, and did not participate in the legal assistance scheme. If these practitioners are excluded, the average number of assignments was 6.5 a practitioner for the year.

Of course, it must be realized that, in addition to the actual assignments, a vast amount of voluntary administrative work is involved. Last year, for instance, over 800 man-hours were contributed free by various practitioners in merely running the scheme (apart from the actual legal services rendered).

Although for many years the work was done without any Government assistance (except for annual grants towards certain of the administration expenses), the Government since 1960 has made special grants to provide a small measure of recompense to solicitors and counsel acting in assigned cases. The annual grant was \$9,000 for each of the years from 1960 to 1967 inclusive, and since 1968 the grant has been \$17,000 a year. Despite the increase in the special grants, distributions to practitioners have been very small. All out-of-pocket expenses are paid in full, but of the full professional costs involved the proportions paid by distribution have been as follows:

| | Criminal Matters Cents in the \$ | Other Matters Cents in the \$ |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1966 | 25 | 18 |
| 1967 | 25 | 16 |
| 1968 | 26.25 | 19 |

When it is realized that a legal practitioner still has to bear his full overhead expenses amounting to an average of 50c a dollar of gross income, the legal practitioner is virtually paying out of his own pocket for all those assignments which are handled by him and which are payable out of the special Government grant. The burden imposed by the scheme in the context of present-day levels of overhead expenses has produced in the legal profession grave concern as to the future of the existing

scheme. Most people in the community are completely unaware of this position, and of the fact (as mentioned earlier) that the South Australian legal assistance scheme is by far the oldest established and most comprehensive scheme in Australia. The Government has been conscious for some time that it will be necessary to give greater assistance to the profession because it believes that the ordinary citizen in our community who cannot afford the services of a lawyer in the normal way should, nevertheless, be able to obtain such professional assistance at the time of need.

Accordingly, it is proposed to allocate at least one-half of the income from the combined trust account into the legal assistance fund as a contribution towards the costs of administration of the scheme and for the reimbursement of legal costs and out-of-pocket expenses. The Government grant for the last financial year to cover the cost of administration, which includes two full-time legal practitioners (being the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of the society) and six other staff members (the majority of whose time is devoted to the legal assistance scheme), amounted to \$25,750, while the special grant for reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses and some contribution towards legal costs of practitioners amounted to \$17,000. The further contribution from the income of the combined trust account will provide by degrees a more reasonable return to legal practitioners for the services provided under the legal assistance scheme and will thereby ensure the continuance of legal assistance on the present comprehensive scale.

It is proposed that the legal assistance scheme be conducted on the same successful lines as heretofore, and this Bill sets out in legislative form the necessary statutory provisions deemed necessary to permit the scheme to continue in a manner which 35 years of practical experience supports. Although the Poor Persons Legal Assistance Act, 1936, is to be repealed by this legislation, the relevant provisions have been written into this Bill. In addition, as the scheme has expanded over the years to assist many persons who are not really "poor persons", as those words are usually understood, it is now proposed to call the scheme simply "the legal assistance scheme". As the President of the Law Society has pointed out, the legal profession has been assisting many who may be heavily committed to paying off instalments on houses, cars and household or electrical appliances. In fact, a large part of the scheme could be regarded as legal assistance on an interest-

free time-payment basis. Nevertheless, it is considered that the ordinary citizen should receive (and, in fact, does receive) legal assistance at the time that he requires it. It is also highly desirable that the ordinary citizen can obtain independent legal advice in criminal matters, matrimonial and estate matters, claims resulting from road accidents, house purchase and money-lending transactions, and in the many other matters in which the legal practitioner is especially qualified to assist him.

To enable the guarantee fund and the legal assistance fund to be established, it is proposed that about one-half of each solicitor's general trust account be pooled and transferred into a combined trust account and invested through the banks. The interest earned by the combined trust account will be paid or credited to a statutory interest account. After payment of certain expenses, one-half of the statutory interest account will be paid into the legal assistance fund and the remainder will, in the first instance, be paid into the guarantee fund. When the guarantee fund has reached its maximum limit (as outlined earlier), the balance will be paid or applied to the assistance fund, or for any purpose approved by the Attorney-General and the society. It is contemplated that if the amount available for legal assistance is adequate, then surplus moneys at some future time may be used for such purposes as legal education and research, law libraries, law reform and the like.

It should be stressed that, normally, solicitors' trust accounts comprise two components. First, there is what can be described as a general trust account representing sums of money held for clients for a variety of reasons such as land settlements and settlement moneys for court actions and the like. In the normal circumstances, this money is only temporarily held by the solicitors pending date of settlement or receipt of instructions. There is, however, normally a substantial balance in the general trust account at any one time. This general trust account, being held in a current banking account, does not bear interest. Even if it were possible, as a matter of banking practice (which it is not), for it to bear interest, the interest could not be allocated between the various clients because of the continual movement of moneys in or out of the account. It is this general trust account which, it is proposed, will be subject to the provisions for one-half to be transferred into a combined trust account to enable the amount so transferred to bear interest.

The second component of solicitors' trust accounts consists of moneys held specifically for clients in interest-bearing bank accounts or deposits. In these cases the interest is specifically accounted for to the client. This latter component of solicitors' trust accounts is unaffected by the proposals, nor is it brought into calculation to ascertain the amount to be transferred to the combined trust account. It is difficult to estimate what amounts will become available for payment from the statutory interest account to the guarantee and legal assistance funds as it is not practicable to obtain full up-to-date statistics. There has been no requirement in the annual audit report to be filed by legal practitioners in the Supreme Court for the disclosure of the necessary information, although some legal practitioners or firms of legal practitioners have done so; but even here there has been no dissection between the two components. It is, however, quite reasonable to expect, upon current information, that the amount will probably be about \$40,000 a year. However, any amount would, of course, be subject to variation from year to year. Based on experience in other States, it is expected that, once a legal practitioner has transferred to the combined trust account about one-half of the balance of his general trust account, he will not often require to draw moneys out of the combined trust account; but if he is required to do so by his client and he has then an insufficient balance in the remaining part of his trust account, the moneys will be repayable immediately from the combined trust account to the extent required.

The proposals are designed to enable each legal practitioner to nominate the branch in South Australia of the bank in which he desires to have deposited by the Law Society his portion of the combined trust account. In fact, the combined trust account will consist of the series of deposits by legal practitioners in the various banks nominated by all legal practitioners. This arrangement will assist materially in reducing administrative costs to a minimum and, at the same time, will preserve the solicitor's proper right to have a bank of his own choice. To ensure safety, all moneys held in the statutory interest account, the guarantee fund, and the legal assistance fund when invested must only be invested in trustee securities. In addition, regular audits are to be made and reports are to be sent to the Attorney-General each year.

A considerable amount of work has been done by the committee appointed by the council of the Law Society in the examination of

similar schemes in other States to develop this legislation, which contains, as I said earlier, many improvements on such other schemes. In April, 1967, a broad outline of the proposals was circulated to the members of the profession. From the 278 replies received, 272 stated that they were in favour of the proposals. A detailed draft was then prepared by the special committee, approved of by the council of the Law Society, and then submitted to the Attorney-General. Following intimation that the Government approved of the proposals, in principle, a special meeting of the members of the profession was held on May 15 last at which an overwhelming majority approved of the detailed draft.

Since that date the special committee has had numerous conferences with the Parliamentary Draftsman to prepare the present Bill based closely on the special committee's detailed draft. The Bill in its present form was unanimously approved of by the council of the Law Society at a special meeting held on September 15.

I consider that the way in which this Bill has been prepared, over a period that goes back before the present Government came into office, is a model of co-operation between the Government and an outside body, in this case the Law Society of South Australia. I know that the society has much appreciated the co-operation it has received from the Parliamentary Draftsmen, particularly Mr. Ludowici and Mr. Hackett-Jones: in fact, the President told me this today, and that is why I make bold to mention it now.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the amending Act is to commence on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 repeals the Poor Persons Legal Assistance Act, 1936. The provisions of this Act are now to be incorporated with the new provisions introduced by the Bill. Clause 4 amends the provision dealing with the formal arrangement of the principal Act. Clause 5 amends the interpretation section of the principal Act. Definitions are inserted for the purposes of the new provisions to be inserted in the Act.

Clause 6 amends the heading to Part IV of the principal Act, repeals section 22, and enacts new sections 22 and 22a. New section 22 has substantially the same effect as the old provision, but it attempts to overcome certain legal difficulties that arose from the form of the old section. The new section requires a legal practitioner to pay trust moneys that he receives in the course of his practice into

a trust account. New section 22a provides some protection to a bank. Under its provisions a bank is deemed not to be affected with notice of any specific trust to which moneys deposited in a trust account are subject, but the bank is not relieved of any common law or statutory liability. Clause 7 makes a drafting amendment to section 24 of the principal Act.

Clause 8 enacts most of the new provisions to be inserted in Part IV of the Act. New section 24a provides that a legal practitioner is to deposit a certain proportion of the lowest balance of the moneys held in his trust account during the preceding year with the society. The society is to pay these moneys into a banking account or banking accounts entitled, or collectively entitled, the "Legal Practitioners Combined Trust Account". The new subsection contains various other provisions designed to deal with various subsidiary matters and to ensure the effective operation of the section. New section 24b requires the society to invest the moneys deposited with it in an interest-bearing account specified by the legal practitioner. New section 24c establishes an account, entitled the Statutory Interest Account, into which the income and accretions realized from investment will be paid. After making provision for administrative expenses the moneys in this account are to be applied as to one-half to the assistance fund and as to one-half to the guarantee fund until the amount of that fund reaches an amount arrived at by multiplying the sum of \$2,500 by the number of practising legal practitioners. When the guarantee fund reaches this amount any further income that would normally be payable to that fund may be paid to this assistance fund or towards any other object approved by the Attorney-General and the society.

New section 24d exempts a legal practitioner from any liability in respect of any action done in compliance with Part IV, and provides that a person beneficially entitled to trust moneys may effectively enforce his interest as effectively as if Part IV had not been enacted. New section 24e provides for the establishment of the legal assistance fund. This fund is to consist of moneys derived from the statutory interest account, moneys provided by the State or Commonwealth Governments, moneys recovered by the society under Division III of Part IV, any other moneys that the society thinks fit to include in the fund, and the income and accretions realized from the investment of its moneys. New section 24f provides

for the delegation of the powers of the society under Division III. New section 24g provides that the society may itself provide legal assistance by means of practitioners employed by it. Their assistance is, however, to be confined to legal advice. This section thus reflects the existing practice under which the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary of the society provide certain advice where the assignment of applicants to outside practitioners is not justified.

New section 24h provides for the society to prepare and maintain panels of the legal practitioners prepared to participate in the legal assistance scheme. New section 24i provides for the assignment of legal practitioners to assisted persons and the payment to a legal practitioner so assigned for a proportion of his costs. New section 24j provides that a court, in making an order for costs, is not to take into account the fact that a party is an assisted person. The legal practitioner is to be subrogated to the right of an assisted person to recover costs in respect of legal assistance. New section 24k provides that a legal practitioner may and, if required, shall disclose to the society facts pertinent to the provision of legal assistance for that person but that the privileges between a legal practitioner and his client are otherwise unaffected. New section 24l protects confidential information obtained by the society in the course of administering the scheme from disclosure.

New section 24m makes it an offence for an applicant for legal assistance to mislead or attempt to mislead the society. New section 24n provides that the Attorney-General may remit fees and charges payable to the Crown where those fees are payable in respect of an assisted person. New section 24o exempts from stamp duties any statutory declaration made in connection with an application for legal assistance. New section 24p provides for the establishment of the guarantee fund. This fund is to consist of moneys paid from the statutory interest account, moneys recovered by the society under Division IV of Part IV, any moneys that the society thinks fit to include in the fund, the income and accretions derived from investment of the fund, and any moneys received in pursuance of a contract of insurance. New section 24q enables the society to delegate its powers under Division IV. New section 24r enables the society to ensure against claims under Division IV. New section 24s provides that the guarantee fund is to be held

and applied to compensate persons suffering loss from the dishonesty or negligence of any legal practitioner, his clerks or servants.

New section 24t enables the society to advertise in order to ascertain all claims in relation to a legal practitioner. New section 24u provides that, if the society rejects the claim of an applicant in whole or in part, he may take action in the Supreme Court to establish the validity of his claim. New section 24v enables the society to require the production of documents relevant to the determination of a claim. New section 24w deals with the amount of a claim and provides that the amount available to satisfy all claims in respect of a legal practitioner shall not exceed 5 per cent of the last audited balance of the fund. Where all claims cannot be fully satisfied, the amount available is to be apportioned in accordance with the section. New section 24x enables the society to recover the amount of any payment under Division IV from the person legally liable for the default.

New section 24y provides that proper accounts are to be kept and duly audited. New section 24z provides that payments between the various funds established under Part IV and payments between the trust account of a practitioner and the society are to be exempt from stamp duties. New section 24za provides for the society to employ officers and servants for the purposes of the Part and to pay their salaries from the various funds. New section 24zb makes it an offence for a person to contravene or fail to comply with a provision of Part IV. New section 24zc gives the society certain administrative powers. New section 24zd empowers the Governor to make regulations.

Clause 9 deals with a rather different matter. The society has requested that the principal Act be amended to enable it to appoint more than one vice-president. The Government readily acceded to this request, and consequently section 28 of the principal Act is amended to enable the society to appoint more than one vice-president. Clause 10 makes an amendment consequential on clause 9. Clause 11 amends section 35 of the principal Act. This amendment is consequential on the enactment of provisions for the delegation of certain powers of the society in Part IV. Clauses 12, 13 and 14 make further amendments consequential on clause 9.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

THE BUDGET

The Estimates—Grand total, \$328,261,000.
In Committee of Supply.
(Continued from September 23. Page 1695.)

THE LEGISLATURE

Legislative Council, \$45,615.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): Yesterday I was referring to the action of the Government in imposing taxation measures.

Mr. McKee: There were plenty of them.

Mr. BURDON: Yes; someone tallied them up and said there were seven or eight, and that there were more to come. As I said last evening, I have received a couple of letters dealing with one taxation measure introduced by the Government. The first letter, dated July 17, sent to me by the Corporation of the City of Mount Gambier (and copies were also sent to the Premier and the Minister of Works), states:

My council is gravely concerned regarding the recent announcement that water rates are to be increased and wishes to record its absolute opposition to such a move, particularly as it effects the country areas and more directly Mount Gambier. Such an increase may be justified in metropolitan areas, where the residents are enjoying the privilege of cheaper water, at the expense of the country. The costs of pumping water to Adelaide and its surrounding urban areas, and other areas where a supply is dependent upon pumped water from the Murray River, should be borne by those particular districts. The members wonder if the Government would pump the Blue Lake water to Adelaide and sell it in the metropolitan area at a cheaper rate than that charged in Mount Gambier. Whilst the cheaper rates apply to the urban areas surrounding Adelaide, it cannot be said that decentralization is earnestly being fostered within this State. If we wanted to attract water consuming industries to areas outside Adelaide surely Mount Gambier and its surrounds should enjoy the same rating privileges as does Adelaide, particularly as the water in this area can be supplied at a cheaper cost to the consumer than is the case in Adelaide.

With the ever-increasing population drift to the metropolitan area, the burden of overweight taxes is becoming greater to those who remain in the country to maintain the backbone of the State. If the migratory trend is to cease, the sympathetic understanding and assistance must be forthcoming from the State Government and what better means could be adopted than granting the diminishing percentage of country residents the same water rating privileges as enjoyed in Adelaide. Your assurance that your Government will seriously consider this matter and grant to Mount Gambier and other country centres some form of a relief in this rating would be welcomed by the council members and residents of this city.

This letter requested me to take up the matter on behalf of the council. I raised the matter during the Loan Estimates debate earlier this year, but since then I have received a letter from the South-Eastern Regional Group of Chambers of Commerce. This letter, dated August 4, 1969, and posted from Mount Benson, states:

The annual conference of the above group was held at Mount Gambier on July 21 and, as Region Director, I was instructed to bring to your notice the following minute and remarks:

Hopgood (Mount Gambier): I move, "This conference expresses support for the Mayor and Corporation of the City of Mount Gambier in their efforts to achieve parity of rating with the metropolitan area for water and particularly sewerage rates in the South-East and that the member for the district be advised accordingly. Sec. Allert (MG).

The Mayor (Mr. Stan Elliot) in support, said, "The metropolitan are paying only two-thirds of country ratings. This disparity discourages industry to come to the country, as businessmen always investigate such charges when considering a new area and as it stands we are about 4 per cent above city costs." The motion was carried and as such was declared of sufficient importance to be presented at the State Conference of Chambers of Commerce to be held at Renmark in October. I respectfully present the above for your attention.

Yours faithfully, E. W. Jarman, Regional Director (S. E. Group).

The Treasurer states in his Budget explanation that he expects that this year revenue collections will be \$2,410,000 more than last year. We all know that water is vital in South Australia, the driest State in the driest continent. Whilst I do not intend to discuss the merits or demerits of the Chowilla dam, I want to point out that the cost of pumping water in South Australia places a heavy burden on the State and on the consumers who have to pay the Bill. I know, from discussions with officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, that a scheme of payment for water on the basis of quantity used has been considered. I think the Minister of Works recognizes that this method could have complications, although he has agreed that the department is considering it. It was also considered by the previous Minister. I am not optimistic about such a scheme being introduced, because the department faces the problem of the relationship between cost and possible revenue. It is wrong to give the people the impression that certain action will be taken when the Government does not intend to take that action.

Mr. McKee: That's political trickery.

Mr. BURDON: I must agree. I consider it dishonest for the Government to make these suggestions. Revenue must be obtained in relation to the cost incurred. In some other fields of Government expenditure, the Government says that it cannot provide services because it has not the money. I do not think games of political trickery should be played on the people in these matters.

Because I now wish to refer to my electoral district, I will probably be accused of being a little parochial. Nevertheless, I point out that I have received another letter, dated September 9, from the Corporation of the City of Mount Gambier. It is as follows:

The members at council last Thursday discussed the question of the proposed new courthouse and Government offices recently raised by you in Parliament. Council has requested that I write and offer you their fullest support in this matter. All members are most concerned regarding the delay and trust you may be able to press for some immediate action in this regard. A copy of a letter sent today to the Honourable the Premier is enclosed for your information.

The letter that the Town Clerk, who signed the letter I have just read, referred to is as follows:

My council is concerned regarding the apparent procrastination regarding the building of a new courthouse and Government offices in this city. As far back as 1962 the then Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, stated in a letter to His Worship the Mayor that, "there is no doubt that the building (courthouse) has had its life" and yet to date no further progress has been made.

Regarding the Government offices, Sir Thomas Playford also stated in his letter that "now after many months of patient negotiation with several departments, all of whom have had their own individual exacting requirements, we have at last reached agreement with the Commissioner of Police to use his land under certain prescribed conditions, and with the other departments on their office requirements" and that they were ready then to prepare contract documents.

Today both sections continue to work under extreme difficulties. It is quite common for the justices court to have to sit in the Clerk of Court's office, together with his other staff carrying out their normal duties. These conditions are unbelievable and have to be seen to be fully appreciated. In fact some justices have refused to work under the conditions referred to above. These conditions certainly warrant your personal inspection.

The Government offices are little better, and again the conditions under which these officers work is far removed from the modern office suites being built in Adelaide and other country areas. The members would appreciate your assurance that the above matters will be brought forward and acted upon immediately.

This letter, too, was signed by the Town Clerk. To be fair, I must point out that the Minister of Works and I have discussed this matter several times. Recently the Minister said that an officer of the Public Buildings Department would visit Mount Gambier in connection with this matter. On two or three occasions over the last five or six years I have made a similar request in this regard. I make no less strong appeal this evening than I have made in the past for these offices, although I acknowledge that the Government provided much better facilities for some sections of the public offices in Mount Gambier when it took over a certain building, which was about a 200 per cent improvement on the buildings that had been worked in for many years. I make an urgent appeal to the Government to take positive steps to provide these necessary facilities in Mount Gambier.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is audible conversation going on. I ask that all honourable members be seated.

Mr. BURDON: The Corporation of the City of Mount Gambier and I are not doing any more than requesting the Government to get on with the job, and I hope that my plea on this occasion, coupled with others I have made, will produce results soon. On many occasions I have explained the difficulties experienced in hearing cases in the justices court and the magistrates court at Mount Gambier. The work of the courts is increasing at Mount Gambier as a result of the population expansion in the Lower South-East, and if for no reason other than that the Government in 1962 was convinced that these facilities were necessary, my plea to the Government in 1969 is to get on with the job without further delay.

The previous Government allotted \$1,000 to the Bethesda Home for Alcoholics in Mount Gambier, and this year the Government has increased that sum to \$2,000, an increase that is appreciated by me and officials of the home. The sum of \$6,300 has been made available as a capital grant, but I am not sure whether this is a straight-out capital grant or whether there are strings attached to it. On behalf of the organization I plead with the Government to make this a straight-out gift to the home, as this money will greatly assist the organization. It could be argued that the sum of \$6,300 is minimal compared with the amount of excise collected by the Commonwealth Government (about \$1,000,000 a day), but I realize that many such small sums have to be considered by the Treasurer. The home would experience some difficulty in matching

this grant if this were required, and I should like it to be considered as a straight-out grant to the home.

Mr. McKee: Will the money have to come from the local people?

Mr. BURDON: Many people now support the rehabilitation of alcoholics and, although this home is doing good work at present, there is a danger that its activities could cease, which would be a retrograde step. Last year the home purchased several acres, intending to produce a cash crop. Although it produced 100 tons of onions, I do not think it has sold two tons. It was expected that this venture would return to the home about \$4,000 cash but, after spending about \$1,100 to produce the onions, the home has received no financial benefits.

Mr. McKee: Is there no market for them?

Mr. BURDON: None: over 90 tons of onions is virtually useless and will have to be dumped soon. The home is doing a good job and I hope it will continue to function in the future. Indeed, the provision of a capital grant will enable it to do so. Although the Government will not always be saddled with this responsibility, such a grant will help the home establish itself in the immediate future and, on behalf of those administering the home, I would appreciate the fact that the \$6,300 will not have any strings attached to it and will be a gift. Judging from the matters that have been raised in this debate, I believe that the Budget is not one that the people of South Australia have received with great enthusiasm. However, I think credit must be given where it is due.

The Government has in a couple of cases made some contribution towards solving some of the present problems confronting headmasters and staff by providing certain ancillary staff in schools. However, there is nothing else in the Budget over which I can enthuse. This Budget will do nothing other than maintain the normal growth of the State. I believe that the \$12,000,000 being held in reserve by the Treasurer could well be used for the benefit of the State in providing public buildings, including schools, and other facilities for the community. Last Monday week the Premier said in Naracoorte that he did not think the receipts tax had had a great impact on the people of South Australia. He said he did not think there was much opposition to it, and that he believed the opposition that had been expressed in some quarters was not warranted. I want to tell the Premier, however, that the reaction of people throughout the State to the receipts tax has

been hostile. With many other people in South Australia, I wonder just what will be the upshot of the High Court decision. It could be that that decision, given in Western Australia, will get the Hall Government off the hook in relation to the receipts tax, because the imposition of most of the tax may be invalid. In other words, the Government will have to find some other means of taxation soon.

Mr. Freebairn: If your Party forms a Government after the next election, will you take off the receipts tax?

Mr. Corcoran: Of course we can't, because you have committed the people of the State to it.

Mr. BURDON: The member for Light should not have used the word "if"; we shall be in Government after the next election. The Labor Party has been honest with the people regarding taxes, and this has paid dividends. At the last State elections we told the people what taxation we intended to introduce. However, the present Government did not refer to any of the taxation measures it has since introduced. It immediately proceeded to increase taxation in this State by 20 per cent in one year. This is what I put to the member for Light: a little honesty will go a long way towards increasing the popularity of a political Party, and that the Labor Party enjoys that popularity is shown by the vote that it received in 1968. The dishonesty inflicted on the people of South Australia by the present Government Party must be extremely disconcerting to the member for Light, because I do think he has a conscience.

Mr. McKee: No. He's got a hide like a buffalo.

Mr. BURDON: It does not seem that any of my colleagues agree with me in that statement. However, the conflict between the statement on the hustings that the Government would not increase taxation and the increasing of taxation by 20 per cent, raising an additional \$8,000,000 or \$9,000,000 from the taxpayers in one hit, must be pricking the honourable member now.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I compliment the Treasurer on presenting a magnificent Budget. It is satisfying to have a good practical man, who has made a great success of his own private business, bringing his business skills to guide the State's finances. What a dramatic contrast this is with the three years of unhappy stewardship of the State's finances

that we suffered under the Australian Labor Party Government. I affirm my belief in the federal system, which is an ideal system in a country so vast as Australia, with great variations throughout the Commonwealth. It would be difficult to run as a unitary State, as I believe some members opposite desire, with all the power and all the major decision making vested in Canberra. What a hopeless political situation that would be!

We cannot discuss the State Budget without paying attention to the federal system, because we are but a part of the whole federal structure. When we consider that the Commonwealth Government, with its great taxation powers, is able to raise about 20c tax in each dollar of gross national product whereas the States raise only about 5c in each dollar of the G.N.P., we realize how dependent we are on the central organ in our federal structure. The present Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament (Mr. Whitlam) addressed a group of students at the Adelaide University some months ago, and a report of his speech is headed, "Whitlam hits State system." Mr. Whitlam stated:

State Parliaments were no longer able to carry out government adequately, the Leader of the Federal Opposition said yesterday. Mr. Whitlam was addressing a meeting arranged by the Adelaide University A.L.P. Club in the Union Hall. He said that Australia should be governed by a House of Representatives—

note that there is no mention of a Senate—a dozen metropolitan Parliaments, one in each of the larger cities, and a few score local governing bodies to look after the areas of production and development.

This illustrates the Labor Party's attitude to our Australian Federation. I do not know how the various constituent parts of Mr. Whitlam's unitary State would be administered, but I assume a commissar, or some such person, would be in charge of each of the administrative units. Mr. Whitlam continued:

State Parliaments were all dealing with areas far too big for their financial resources. Many phases of State Government could be carried out only by finance made available by the Commonwealth—

here comes a pearl!—

He advocated merging State railways into a national system and said port authorities also should be under national control . . . The A.L.P. proposed to get a Bill through Parliament to amend the Commonwealth Constitution—

although A.L.P. members of the Commonwealth Parliament comprise only about one-third of its numerical strength—

so that in all State Parliaments every person's vote would be equal.

I should like Opposition members to explain their reaction to Mr. Whitlam's plan for a unitary State: then, we would see how hollow are A.L.P. criticisms of the Treasurer's excellent Budget.

Mr. Venning: How will Mr. Whitlam go on October 25?

Mr. FREEBAIN: Very poorly. I forecast that Mr. Whitlam will return after the election with his ragged remnant no greater than it is now. I should like to quote what the Prime Minister said about the Commonwealth Budget about a month ago in the House of Representatives. His remarks indicate Australia's enormous growth in the 20 years of Liberal and Country Party Administration in Canberra. The Prime Minister said:

Successive budgets under a Liberal Administration have led in that period of time to a situation where, compared with 1948-49 . . . This is about the time that the A.L.P. Government was thrown out of Canberra, and what a pity it is that so few Opposition members are in the Chamber to hear my exposition. I am sure they are sitting out in the corridors with the intercommunication sets turned up. The Prime Minister continued:

... our mean population has grown from 7,796,000 to 12,171,000; our gross national product at constant prices has risen from \$8,391,000,000 to \$21,077,000,000; our steel production has risen from 1,178,000 tons to 6,599,000 tons; our new motor vehicle registrations have risen from 103,149 to 459,885; our construction of new houses and flats completed has risen from 52,684 to 115,357; our mineral exports have risen from \$12,883,782 to an estimated \$464,079,000 and our unemployment rate has fallen to a stage where all our people can be said to be fully employed to an extent that has never been known in this country before.

What a dramatic statement to make in the Commonwealth Parliament. It indicates the enormous progress that a Liberal and Country Party Administration has made over about 20 years—a period in which rather more than one-third of the Australian people (the youngest third) have known only a Liberal and Country Party Administration.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: It's the greatest period of growth in Australia's history.

Mr. FREEBAIN: Yes, and how lucky we have been to have a Liberal and Country Party coalition in Canberra in all those 20 years. We now see that the Australian people have realized the benefit of an L.C.P. Administration, and now there are L.C.P. Administrations in every Australian State as well.

From time to time, I will make praiseworthy remarks about the South Australian Government, but there are certain aspects of its policy with which I find some fault, particularly its policy of propping up the South Australian Railways. I consider that effective and substantial economies could be made in the Railways Department that would more than equal the demands now being made for an increased allocation for education. I think that every reasonable person would admit that our education allocation should be increased but I hardly think that a reasonable person would say that a State should spend more than one-quarter of its Budget on this department, important as it is. A former Minister of Education (Hon. R. R. Loveday), for whom I have great respect, said this publicly when addressing a meeting of the Kapunda-Eudunda Teachers' Association some weeks ago. I have a message for all the Labor Party members who are skulking out in the corridors: I will have something to say about Mr. Harris a little later. I am sure that Labor Party members would like to be in their seats to hear my observations, because he is one man who has destroyed the Teachers Institute campaign for more money for education.

Returning to the railways, I refer to page 141 of the Auditor-General's Report and I hope that all the unseen Labor Party members outside the Chamber have taken their copies of it with them. What a pity that A.L.P. members have not got the intestinal fortitude to sit in the Chamber and take some criticism. Page 141 of the report states that the total Railways Department deficit (and this will interest the member for Glenelg, who knows something about figures) is \$12,316,723. What an enormous cross for the State Budget to have to carry. Why is that so? In referring to page 146 of this report I should like to correct an error I have made previously when I said that the number of railway staff was about 8,000.

From the Auditor-General's Report I find that the total of the railways staff in 1969 is 9,242, which is almost as many railway employees as there are teachers in the Education Department. What a hopeless imbalance in the State's employment sphere, when we have almost as many Railway Department employees as we have teachers in our schools teaching our young folk. I refer now to the annual report of the South Australian Railways Commissioner for the year 1967-68, in which he tentatively indicates some of the weaknesses

in the railway system. At page 4 the report states:

The year under review was a difficult one. The financial result underlines the dependence of the South Australian Railways on the agricultural and the Broken Hill mining industries. On the other hand, inter-system traffic continues to grow and there are indications that this trend will continue. Nevertheless, local traffic still furnishes the greater proportion of revenue.

The Commissioner then indicated ways to make the railways pay a bit more, and I hope my unseen listeners are paying rapt attention. What a pity that only two members of Her Majesty's Opposition find it convenient to be in the Chamber during this debate, which is the most important in our Parliamentary year but, apparently, Opposition members, because of their lack of responsibility toward financial measures, find it convenient not to be in their proper place in this Chamber.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ferguson): Is the honourable member drawing attention to the state of the Committee?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Not specifically, Mr. Acting Chairman, but I draw attention to the fact that so few Socialist members find it convenient to be in their places at present. After all, Opposition members are paid the same professional salary as Government members are paid.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to return to the Budget.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On page 5, the Commissioner's report of 1967-68 states:

This economically viable transport structure would, in my view, exclude the suburban and those country passenger services not associated with interstate traffic, as well as those lines which, from the point of view of railway economics, should be closed but which are retained for social reasons.

I take issue with the Commissioner on that point and question whether we, as taxpayers, should maintain uneconomic railway services for social reasons. We all know that the Municipal Tramways Trust could run those services and not sustain a loss. The Commissioner goes on to say:

In particular, this should apply to intra-state passenger services and especially to the suburban ones. It is possible to economize on the country routes, but this is not so where suburban services are concerned. In fact, due to the large amount of equipment that must be maintained to handle traffic in the peak periods, any increase in commuter patronage must inevitably result in greater rather than reduced losses. It is envisaged that, if rail patronage increases over the next 20 years to the degree

forecast by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, the losses on these services will almost certainly escalate proportionally.

I hope that the few Opposition members who are in the Chamber have paid attention to those remarks of the Commissioner. The Commissioner goes on to say (and this will be of some interest to the member for Glenelg, who in his economic simplicity wants the metropolitan railway services improved):

The fact that suburban passenger travel has not kept pace with the population growth can be explained in part by the fact that some of the major areas of development are remote from rail.

Yet we find the member for Glenelg recently in this Chamber, I think during this debate, advocating the development of metropolitan passenger services. We can see from the Commissioner's statement how hopeless it is to try to prop up a railway service that fewer and fewer people desire to use. In fact, the more we prop it up, the greater our losses will be.

Mr. Venning: Do you think people would use the railways even if the service were free?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No. We have the spectacle of all members of Parliament living in the metropolitan area, who have free rail and bus passes, using their private cars. This is a fair indication that people will not use the railway services. How often does the member for Glenelg use the rail passenger service to Brighton? Rarely, I suggest. Not a word do we hear from him or, of course, from his many absent friends. I hope that I am not alone when I advocate effecting economies in the railways. Last Saturday's *Advertiser* shows a picture of two happy railway officials, one with his foot on a barrow and the other standing with his hands in his pockets, apparently discussing the problems of the railway system at Angaston. The article, which is a most fascinating one, indicates the sort of hopeless inefficiency existing in the South Australian Railways. This would be funny if it were not so tragic. You and I, Mr. Acting Chairman, as taxpayers, are helping to make up the deficit of the South Australian Railways. The article, headed "They wait for passengers who never come," states:

There was a nice show of geraniums at the Angaston station yesterday afternoon, well manicured lawns at the Tanunda station and fires glowing cosily in the office grates at both. The staff at the stations had time for a chat. Plenty of time. Because things have been a little slack since the passenger trains stopped running last December.

I ask members to note that the passenger service stopped running last December. The article continues:

The main Barossa stations are still fully staffed, apart from the loss of one junior clerk at Angaston

That is the sort of thing going on in the South Australian Railways. It would seem that no attempt is being made to effect economies where economies can be made. The article continues:

Former Barossa railcar driver Mr. E. R. Schulz, of Nuriootpa, said yesterday that previously there had been 45 passenger services a week and four freight services a day. Now there are only four freight services a day. That means work for the station staffs. But it's not like old times. There are, they admit, quiet times, boring times, with only paper work and a few duties between the trainloads of stone and cement which pay the bills along the Barossa line. And there are the geranium beds and lawns to look after and the empty waiting rooms to tidy.

Yet we find that our absent friend, the member for Edwardstown, supports the way the Railways Department is being run. He does not want any reduction in the scale of operations of the department but wants to see it developed. Of course, we all know why: in the South Australian Railways are almost 10,000 captive trade union supporters, and the Labor Party officials hand around the hat before each election campaign. When the election comes, I am told that each of these employees dobs in \$5, so why should not our absent friend, the member for Edwardstown, advocate increased expenditure on the railways? Even the Deputy Leader is squirming in his seat in embarrassment. I regard him as one of the few practical men in the Opposition team. I rejoice to see that Opposition members are now coming back into the Chamber. I will continue to read references from Saturday's *Advertiser*, because they help to show how the South Australian Railways works. At page 13, under the heading "Railwaymen 'Explosive'", the *Advertiser* contains an article that states:

Feeling among railwaymen over possible rail service cuts was "explosive," a railways unions' deputation told the Premier yesterday. The State Secretary of the Australian Railways Union (Mr. H. C. Garnaut) said the Premier had also been told that union officials held "grave fears" that they would not be able to control the reaction of their members because of his failure to give an assurance that train services would not be curtailed "to the detriment of railwaymen and the travelling public."

I am informed that there was a most tearful display in the Premier's office; the trade union officials just about sobbed themselves into a state of trauma. The article continues:

Mr. Garnaut said his office had obtained a circular proving the South Australian Railways was studying the feasibility of curtailing rail services.

That circular is similar to the one that I understand the member for Edwardstown acquired by some improper means. I am glad to see that another of our absent friends has returned. The article continues:

Mr. Garnaut said that a special meeting of the State council of the A.R.U. in Adelaide this week had ordered the executive to call an immediate protest stoppage as soon as the South Australian Railways took any positive steps to indicate that it would curtail services after specific times and on Sunday.

In other words, the impudent railway trade union officials threatened to cause disruption among the railway employees to try to force the Premier's hand. Either they use cudgels or they use tears, and I am told they used both while being interviewed by the Premier on Friday last week. What a contrast there is between the South Australian Railways and the Municipal Tramways Trust! The trust transports 80 per cent of the persons in the metropolitan Adelaide who use public transport each day and it has a staff of only 1,741, yet it can run its business with only a minimal loss, whilst the South Australian Railways transport only 20 per cent of the people who use public transport in Adelaide and show a loss of about \$12,000,000 a year. My criticism of the present Government is that it has not taken action sufficiently drastic to reduce the railways losses.

I recall an incident that occurred when, with the present member for Eyre, I was driving around that wonderful district before the election in 1968. We stopped at a railway crossing to allow a passenger train, comprising an engine and two carriages, to pass in front of us. The enginedriver and the guard waved cheerfully to us, but there was not one passenger on the train. This is the case with many country passenger rail services.

I wish to make a passing reference to the mention of education in the Commonwealth Budget. We are in a Federation, and the two great parts of it—the States and the central administration—are, or at least ought to be, in a state of balance. We cannot consider a State Budget without also paying some attention to the Commonwealth Budget. First, I should like to comment on a report in yesterday's *Advertiser* headed, " 'Absurd,' say Dunstan." The report states:

It was absurd to provide State aid to all private schools, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Dunstan) told students at a crowded

lunch-hour meeting in the University of Adelaide's Union Hall yesterday. It was the small parish schools, not the larger wealthy colleges, which needed assistance, he said. "My sons go to St. Peter's College, but I see no reason why St. Peter's College should get any money from the Government," he said.

It is all very well for the Leader, who is a wealthy man, to send his sons to St. Peter's College and to say that that school does not need any finance, but the vast number of private schools are not in the wealthy category that St. Peter's College is in. I think most South Australians know that that college has enormous assets, partly because of the famous Da Costa bequest. The vast number of non-government schools are conducted by churches and those schools would make no claim to being affluent. The article also stated:

Money should be spent on schools where it was most needed, not granted as a blanket provision just as a vote-catcher, Mr. Dunstan said. Australians on high incomes should be taxed more heavily to raise revenue. If the top 16 per cent of the community were taxed like this bracket's counterpart in the United States, hundreds of millions more would be obtained.

I do not know whom the Leader would define as being on a high income, but I assume that it would be somebody earning a professional salary at the level of a Parliamentarian, or in some higher income bracket. One wonders what the parents of children at non-government schools thought when they saw this article.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I wonder whether the Leader is aware that 4.5 per cent of the taxpayers pay about 40 per cent of the total tax paid in Australia.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I would think the Leader probably would be aware of that. I am sure that the Leader, a wealthy man, would be in that group. Most Opposition members would be in the group, too, as would most Government members. I should like the Committee to think what the reaction of parents of children attending non-government schools would have been to the Leader's comments on finance for wealthy private schools. How many parents sending their children to non-government schools would consider themselves wealthy or their schools wealthy? According to the South Australian *Pocket Year Book* for 1969, in 1968 there were 155,331 primary students and 66,688 secondary students in Government schools. On the other hand, in the same year there were 22,814 primary students and 13,599 secondary students in non-government schools. So, about one-fifth

of the students in South Australia are attending non-government schools. The Leader saw fit to insult the parents of these children by saying that they went to wealthy schools and that it was wrong to subsidize the children of the rich.

In connection with the 35,000 students attending non-government schools, about 30,000 parents might be involved. I do not know what they would think of the Leader's attitude. When the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) was younger and more foolish than he is now he had some very strong things to say about spending money on non-government schools. I wonder whether he still has those strong views. Because he has already spoken on the first line we may not hear his present views, but perhaps he will announce them during discussion on the lines. It is apparent that the thinking of the South Australian Labor movement on aid to non-government schools is very different from that of Mr. Whitlam and his Commonwealth colleagues.

Mr. Venning: When things are different they are not the same.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Opposition members think they are being very clever in attacking the parents of children attending non-government schools: they think it will be a vote-catcher. They are not really interested in equality of education and of opportunity. They want to deny those parents and those children a fair share of the Government's allocation to education; they want to deny the parents a reimbursement of money that they have paid in taxation. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will probably speak on this topic and I will be interested to hear his views on aid to non-government schools. I quote now from page 646 of the Senate *Hansard* dated September 10, and again I make a passing reference to Commonwealth *Hansard* as we must consider the State Budget in the overall Commonwealth context because it is our responsibility to invest some of the money paid by the Commonwealth for education in this State. I will quote from what Senator McManus, who is one of the Parliamentary Labor Leaders and one of the more distinguished Labor Parliamentarians in Canberra, had to say when talking about Commonwealth grants to education. He said:

I feel that we can congratulate it (the Commonwealth Government) on the measures which have been taken in the Budget to give what some people call aid but what I think should be called justice to independent schools.

I congratulate the Minister for Education and Science (Mr. Malcolm Fraser), who has stood up to a considerable amount of pressure on this matter and has implemented the proposals which he believes to be just. There is some resemblance between the amounts which have been allocated by the Government and the amounts proposed in the Bill that the Democratic Labor Party put forward, but I do not take any objection to the Government endeavouring to take unto itself at least some of the credit for this very desirable action.

I hope that the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) will not copy his rude colleagues and take no notice of Government members who speak in this debate because he has very different views on spending public money on non-government schools from some of his more left wing colleagues like the member for Glenelg. Senator McManus, one of the famous Labor leaders in Canberra, continued:

I am glad that honourable Senators on both sides of the House are supporting the proposals, although I have an idea that on both sides of the Senate there are some uneasy conscripts on this issue.

He was referring to the fact that some of the members of the Parliamentary Australian Labor Party (I think it calls itself) are very antagonistic to any sort of finance at all to non-government schools. I think that the member for Glenelg belongs to this extreme left wing group, and I hope that he will show his hand a little later in this debate.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Don't you think that the Leader tried to get out from under in the statement that he made?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: There is no doubt that the Leader was trying to get out from under, and I do not know how the Leader of the Parliamentary Labor group in South Australia will reconcile his thinking with that of his counterpart (Mr. Whitlam) in Canberra. It will be interesting to find out how the Australian Labor Party group in South Australia lines itself up with its Commonwealth colleagues, because it will have to do this before the coming Commonwealth election.

Mr. Venning: Perhaps the Senior Vice-President of the Australian Labor Party might know something about it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes. The Federal Vice-President of the Australian Labor Party is Mr. G. T. Virgo. I am indebted to the member for Rocky River for interjecting. He asked what were that person's views on aid to non-government schools. What a pity it is that so few members of the Australian Labor Party are in the Chamber to help this debate, perhaps by means of helpful interjections. I hope the member for Glenelg listens to the

next quotation because he has to justify himself here. He has many people in his district who send their children to non-government schools and they would not like to think that their member opposed aid to non-government schools. Senator McManus continued:

I was pleased to note that a Gallup poll indicates that nearly 65 per cent of the people of Australia think that there should be more aid for independent schools. Even allowing for that, I regret that there are some people who have been endeavouring to deal with this issue as though it were a question of rivalry between the State and independent schools. The attitude of my Party is that there should be adequate Commonwealth assistance for both State and independent schools. I believe that that is the attitude of fair-minded Australians in general.

Senator McManus then made some strong comments, and said:

The Democratic Labor Party does not support the proposal of the Australian Labor Party that a means test should apply to education.

Of course, the Democratic Labor Party is the non-Communist side. At last I have received some interest and attention from members opposite. The quote continues:

This is a strange proposal when one considers that at the same time the Party advocates no means test in regard to social services. My Party does not adopt the attitude that everybody whose son goes to a top independent school is a wealthy person.

I feel sorry for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who is the only soldier opposite who can stand fire from the Government benches.

Mr. Corcoran: I feel sorry for myself, because I have to sit and listen.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Why does the Deputy Leader not leave the Chamber to Government members? It will be recorded in *Hansard* that only one Labor member is attending this debate now. I do not know what other Labor members are doing. Perhaps Mr. Andrew Jones was correct when he indicated what members in Canberra were doing.

Mr. Corcoran: Why not expand on it: it would be in keeping with the rest of your speech if you did?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I shall not expand on it. Perhaps there is a Caucus meeting at present.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ferguson): Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the Budget.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Australian Labor Party advocates a means test for finance for education for non-government schools, but it does not advocate a means test for social

services. This is a contradiction that I cannot understand, cannot follow, and cannot interpret in the policies of the A.L.P. It was not my plan to make a lengthy speech, and perhaps it is a good thing that Opposition members are not present because they are such ebullient members. They breach Standing Orders by interjecting frequently, and that tends to make a well documented and carefully prepared speech longer than it otherwise would be. We have heard rantings from Opposition members about the contribution by this Government to education, and they have attempted to make unhappy comparisons with the share we have contributed compared with the proportion of revenue contributed by Governments in other States. I should like to quote from the *Commonwealth Year Book* figures that completely refute some of the remarks made by members opposite. I am quoting from page 764 of the book, in which are listed broad figures relating to education expenditure in each of the Australian States. To make it easier for members opposite when they read my remarks in the *Hansard* pull tomorrow, I will quote the figures in terms of dollars per capita rather than in terms of gross expenditure.

In order to get a clear comparison, I will quote two years which will serve the purpose, for they are reasonably well spaced and indicate how South Australia's expenditure on education compares with that in other States. Taking, first, 1962-63, we find that in South Australia \$187.7 per capita was spent on education. Members will recall that this was during the palmy days of the Playford Administration, and our per capita contribution to education was second in the Commonwealth. The only State that contributed more was Western Australia (\$204.12), and Western Australia had a smaller and more scattered population. In that year, the lowest contribution was that of Victoria (\$137.51).

The latest figure recorded in the *Commonwealth Year Book* relates to 1966-67, which members will recall was one of the years when we languished under a Labor Administration and in which South Australia dropped to third place in its per capita expenditure. Having been in second place in 1962, South Australia dropped to third place in 1966, in which year the State invested \$227.10 per capita on education. The State which contributed the most in that year was Western Australia (\$264.66), and Tasmania was second (\$252.50). It is wrong, therefore, to say that the Liberal and Country League Administration is less mindful of the needs of education than are Australian

Labor Party Administrations. I regret that I do not have the latest figures in order to compare the trend in South Australia with that in other States.

I should like to make only a brief reference to one or two personalities that seem to have obtruded themselves into the consideration of the Budget. I refer to the active campaign being organized by the South Australian Institute of Teachers to promote a public awareness of the needs of education. I commend the members of the institute for their interest in education and for the enthusiasm they are showing for the cause. I believe the teachers deserve nothing but the highest commendation. From my teacher friends, including teachers in my own district, I know that their thoughts are for the children.

Mr. Venning: They are dedicated.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, and they would like to see the children attending our schools given the best deal possible. We all know that the Minister of Education is doing a magnificent job, but she has only a limited budget with which to work. As I said earlier, if we curtailed some of our spending on the South Australian Railways, we could allocate more for education, and I believe that is a valid point. The regret I have about the campaign of the South Australian Institute of Teachers has been that one young man, who is known throughout the length and breadth of the State as a strong Labor Party activist, has somehow or other got himself into a position where he is acting as public relations officer for the institute's campaign.

Mr. Venning: That is unfortunate.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, and I understand that the man himself asked for the job. As he is a prospective Parliamentary candidate (he has been a candidate in the past), he knows he can get some political advantage out of being a public relations officer for the institute. I regret that the institute's campaign has been largely nullified by the appointment of Mr. Harris as public relations officer. If Mr. Harris had any real concern for the institute's campaign he would resign from the office of public relations officer for the institute. I very much regret that this man has become involved in the promotion campaign. I believe that all the loyal teachers in South Australia who desire their cause to be promoted and who have contributed a vast sum towards the campaign are largely having their efforts nullified by the political activism Mr. Harris has injected into the campaign. From the attitude of members

opposite to Mr. Harris and the institute, we have seen that they are no doubt supporting Mr. Harris for Party-political gain. I hope that any teachers who hear my remarks or read my comments will take some action to have Mr. Harris removed from the position of authority and trust that he now occupies.

I find I have made several remarks about various aspects of the State Budget. I have criticized the Government for not adopting a more vigorous pruning approach towards the South Australian Railways. I have commended the Minister of Education for running her department efficiently and well. I have expressed great regret that members of the Labor Party do not spend more time in the Chamber of the Legislature, as the taxpayers pay them to be here. I have complimented the South Australian Institute of Teachers on its interest in the promotion of education and I have deplored the employment of Mr. Harris as a public relations officer. I hope the institute will take immediate action to have Mr. Harris's appointment changed. Perhaps I should hope that Mr. Harris would have the decency to resign his job and take away the Party-political flavour from the institute's campaign.

Mr. Corcoran: Why don't you call on the teachers to sack him?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is not the role of the teachers to sack Mr. Harris: he is employed by the institute at the executive level. I wish to say how much I have appreciated the statesmanlike attitude of the President of the institute (Mr. White) through this long campaign. He has been to see my fellow Parliamentary Under Secretary (Mr. Rodda) and me two or three times and he has adopted a proper, objective and statesmanlike attitude. I would like the fine work Mr. White has done for the teachers and the institute to be noted in the record. If all the members and officers of the institute conducted themselves in as proper a fashion as Mr. White has conducted himself, I suggest that the teachers would do rather better than otherwise would be the case.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you think he had anything to do with the employment of Mr. Harris?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: As the Deputy Leader knows, it would be a breach of privilege if I discussed private conversations that I have had with Mr. White. However, the Deputy Leader must know that Mr. Harris is an officer of the institute and he must also know how officers are appointed. Perhaps during the debate on the lines more members of the

A.L.P. will be in the Chamber and perhaps my golden words will have more effect then. I support the first line and again commend the Treasurer for the magnificent Budget he has presented. I repeat that I am pleased that we have a good, practical man who has made a success of his own private finances, running the State.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): In no place that I have been since the Budget was introduced has anyone enthused about it. Although the present Government had to tax the people when it first came into office, members of the Government Party had said before the election that they would not tax as much as they subsequently did. On the other hand, the Labor Party told the people that it would have to impose taxes. The position cannot be corrected until the opportunity arises, and at that time we shall be on the Treasury benches.

Mr. Virgo: There's no doubt about that.

Mr. LANGLEY: No, that is learned by going around the districts. On October 25 the people will vote in a way different from that in which they voted at the last State election, and the October 25 election will be conducted more fairly because, if the Labor Party receives more than 50 per cent of the votes, it will win seats accordingly. Recently there has been much talk about education, and this subject has been raised not by one person but by the teachers in our schools. The Labor Government and its Minister of Education (Hon. R. R. Loveday) brought education out of the doldrums and upgraded it. However, since then the teachers have become worried and I think every member has received letters from teachers at schools in his district. I have only a few schools in my district, but all except one have told me in various ways about what is needed in education. We do not spend enough on educating young people.

At the recent Federal Conference of the Australian Labor Party many matters that would improve education and help its development were discussed. That development in education has been lacking over the years, especially on the part of the Commonwealth Government, which has not made sufficient money available to the States. That position will be changed by the Commonwealth Government soon. All schools, whether denominational or Government-conducted, should be treated equally, but this has not been happening recently. One section has been belittled in its moves for better education.

There has been a lack of assistance by the Commonwealth Government for our Government schools. I am sure that everyone agrees with this objective of my Party:

Education should promote love of freedom and justice and should develop critical perception, ability to choose intelligently, capacity for self-government, and a sense of social responsibility. It should instil belief in the equal rights of all people and respect for their essential humanity, irrespective of nationality, colour or creed. It should ensure free and harmonious development of intellect, physique, emotions, and abilities. It is the obligation of the State to provide a universal, free, compulsory, secular system of education open to all citizens.

Most members over 45 years of age will remember the "good old days" during the depression when we did not have sufficient opportunities to become educated because people did not have the money. Children left school at the age of 14 to go to work. Since those times we have advanced, but Australia has not developed sufficiently in education to enable its people to keep up with the rest of the world. This is most noticeable from the letters we have received from the teachers institute.

Mr. Lawn: We have made our greatest progress since the advent of the Curtin Labor Government.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, and the Australian Labor Party has a policy that ensures that something will be done for the benefit of our children. Everyone should be given free education.

Mr. Virgo: From kindergarten to university!

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. Some parents go without things to give their children a sound education, but I am sure that many children do not have the opportunity to get a proper education. One often hears Government members who have been here a long while and who use the Labor Party's ideas say, "We did things of benefit to the public in general when we were in office." I hope that the Government will supply free textbooks to students in schools other than primary schools. The Attorney-General has several times referred to the cleaning of school windows. This Government, although it has not removed the embargo on cleaning windows, is finding it difficult to keep up with the requirements of educating our children today. The former Labor Government ensured that there was equal pay for women teachers, and we have always considered that there should be equal pay for equal work. This condition of employment may attract more teachers to the profession.

At last year's election many people showed that they wanted the Labor Party policy on this matter continued. I now turn to a road traffic matter concerning Duthy Street in my district.

Mr. Hughes: Why don't you tell Government members more of what the Labor Party did?

Mr. LANGLEY: I will do that later but Duthy Street is an urgent topic to people in my district, because they are confused about what is happening.

Mr. Edwards: It's a pity you don't return to education and read more from that book.

Mr. LANGLEY: Perhaps I should give it to the honourable member, because he would find it useful. I have two sons in the Education Department and I know that they and their friends are not happy about the education situation at present. However, I want to speak about the safety factors in relation to Duthy Street, so that people in my district will know that I am trying to have something done about this matter. Many accidents have occurred on this thoroughfare, but nothing has been done by the council. The Road Traffic Board had prepared a report for the council, but before this report was presented 1,304 signatures had been obtained on a petition to go to the council and the board. The contents of the report prepared by the board for the council were not known to the public, and many local residents were alarmed during the course of preparing a petition to see articles appearing in newspapers and containing different theories about the safety of this street. One suggestion was to introduce star signs at certain corners. Duthy Street is a busy thoroughfare, used by many people travelling to Mitcham and the hills and by others who live in this district.

Instead of travelling along Unley Road many people use Duthy Street, because it has a wonderful surface. However, it has become something of a speedway, especially during the hours when people are going to and from work. Many accidents have occurred, and something must be done: the situation came to a head when a woman and her child were walking along the street, were hit by a motor car, and the child was killed. Something had to be done and, in fact, was done to ensure that this would not happen again. We were able at that stage to forward the petition to the gentleman concerned but, lo and behold, at the same time we saw a statement in the

press by the local mayor of the district to the effect that star-shape signs would be installed at a cost of \$5,000.

The people in the area would have been pleased to have only "stop" or "give way" signs erected, for this would have ensured additional safety not only for pedestrians but also for motorists. The document concerning this matter was a secret one, its contents being known only to members of the council, and at the next council meeting I was placed in an invidious position. At that meeting a councillor, with the support of another councillor, asked who put the relevant information in the press, the mayor smartly replying that he did not know anything about it and that it was the member for the district who made the statement to the press.

Mr. Virgo: You soon put that right!

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, and I am putting it right again now so that the people of Unley will know what happened.

Mr. Jennings: The mayor was your opponent at the last State election?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. Several members of the council are a little L.C.L.-minded. They even invited to a council meeting the person who thinks he will be the new member for Hawker, but they forgot to ask the other candidate for that district to the meeting.

Mr. Hurst: Are they using these meetings for political purposes?

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not think so, although some of the council members are a little political-minded. Questions were asked during the course of the meeting to which I have referred, and finally the mayor of the district (my former L.C.L. opponent) admitted that he had written the article and given the information to the paper concerning this matter.

Mr. Hughes: Yet he blamed you in the first place?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. I do not wish to read out all that happened at the council meeting, because I do not want to go that far; but I assure the people of Unley and those who use the road with which I am concerned that I am supporting their case in this Parliament and seeking to ensure that adequate safety measures are implemented. The road is an arterial road and is used by many people in peak hours. Indeed, I gather it will not be long before Unley Road, which is nearby, will become a clearway similarly to what has happened in the case of Anzac Highway, although the latter thoroughfare is totally different because it has few shops along it to

be considered. I am sure that any move to make Unley Road a clearway will receive opposition from shopkeepers in the district. Unfortunately I believe that one councillor has said that he does not care what happens to the people on this road.

One reason he said that was that he has a business on Unley Road. I am making these comments to try to ensure that people can proceed safely along this road. I do not know whether the Attorney-General will agree with what I have said about the mayor, but I can say that the mayor is concerned about the position. People outside this area have sent many letters to me supporting the stand we are taking in this matter. Some of these people have been the victims of accidents in this street. They have not known it is a main road that is used extensively in peak periods, and they want to be able to travel along it more safely than is at present possible.

I now wish to refer to some letters dealing with education matters. The Minister of Education will realize that she has answered some of the points raised in the letters, and they have been good answers. At schools in my district children whose parents are naturalized Australians are a little bit more awkward to teach than English-speaking children. I have received one letter from the Goodwood Primary School, and I hope this will give an idea to the member for Eyre of the kind of problem we have. Even if we were in Government we would have to bring these matters forward. We could not deny that there was a crisis in education, because most of the comments made in these letters are fair and reasonable. This letter states:

As representative of our South Australian Institute of Teachers, I am writing to inform you of the very grave deficiencies of education in this State at present and in particular of our local problems at Goodwood school. We teachers, as educationists, realize our enormous responsibility to ensure that tomorrow's leaders are equipped to cope with the ever changing environment and constant advances elsewhere and abroad, and we realize that the future of this State and of our nation depends on how well we fulfil our duty to our children. We therefore call upon the Government, as the educational agency of the community, to accept its responsibility and provide the means of quality education to our children. Our particular problems and deficiencies which are seriously affecting the children in our area at Goodwood Primary School, can be summed up as follows—

I do not think these are much different from the problems experienced in other schools—

1. Classes too large, thus impeding progress of children through teachers' inability to cope

with individual differences and deficiencies which are considerable in this area.

Many Italian and Greek children live in this area.

Mr. Hughes: The teachers are concerned to see that the children receive the best possible education to fit them for the future.

Mr. LANGLEY: I agree that they need more help. The young ones do not take long to learn but, with large classes, they cannot be given the individual attention they require. The Minister has given a reply on this matter. However, that does not help first-year children at the schools. The second matter mentioned is the lack of ancillary staff, and since that letter was written the Government has decided to take action on this matter. I only hope that each school will have sufficient staff to ensure that headmasters will be able to get to know those at the school and spend more time with them rather than doing the clerical work now required, particularly the large amount of such work required in the big schools. The letter suggests that the minding of children under six years and children who come to school too early because both parents work should not be expected of teachers. I do not think we can do much about that, but it is mentioned. Paragraph 3 of the letter states:

Migrant incidence—In this school, the number of children born in Europe plus the number who have one and/or two parents born in Europe, is just over 60 per cent. The majority of the parents speak little or no English and this lack of communication in English in the homes, is reflected in the difficulties many of these children experience in school work. A separate remedial class for migrant children until Grade 3 English is attained is therefore urgently needed.

I wholeheartedly support that, because the present position is most noticeable. When I have attended the opening of schools at the commencement of the school year I have noticed the unfortunate lack of English of those people. Paragraph 4 of the letter states:

Facilities outmoded—thus atmosphere not conducive to learning, resulting in lack of aspiration of pupils.

- (a) old rooms, poorly lit, high windows, old lights.
- (b) lack of educational aids due to poor area.
- (c) inadequate recreational space—only approximately four-fifths of an acre of asphalt is available for playing space for 550 children—no space for needed play equipment, *e.g.*, Mitcham Girls Technical High School, was built on site of old Unley High School, away from the noise of Unley Road.

We, the teachers of Goodwood Primary School, recommend these matters for your immediate consideration, and, we hope, implementation.

Since that letter was written, I have asked several questions about the matters raised, and I know that the Ministers concerned will look further into these matters. We drop back from excellent schools like the Mitcham Girls Technical High School and the Unley High School to an old school like the Goodwood Boys Technical High School, which has inadequate provision for sport. It is difficult for any Government to provide sufficient land for ovals and accommodation for physical education. I do not begrudge the provision of good facilities at new schools, because providing those facilities is a far-sighted step. However, improvements such as have been suggested in this letter could be made.

Mr. Hughes: What asphalt cover is there for more than 500 children there?

Mr. LANGLEY: They have four-fifths of an acre. The Minister of Education has promised to inquire about the purchase of additional land for the Goodwood and Park-side schools. The availability of adequate space for these schools, which maintain student enrolment, is important.

Mr. Hughes: What about the separate remedial class?

Mr. LANGLEY: Difficulty arises when migrant children of 10 years or 11 years come to a school and then move on into the higher classes. During the debate on the lines more matters will be brought forward but I have mentioned some items in the hope that the Government will consider more fully the educational opportunities for people in schools in the inner areas. I am sure that the Minister of Works and the member for Hindmarsh have old schools in their area that are lacking in playing space. I hope that consideration will be given to purchasing land, when available, to enable children at these schools to play safely and to enjoy some of the amenities that are provided in the new schools. I support the first line.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I have a number of things to say on the lines but I am awaiting further information on them. I am reminded that we are discussing the Budget, although very few members have referred to the Budget, and those who have referred to it have reminded us that it is scarcely a Budget: it is merely a book-keeping kind of Budget. One of the rather peculiar things arising from the Budget and the financial affairs that have taken place lately is a remark that has been

credited to the Commonwealth Government. We are not altogether unaware that a Commonwealth election is soon to take place and that this may have some flavouring in it. I am not a suspicious man, but I think it may have some flavouring on things that the Commonwealth Government is saying at present. Recently, the Commonwealth Government was responsible for saying that Australia was at the point of moving into overfull employment. Well, I have never been able to understand what constitutes over-employment, and if any honourable member can tell me about this I should be glad to hear it. A report in the *Advertiser* of September 16 states:

At the same time a report from the Bank of New South Wales and the Associated Chamber of Manufactures paints a buoyant picture of the Australian economy and forecasts brisk business in the coming six months.

This, once again, is the kind of report we would expect from the Bank of New South Wales at this time of the year. The report continues:

A serious labor shortage, with vacancies exceeding unemployed, already exists in three States—Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia.

Coincidentally, on the same day a report in the *Advertiser*, emanating from Naracoorte, states:

"The South Australian Government was looking down a gun barrel in its financial outlook this year," the Premier, Mr. Hall, said at an L.C.L. sponsored public meeting here tonight.

One of the Under Secretaries, Mr. Rodda, said during this debate that it was a public meeting and not an L.C.L. sponsored meeting.

Mr. Clark: He told me that by way of interjection.

Mr. JENNINGS: If anyone could get into an L.C.L. sponsored meeting without a ticket he would be a courageous man. Anyway, who would want to go, particularly to hear the Premier? This report was issued the same night as the Commonwealth Government stated that Australia was moving into over-full employment. I thought that South Australia was part of Australia, and I always hoped that it was, but sometimes I wonder. It was suggested before the last election that if South Australia elected a Liberal Government we would be part of the family but, although under our present system of democracy 42 per cent who voted for the L.C.L. was sufficient to get an L.C.L. Government, we find that being associated with the family is not a great advantage. It is not a happy family, and I think the young son has been kicked out

pretty quickly by father. On September 17 Mr. Coumbe, the Minister of Labour and Industry, is reported to have said, in a reply to a Dorothy Dixer from Mr. Evans, the member for Onkaparinga, that the South Australian economy had made a remarkable recovery. Then, a day later we find out belatedly that when the Premier had been at Naracoorte he had been talking about electoral reform, as he preferred to call it. This, as we know, means the electoral redistribution that is likely to hit us within a few days. I do not think anyone would call it electoral reform; the terms of reference were such that it could not be called that. At its best it is electoral redistribution. As though he had seen the report (I do not believe that he has, but he spoke as though he had seen it), the Premier said, "Well, if the Opposition does not accept it, it is just going to be too bad." He was using the big stick over us, but I think it was just a matter of the Premier's speaking at an L.C.L. meeting and being reported, rather than of his having seen the report of the Electoral Commission which, of course, at this stage is supposed to be confidential. As I said, I should prefer to think that it was confidential.

The Premier also spoke about extra water being made available for irrigation from country pipelines and about metropolitan needs, and he said that extra water was conditional on South Australia's support for the building of the dam at Dartmouth on the Mitta Mitta River in Victoria, and many things of this nature. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I will not speak at any great length in this debate because, as I said earlier, some of the most important things I have to say are contained in the lines, and I will want a little more information about the relevant items before I speak on them. Of course, I will have a few more days yet to get that information. However, one thing that has been shown right throughout this debate is the attitude of Government members to education. They well know that their own Government over a period of three decades neglected education in this State. I do not think the present situation comes about by any neglect other than deliberate neglect. I believe that L.C.L. members do not believe in education—

Mr. Venning: Rubbish!

Mr. JENNINGS: —that they do not support education—

Mr. Venning: Rubbish!

Mr. JENNINGS: —and that they are afraid of education. Members opposite can interject

if they wish; they are entitled to their opinion, and I will not argue with them at this time of night. However, it is rather astonishing that these gentlemen are those who say, "We want education for a certain class, for the people whom we represent, but not for the ordinary people in the community or the majority of the people in the community."

Mr. Edwards: Don't be so ridiculous.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am not being ridiculous. Apart altogether from that, if the honourable gentlemen opposite do not support what I am saying, I point out that their attitude over the last 30 years certainly does. Over that whole period (except for the three years of the Labor Government) there have been people in control of the Treasury benches who have retarded education in South Australia. We had a man who was Premier for 32 years who said, "I left school at an early age and I got on all right; it didn't affect me."

Mr. Broomhill: Are you sure of that?

Mr. JENNINGS: I heard him say it many times. It was also said on innumerable occasions by the man who was then the chief Minister in the Upper House. This goes to show that these gentlemen do not believe in education. They are afraid of it, because so many members on this side of the Chamber, having become educated, sometimes through their own hard efforts, have, as a consequence, become supporters of the Labor Party, believing that the benefits they have gained should be shared amongst other people. As a consequence, education has now become a political issue. However, the position is completely the opposite of what many people are told outside about its being people on this side of the House who are not educated and people on the other side who are. The position is the opposite of that, as honourable members should well know. I usually bother to go through some of the remarks made by honourable members opposite, and I have done so on this occasion, but it is too late now to start debating those matters.

Mr. Broomhill: They didn't say much, anyway.

Mr. JENNINGS: If one starts at the beginning, one finds they have not said anything. I was interested this evening to hear the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) draw attention to the fact that water rates have recently been increased, and this is in addition to the 20 per cent increase in taxation that the present Government has imposed on the people of the State in the limited time it has occupied the Treasury benches. It has done

this despite the fact that it obtained its votes by promising that it would reduce taxation and other charges, build Chowilla and do all sorts of good things in the State. We know that the Education Department's programme is being attacked at present, not on the grounds of its intrinsic merit at all but on the grounds that Mr. Bob Harris, who is directing it, is an employee of the South Australian Institute of Teachers and was formerly a Labor candidate. I sincerely hope he will be a Labor candidate at the next State election.

Mr. Venning: I wouldn't think so.

Mr. JENNINGS: I sincerely hope he is and I also hope that, if he is a Labor candidate at the next State election, shortly after that he will take his place in this Chamber, but on the other side of the Chairman, as a member of the Labor Government.

Mr. Broomhill: You'll be right on both counts.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think so. It is most remarkable that responsibility for this attack on the Education Department has been attributed to Mr. Harris. I know that gentleman very well. He is a quiet inoffensive and capable young man. Obviously, he did not appoint himself to the job: he was elected by members of the institute.

Mr. Virgo: They had the intelligence to make a good selection.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. Mr. Harris is not a rabid radical or anything like that. He is doing a good job that needed to be done. To think that the Institute of Teachers could be hoodwinked by one man in such a short time is absolutely ridiculous, and the suggestion reflects on the intelligence of the teachers of South Australia. Surely no member on the Government side would want to gratuitously insult teachers in that way, but members have done it. As I have said, they are frightened of education and do not like it.

Mr. Broomhill: You'd think the Minister of Education would take them to task.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, but I am afraid she is not very capable of doing that sort of thing. That is about all I want to say this evening. I repeat that I will have much more to say on the lines when I get information about some important matters that I want to discuss then. I support the first line.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I welcome the opportunity to say a few well-chosen words about the Budget, and I should like to congratulate the Treasurer on preparing it. As one peruses the various lines, one sees that the Government is trying to make additional

finance available for the various Government activities.

Mr. Virgo: Have you read the Budget explanation?

Mr. VENNING: Yes. Several good speeches have been made on the Budget by members on this side. For example, the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) made such an enlightening speech. Although several Government members may not have necessarily agreed with all that honourable member said nevertheless he gave Opposition members something to think about. The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo), who spoke after the honourable member, did everything that he could to slander him, and the member for Edwardstown is the Senior Vice-President of the Labor Party in Australia! What future has that Party in this Commonwealth, when that man is expected to lead the Party soon? I suggest to that honourable member that he have a good look at himself and see that he is capable, when the time comes, of occupying this important position in his Party. I shall talk about education, because various insinuations have been made on various aspects of it.

Mr. Broomhill: What about the Jamestown meeting?

Mr. VENNING: A meeting was convened at Jamestown for the evening of Monday, August 18, and I was suspicious because certain Opposition members knew about it long before it was planned, which to me indicated politics. I shall read the speech I made in the Chamber concerning the meeting at Jamestown.

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Acting Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): I was about to say that the member for Rocky River cannot refer to a speech he has made here during the current session, otherwise he will be ruled out of order.

Mr. VENNING: I take it that I shall be permitted to refer to it without reading it. I defend myself in this regard because the Opposition has had much to say about the meeting at Jamestown. Had the *Advertiser* printed my entire speech I am sure the comments that have been made would not have been made. I make it clear to the House that what I said about the meeting was true. The member for Frome's statement that teachers' salaries were not mentioned at the meeting is untrue, and I could tell him the name of the teacher who mentioned them there. If the memory of the member for Frome is any good,

he will recall that, when moving a vote of thanks, I said that I was pleased that a teacher at the meeting had said she was not complaining about salaries. I have talked with teachers throughout the State and their remarks support that teacher's statement. But teachers have other problems, and every effort should be made to provide schools with ancillary staff, thereby allowing teachers to devote more time to teaching.

Subsequent to the meeting I was pleased to hear from the Minister of Works that his department was becoming more effective in providing amenities for teachers in their departmental houses and in schools without having to go through the red tape that was necessary previously. I am sure that in future, because of these alterations, the subject of many teachers' complaints will be rectified.

For some time I have been concerned about the Railways Department. I have always been a great advocate of this department, and I am sorry to find it in its present plight. On asking a question about whether excursion fares had been offered to country people to travel to the Royal Show, I was told that even if travel on our railways was free people would not use them. This point was emphasized by the member for Light earlier this evening when he said that members of Parliament who are entitled to free travel on buses and trains prefer to use their own means of conveyance. On August 8 members visited the railway workshops, and it was interesting to all members to see the activities of the department. I was disappointed with the Leader of the Opposition, who joined the party but disappeared when the cameraman disappeared. This indicated to us that the Leader was not concerned with the Railways Department, but that he could get some publicity by being present.

Members interjecting:

Mr. VENNING: When the cameraman disappeared he also disappeared. However, that is a side issue. We visited the workshops, and it was an inspiration to see the work that was being done. I am sorry that the Railways Department is in its present unhappy economic plight.

Mr. Virgo: It is being dragged down by your Minister.

Mr. VENNING: I remind Opposition members that when the Labor Government was in office it increased considerably rail charges on grain, to the detriment of the Railways Department. The history of country grain freights goes back to the days of Sir Thomas Playford,

who gave relief in respect of long hauls in the country. A report in the *Advertiser* of August 19, 1966, under the heading "Higher S.A. Charges for Railing Grain", states:

Higher charges ranging up to 33½ per cent above present rates were authorized yesterday for the transport of grain by rail in South Australia. Executive Council approved the railway regulation to increase the charges. The sliding scale charge was increased as follows: Up to 70 miles, up to 6 per cent; 71 to 100 miles, up to 18 per cent; 101 to 150 miles, up to 30 per cent; 151 to 170 miles, up to 33 per cent; and 171 miles and beyond, up to 33½ per cent.

Mr. Allen: The farmers have not forgiven them.

Mr. VENNING: Of course not. The report continues:

Based on the 1964-65 harvest, the Government would receive an additional \$630,000 under the new rates.

Concerning rail freight increases, for Quorn (in the District of Frome) the rail freight was 11.784c a bushel, but was increased to 15.123c, an increase of 3.239c a bushel, which is almost 10c a bag. This has altered the grain delivery situation throughout the State. South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling built silos for growers throughout the State when these old freights were charged. However, we find that, because of these increased freights on long hauls, road transport has been able to take the grain from the grower's paddock and deliver it straight to the terminal, thus robbing the railways of work that it could undertake during the year. This has considerably affected the programme of our bulk handling system in South Australia.

Mr. Virgo: What efforts have you made to get your Minister to reduce the freights?

Mr. VENNING: For the benefit of the member for Edwardstown, I point out that the correct procedure would have been to increase the rail freights on a percentage basis throughout the State, and there would then not be any complaint from the growers.

Mr. Virgo: Why haven't the freights been reduced?

Mr. VENNING: Just now, when a member opposite was asked what he would do about the receipt tax if his Party were in office, the member for Millicent said, "You can't turn the clock back on these things," and that is the situation regarding rail freights. One cannot be chopping and changing all the time. The increase in rail freights has allowed road transport to participate and to undermine the railways, and this is where some of our problems have arisen in connection with the

railways. I am sorry that this situation has developed, because I know what would happen if we did away with our railways altogether. We would soon see what happened to road transport charges where there was no competition.

Mr. Clark: That's true.

Mr. VENNING: Yes. This matter concerns me, because we see so many examples of this in certain parts of the State where there is no railway to keep freights down.

Mr. Hughes: What are your comments on grain shifted from railway sidings by road transport, and yet there is still rail freight to be paid?

Mr. VENNING: That is all right. The grain is stored on railway property, and if it is helping the railways of the State I do not mind, really. As I said, I support the railways, and it will be a sad day for this State if they go out of existence.

Mr. Hughes: That doesn't answer my question about having to pay two freights.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): Order!

Mr. VENNING: The grower does not pay an increase in freight. The charge for road transport from the silo may be less than that for rail transport, but we have to pay a charge to the Railways Department, because we have used its property; the silo has been built on its property, and this charge has always been in existence.

Mr. Hughes: I am referring not to silos but to where grain is stacked at railway sidings; the bags have been slit and it has been road freighted—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. VENNING: It is all the same.

Mr. Hughes: No, it is not.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order. The honourable member for Rocky River!

Mr. VENNING: If the member for Wallaroo, under drought conditions, were to go into Bute and take out a load of grain in his truck to feed some sheep, he would still pay to the Railways Department a charge on that grain when, in fact, there had been no railway activity in moving that grain.

Mr. Hughes: You know very well that the Premier gave the figures in this Chamber only a short time ago showing that it had to be where grain was taken out of railway sidings (it had been stacked at railway sidings); road freight was paid on it, and the Railways Department received freight as well.

Mr. VENNING: I am not denying that. I am saying that is the position.

Mr. Hughes: Do you agree with it?

Mr. VENNING: That is all right.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Rocky River to address the Chair.

Mr. VENNING: My apologies, Mr. Chairman, thank you. The grower has had freight deducted from his return, and he does not pay any more whether the grain goes by rail or road transport. The money is chopped up and the Railways Department gets about 15c a ton, which is not much.

Mr. Hughes: You're a long way out.

Mr. VENNING: It is not much and the road transport people get the balance.

Mr. Hughes: You're a long way out.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. VENNING: I am pleased to see in the Budget a sum of \$600,000 provided to attend to the maintenance of the permanent way. With sums provided from other sources, this will contribute much towards putting our permanent way in a much better state than at present. I was very sorry for the member for Port Pirie in his effort to draw attention to the rail service in his area, although he may have gone a bit too far in saying to his constituents, "I advise you not to travel on the rail; it is unsafe". However, I think he was trying to put the situation clearly that something had to be done to keep the railway permanent way up to standard, and it was unfortunate that he was taken to task in the way he was in his endeavours to improve the situation. I want to read the following article headed "Rail Transport Officers Reply to Mr. McKee" about this:

The South Australian division of the Australasian Transport Officers Federation says that it has taken a "very grave view" of recent statements made by the member for Port Pirie, Mr. D. H. McKee, concerning the safety of the Adelaide to Port Pirie railway line. In a letter to *The Recorder*, three councillors of the federation said that they felt sure Mr. McKee's warning would be ignored by all people in Port Pirie possessing normal intelligence. "Statistics reveal that rail transport is still the safest means of transport within Australia," they said.

However, the honourable member made his point, and I say once again that I am pleased that, following the report in connection with our railways and some of the misfortunes that have taken place through derailments, something will be done to put the permanent way in a better state. Much has been said in this place about standardization of the rail gauge.

I refer to the further programme for the standardization of the Port Pirie to Adelaide section of the line.

Mr. McKee: If you had your way you'd close down the railways.

Mr. VENNING: No. The honourable member has not been listening to me. I am an advocate of the railways.

Mr. McKee: Your policy is to sack the railwaymen.

Mr. VENNING: No, we are individualists on this side and are permitted to speak in the way we wish. In connection with standardization, I was interested to read an article in the *Advertiser* of October 13, 1966. I refer to this because only this week members opposite condemned the Premier, saying that the Government was not pushing along with the standardization of the Port Pirie to Adelaide line. This article is headed "Move on Rail Gauge Beaten" and states:

A motion by the Leader of the Opposition—and that was then the present Premier—urging the Government to open negotiations immediately with the Commonwealth Government on the construction of a standard gauge line between Port Pirie and Adelaide was defeated in the Assembly yesterday. The voting was on Party lines.

Members opposite are guilty of hypocrisy. In 1966, when my Party endeavoured to push the Labor Government along in connection with standardization, it was defeated on Party lines, and yet members opposite are now abusing us for not taking action. The Government has set up a committee to provide for standardization, and it will only be a matter of time before it is provided.

Mr. McKee: You just had another derailment, over on the West Coast.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Port Pirie will be rail-roaded if he is not careful, and the honourable member for Rocky River should address the Chair.

Mr. VENNING: I am pleased that the Minister of Works (Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe) has seen fit to provide under the item, "Miscellaneous, port site investigations," an amount of \$23,175. I ask the member for Wallaroo to listen to this, because it is in his interests and I am fighting hard for the port of Wallaroo. I understand that money will be made available towards the seismic surveys at Wallaroo and Port Lincoln, and we hope that Cabinet, by spending some of the money provided, will be able to decide what the Government will do about a deep sea port centrally situated in this part of the State. I

hope the seismic survey favours Wallaroo. I hope that a decision will be made soon so that South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited will know the future planning regarding silo construction in this State. I support the Budget wholeheartedly, and support the first line.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I, like other members on this side, have not found the Budget very inspiring. However, like my Leader, I am charitable enough to say that, under the present Australian financial arrangements, it is understandable that a State Budget does not make the headlines that a Commonwealth Budget makes. The Treasurer states in his explanation that in 1969-70 the previous year's revenue measures will continue to have their effect and the Government takes the view that it would be unwarranted to make, at this juncture, any further major increases in taxes. Of course, I am pleased to know that, because many taxes were imposed last year. I think the main reason why major increases are not being made this year is, as the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) has reminded me, that a Commonwealth election will be held on October 25. I think we will find that, if the present State Government is in office this time next year, additional taxes will be imposed.

Mr. Corcoran: There will be a horror Budget about February.

Mrs. BYRNE: We all know that a supplementary Commonwealth Budget is mooted, but only time will tell whether a supplementary State Budget will be introduced. During the debate there has been much emphasis on education and Mr. Harris, an officer of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, has come under attack constantly because he is a member of the Australian Labor Party. It has been suggested that, because of his influence in the institute, the present campaign regarding a crisis in education is being conducted.

Mr. Corcoran: That's a reflection on the institute.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes, and on other officers of the institute. I suggest that if Government members had attended a National Education Conference held at Wayville on June 28 (as I did) that was attended by teachers from all over Australia they would not have spoken as they have done, because during the late afternoon session of the conference a motion was moved, but not carried, that consideration be given to sponsoring candidates for Parliament. I assure the Government that Mr.

Harris did not move the motion, which was not overwhelmingly defeated.

I am sorry that the Minister of Education is out of the Chamber, as I wish to raise the matter of private business colleges. Last June, I received correspondence from a constituent of mine who expressed dissatisfaction with the standards at one of these colleges. On July 8, I wrote to the Minister of Education asking that an investigation be made into this matter. On July 18 the Minister replied to me that this college had been thoroughly inspected at its last licensing examination in March, 1967. The report was very favourable and there was no hesitation on the part of the departmental inspector in recommending that the licence be granted. The letter stated that, while inspections were made only for licensing examinations and when there were changes in fees structure, the general oversight of such establishments occurs as a result of information such as had been received from me. I would like the Minister to examine and reconsider this matter as I do not think that an inspection at the time of the licensing examination is sufficient or when changes in fees structure are made or when complaints regarding the college have been made.

Mr. Virgo: It's two years since the inspection took place.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes. I think it is in the interests of education generally that these private business colleges, most of which set a high standard, should be inspected once a year. Complaints such as this would not occur then. As these business colleges are licensed by the Education Department people are given confidence to enrol at them. Perhaps only one college in the State is concerned with these complaints but, should a complaint be received about such a college, an inquiry should be held. Later the Minister informed me that a special inspection was made to ensure that the college's high standards were being maintained, and an experienced inspector reported favourably on it. Nevertheless, although matters such as enrolments, teaching staff, teaching loads, attendance rolls, students' reports, standards, employers, accommodation, equipment, and student interviews were considered, these establishments should be examined each year and not only on the occasions to which I have referred.

The question of superseded or modified textbooks has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Education by questions, but it would be worth while my reading portion of a letter I received. We are all aware that many

letters have been written to newspapers on this and other matters, and it is obvious that the present education system is causing general dissatisfaction throughout the State. The letter states:

I must be only one of thousands of parents, who complain at the deplorable waste of money on superseded or modified textbooks each year. Out of my son's 1968 textbooks for first-year high school only four books were resaleable, the rest according to the school curriculum for first-year high 1969 are useless, as they have been replaced. What happens to these perfectly good textbooks which have been covered for protection and are now obsolete? Multiply this by the thousands of first-year high school students, and you would have a fantastic amount of cash "down the drain" and thousands of perfectly good textbooks. In larger families these books could mean a large saving for parents, if the books could be handed down to other children in the family but, this is not the case.

Last year, as an example, I bought Algebra Book I, and Geometry Book I at the commencement of first term. Then, about two months later, both books became obsolete according to the Education Department. On checking the difference between these books, the text varied so very little indeed, that I fail to see the necessity for publishing a book in 1966, when a student has to buy the book in 1968—two months later it becomes obsolete because a revised edition has been printed in 1967. Why then, if the Education Department knew this fact, did they sell thousands of these textbooks in 1968, then two months later sell thousands more of a supposedly revised copy of each book, which was dated 1967?

I have quoted enough of that letter to make my point about the modification and superseding of textbooks, and this is a matter that the Minister should consider carefully. I know it is occasionally necessary to modify or change textbooks, but I doubt whether it is necessary to have it occurring so frequently.

Referring now to a local matter, I have received correspondence from the Marananga school committee regarding the transfer of the head teacher. This particular school has been upgraded from a grade 6 school to a grade 5 school, the new grading to apply as from next year. Consequently, the present teacher is to be shifted. It is pointed out that a grade 5 head teacher's salary is in excess of \$1,000 a year more than that of a grade 6 head teacher; that, as the former is teaching no greater number of children, this seems to be an unnecessary waste of public money; and that, with the evident lack of finance for education, this seems to be totally unwarranted. Of course, to this must be added the cost of moving teachers from one locality to another. The school committee

further informs me that it has checked the school records and has listed the names of the head teachers at the school since 1958. In 1958, the teacher was there for two terms; in 1958-59, the teacher was there for one year and one term; in 1960-61, one year and two terms; in 1961, one term; in 1962-63, two years; in 1964-66, three years; in 1967, one year; and in 1968-69, two years.

It is stated that these frequent changes of teachers, with their differing methods of teaching, have a most unsettling effect on children in their formative years and that this has been reflected over the years in the results. I am told that the committee finds that the present teacher, who is a dedicated person, has the confidence of the children and that the results show this. This head teacher is prepared to stay at the school as a grade 6 head teacher (in fact, he desires to do so), and the parents are anxious that he remain there. If he transfers, it means that his two children who attend the primary school, and those who go to secondary school, must naturally move also. This will bring the number of children down to 31, making it a borderline number for a grade 5 school. The new grading, as I said previously, apparently is to apply from next year. He could be lost to the State system as he has been approached to teach elsewhere. Later, I will probably raise this matter in the form of a question of the Minister, having been asked to draw her attention to the present situation.

I refer now to certain roads that have been declared scenic highways, and there is such a road in my district as well as in other districts. A constituent of mine, who wrote to the Minister of Roads and Transport about sealing the scenic road (in this case it was Range Road, Houghton), received a reply from the Minister on April 24 to the effect that small sections of the scenic road would be constructed from time to time only if councils were prepared to give the work priority "for reasons of normal access to property". In this case, the relevant section of the road is under the control of the City of Tea Tree Gully. The letter goes on to say that this local authority has many unsealed roads within its area and is in the best position to determine those that should be given priority of available funds, and that to date no application has been received from the council for a grant to seal the section near this constituent's property. The constituent also wrote to the Tea Tree Gully council regarding the matter. The finances of this council are stretched to the limit.

I wish to point out that in cases such as this, where roads have been declared scenic highways under the Planning and Development Act, and publicity has been given to them, there has been a marked increase in the number of vehicles passing the properties affected, and much inconvenience is experienced when clouds of dust rise from the surface of unsealed roadways as each vehicle passes. As these roads have been declared scenic highways, much more traffic uses them than used them before, and that is as a result of the publicity given. Therefore, the people whose properties adjoin these roads suffer much inconvenience. It is desirable that these roads be sealed as soon as possible. I believe that the Highways Department and the Minister should give special consideration to sealing roads that have been declared scenic highways. I support the first line.

Mr. ALLEN (Burra): I, too, support the first line. The Budget provides for \$326,000,000 and is the largest Budget ever introduced in the State. I do not envy the Treasurer his difficult task of presenting the Budget for, as all members know, at present we have an inflationary trend. All departments and everyone else is asking for more money and it is difficult at present to make the available funds go around. I do not intend to speak at length on the Budget, as most of the points have been covered by the various speakers. I will refer to only three points. Last evening the member for Wallaroo referred to a road in his area, saying that he would be parochial and would deal with that subject. I think that at times all members are parochial and that we are proud of it, because our constituents wish us to be that way. The member for Wallaroo referred to a piece of road that he had made representations to the Highways Department to have sealed. He complained that only \$1,000 was granted for this road for which the council had asked \$25,000. It was a short piece of road that served the Wallaroo silo. The honourable member said:

I assure the honourable member that in the Wallaroo District grain growing is the principal industry and that producers must cross several council boundaries to remove their product from the farm to the receipt point. One part of my district is within the boundary of the Corporation of Wallaroo. If this road were sealed many heavy vehicles would be diverted from travelling directly through the centre of the town and passing the Wallaroo Primary School. It would also enable these vehicles to queue up outside Wallaroo, whereas at present, during the

harvest period, for days and nights on end vehicles are queued up on the side of the main road right through Wallaroo.

I think that most of those farmers who cart wheat would have carted it over sealed roads, for I imagine that almost every main road in the district of Wallaroo would be sealed. This grain comes from as far north as Port Broughton in a normal season (last season, possibly, it came from farther afield), from Bute in the east, and from the peninsula in the south. I imagine that the majority of this wheat would be carted on sealed roads. I should like to take the member for Wallaroo to my district and show him the roads that wheatgrowers there use, more particularly in the township of Booborowie. The people of this town asked 53 years ago that the railway be extended through that district, but eventually the railway was diverted through Clare to Spalding and Booborowie missed out.

Mr. Venning: They had a wheat stack there years ago, didn't they?

Mr. ALLEN: Yes, for one year. These people cart their wheat to either Burra, 17 miles away, or to Andrews, 10 miles away, all on unsealed roads. In this district 700 tons of lucerne seed passes through the small seeds industry each year. Most of it is grown in that locality, and the rest of it is grown nearby and carted to either Burra or Andrews by road transport. To cart produce to Adelaide, the growers have a 15-mile stretch of unsealed road before getting on to any sealed road at all. Further, the leading merino sheep studs are situated in this district, and last week the people there were able to claim proudly that a world record price was obtained for a merino ram from their district.

Mr. Venning: What was the price?

Mr. ALLEN: It was \$27,500. When stud field days are held in April each year, these sheep studs are visited by about 1,000 people and towards evening there is a continual haze over the whole district from dust from the cars. Apart from the many unsealed roads in the area, the sealed roads that we have are deteriorating badly. The Auburn-Clare road badly needs upgrading, so much so that last weekend another fatal accident occurred on this road because of its narrowness and the fact that the sealed portion is breaking away on the edges. In that fatal accident, the motor car got out of control and eventually hit a tree. If members who have been complaining about roads in their districts saw

some of the roads in my area, they would find that they did not have much to complain about after all. Last evening the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon), when referring to education, said:

I have also received letters from practically every school in my district, supported by the signatures of every member of the staff, and I was rather taken aback by the member for Victoria's remark that he had not received any such representations.

Later, the honourable member said:

I did not receive even one call from that district. However, I received some from the Victoria District and I received many from my district. People can come to their own conclusions regarding the statements made by the member for Victoria in the Chamber tonight.

The member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) interjected and said the member for Victoria was too busy writing his speech to answer telephone calls, and the member for Mount Gambier continued:

It would have been advantageous for him if he had answered the telephone instead of preparing his speech.

I consider that an accusation that a member does not answer telephone calls is rather severe. I think every member would answer the telephone if he were able to do so. Every member is sufficiently dedicated to his work to do that, and that was a severe accusation to make against the member for Victoria. Later, the member for Mount Gambier said:

I am deeply disappointed in the remarks made by and the attitude of the member for Victoria about education and his attitude towards an employee of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. This criticism also applies to the member for Eyre. For those members to say there is no crisis in education and to say they have not received letters from teachers and parent organizations and from other organizations in the State is a bare-faced lie, because I have received letters from women interested in education, from mothers of children, and from teachers who have held meetings in my district.

It is a serious thing to say that these two honourable members have told a bare-faced lie. I support both honourable members' remarks that they have not received letters or telephone calls because I have not received any letters. In saying this, I am possibly inviting letters or telephone calls, but that does not worry me. I have a happy association with the teachers in my area, some of whom are my best friends. We have worked together amicably during the short time that I have been a member of this House. I understand their problems and they talk them over with me, and any time I can assist them I am only

too happy to do so. The teaching profession is a noble one; it is always said that the nursing and teaching professions are two of the most noble professions there are, and I agree to it. I agree that there are problems in education, as there are in many walks of life. Life itself is a problem, and I think that over the years every person who has a problem tries to emphasize it and improve his lot. It is done in local government and in various meetings. The institute's approach is nothing new, and it is justified in bringing forward its problems.

If there is a crisis in education at present, what is looming in the primary industry? Only last week three different reports appeared in the financial pages of the *Advertiser*. The first, headed "Implement Company's Fall", states:

Agricultural implement makers, David Shearer and John Shearer, slumped to their lowest levels for many years on the exchange yesterday. Both issues have been weakening over the past few months as a result of the wheat industry problems, the downturn becoming more pronounced since their reports earlier this month.

The second one states that Massey-Ferguson Holdings (Australia) Limited showed a loss over the last three months. The third one deals with Hains Hunkin Limited which, while not an agricultural implement maker, has branches in the country. It states:

Branch results had not proved quite as favourable as expected. In a large measure this was a result of the slow recovery of the country areas from the effect of the recent drought.

That is only a sample of the reports one sees in the financial pages nowadays, and when the wheat quotas are announced next month there may be a further recession in the agricultural implement industry.

It has been alleged that there is a crisis in education, but there will be more of a crisis in primary industry until we get rid of the present wheat surplus.

Much has been said in this debate about the railway system and about replacing passenger train services with road buses. Using road passenger buses is not new: in 1954 a road bus commenced running in my area, namely, the co-ordinated passenger bus service from Jamestown to Riverton. Previously, a rail car had operated from Riverton to Spalding, and people from Jamestown had to travel a further 25 miles to use this service. Because the line needed repairs, the railcar service ceased and a road bus was introduced in 1954. This bus has given good service to all towns from Jamestown to Riverton.

During the short time I have been a member I have travelled extensively on this passenger bus and have taken a keen interest in its operations. I have asked questions about the number of passengers and the number of parcels carried on this service. During 1967-68, 9,335 passengers were carried, whereas in 1968-69 the total was 9,523—an increase of 188. In 1967-68, 39,045 parcels were carried, but last year 44,024 were carried—an increase of 4,980. The cost of operating the service in 1967-68 was \$20,259, whereas it was \$19,946 last year—a decrease of \$313. In 1967-68 the Railways Department estimated the revenue at \$31,000, but pointed out that the cost for carrying parcels and passengers from Adelaide to Riverton had not been allowed for in the estimate. There would have been a surplus of several thousand dollars on this operation.

The revenue was not given this year but, as the number of passengers increased by 188, the number of parcels carried increased by 4,980, and the cost of the service decreased by

\$313, a substantial profit would have been obtained from the service this year. This service operates differently from those that have been introduced recently: a private bus operates under contract to the Railways Department at a price a mile and the department receives all the revenue from the coach, whereas I believe that the passenger bus services inaugurated recently are operated entirely by private enterprise.

First line (Legislative Council, \$45,615)—passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE BILL

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for a Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts. Read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 25, at 2 p.m.