

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 8, 1969.

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

**PETITION: VICTOR HARBOUR
RAILWAY**

Mr. McANANEY presented a petition signed by 1,350 landowners, business men and/or residents of the area served by the railway between Mount Barker and Victor Harbour, stating that that railway served the State's most important seaside holiday area; that its running losses should be accepted as part of the cost of promoting the tourist industry; and that it was a means of controlling the fare and freight charges of road transport operators. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would not direct that the railway be closed and would order an investigation into ways and means of improving the economy of the operations of the line.

Petition received and read.

PETITIONS: ABORTION LEGISLATION

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE presented a petition signed by 75 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. LANGLEY presented a similar petition signed by 40 persons.

Mr. HUGHES presented a petition signed by 27 persons stating that they viewed with concern any efforts to extend the grounds on which abortion was at present legally allowed. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would not pass any Bill to alter the existing law relating to abortion in such a way that the grounds were extended beyond those which already applied.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

JUVENILE COURT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On several previous occasions proceedings before the Juvenile Court have been mentioned in this House and the Attorney-General has undertaken to have talks with the Juvenile Court Magistrate about the position. In view of the continuing dissension on the administration of this court, can the Attorney-General say what progress has been made in his discussions with the Juvenile Court Magistrate?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I said in the House last week, I think in reply to the Leader's question, that I intended to discuss the matter with the Juvenile Court Magistrate, although I emphasized that neither I, as Attorney-General, nor any other Government member could interfere in any specific case or direct the magistrate as to the policy he should pursue in exercising his judicial powers. However, with those two important riders in mind I have had a discussion with the magistrate on two matters particularly; first, the corporal punishment imposed during the week before last, I think, on two lads in the court by their fathers, and, secondly, the publication of the names of girl shoplifters in every case. I will deal with these matters separately when reporting on my conversation with Mr. Wright. Concerning the cases of corporal punishment, the magistrate told me that both cases arose out of offences that the boys committed together. They were from a country town and took out of a motor car a purse which contained sufficient money for them to come to Adelaide by bus, and this they did. They were apprehended in Adelaide and brought before the court. The first time the fathers of these boys saw them was in court. One boy appeared in court on one day and the other appeared subsequently. The father of the first boy had come down especially to be present in court at the hearing of the case, and when the boy appeared the magistrate asked the father, "Well, what

are you going to do about this?" The father said, "I'm going to take him home and give him a so-and-so good thrashing."

The magistrate, realizing that this would mean a bus ride of over 100 miles, together with a beating for the boy at the end of it, then said, "Would you like to do it here and now?" and the father said that he would. He took his son outside, I think into a cell (because that was the only convenient place), gave him a thrashing with his open hand, and brought him back to the court; and the boy was then discharged. Subsequently, the second boy was brought before the court and the same thing happened: the father said that this was what he intended to do. The magistrate emphasized to me that in these cases this was the first time that the parents had seen the boys, who were 12 or 13 years old, since the commission of their offences.

He said he had never made an order for corporal punishment, nor would he make an order for corporal punishment. But when he is satisfied (I am talking now about cases other than these) that a parent, on finding that his child has committed an offence, has administered corporal punishment, he does not as a rule impose any other penalty. The magistrate considered in these cases that this was the appropriate way to deal with the offences, as this was what the parents had said they would do. I place those points before the House to explain the facts which have been made public.

With regard to shoplifting by girls, I told the magistrate (as I had intimated in this House) that obviously the policy which he had announced was not in accordance with the policy laid down in the Act by Parliament. After much discussion, and after his making certain suggestions to me with regard to the law on this topic (and particularly his stressing that in his view shoplifting was a social problem to which Parliament should direct its attention, because he considered that insufficient was being done at the moment), he said that pending a consideration of the law, which is taking place (I and other members of Cabinet have been considering this now for over 12 months), he would not continue the policy, which he had announced, of publishing the names in each case.

He reminded me that he had pointed out in the two annual reports which he had made to Parliament the seriousness with which he viewed shoplifting. In his later report he

stresses that he has not succeeded in reducing significantly the incidence of shoplifting by girls. This incidence, he says, is great; it is normally a concerted affair either by one girl or usually by a group of girls. The magistrate also says that he has had in 12 months only three cases in which he was satisfied that the offences occurred on impulse when the girls were in the shop. These are the reasons which led him to view the matter with such seriousness. However, he intends not to pursue the policy of publication in all cases but to look at each case on its merits and to make a decision then.

I suggest that this is, in fact, in accordance with the policy in the Act as laid down by Parliament. In the meantime, I intend to follow up some of the suggestions the magistrate has made regarding the law on this topic. I think that covers pretty well the conversation I had with Mr. Wright: it certainly covers those two specific matters. However, I stress again that he is the Adelaide Juvenile Court Magistrate at present and that it is his discretion, and I do not think it would have been proper for me to go further than I have gone in my discussions with him. These discussions were frank on both sides, and friendly. I hope the policies which he has pursued and which he will now pursue will be accepted by the general community.

BURRA COPPER

Mr. ALLEN: Last year, when the natural gas pipeline was being laid west of Burra, I asked whether it would be possible to place a T-joint in the pipeline with a view perhaps one day to supplying Burra with natural gas in the event of the Burra copper mine reopening. Most members have no doubt heard that this mine will open again, this being great news for the Burra people. The mine closed almost 100 years ago and in recent years an industry has been sought in order to keep the population in the district. Now it seems that something has been achieved in this direction. I want to correct a misprint in the article on this matter that appeared in this morning's newspaper. The article states that production will be increased over 18 months to 500 to 700 tons a day, stabilizing at 200,000 tons a year, and that this will yield 200 tons of copper metal each year. Actually, it will yield 2,000 tons of copper metal each year rather than 200 tons, and will be worth \$3,000,000. Earlier in the week, when I asked the manager of the company concerned what type of fuel would be used for heating, he replied that initially

fuel oil would probably be used but that, as the mine got into production, there was a big possibility that natural gas would be needed. Therefore, will the Minister of Works take up this matter with the management of Samin Limited with a view to having provided, if required, natural gas to the mine?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I know that all members are greatly excited at the news that the project at Burra is to go ahead and I hope this will be a good project for South Australia. Regarding the honourable member's request for a T-joint off the pipeline, I think I can bring the matter to the notice of the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority to see whether that is possible and, if the company desires it, to see whether it can be considered. I am sure that this could be another outlet for our valuable natural gas, and I thank the honourable member for his suggestion.

WALLAROO HOSPITAL

Mr. HUGHES: The *Government Gazette* of September 25 called tenders for a heating system for the nurses home at the Wallaroo Hospital, and tenders closed on September 30. Will the Minister of Works find out whether sufficient tenders have been lodged and, if they have, the name of the successful tenderer and when work can be expected to commence?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: If, as the honourable member suggests, tenders closed on September 30, they would hardly be on my desk yet, because they have to be processed by departmental officers and must go to the Auditor-General. I will inquire for the honourable member and see whether I can expedite this matter.

TRURO MINING

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I have received a letter from the District Council of Truro, which is objecting strongly to the proposed mining operations to be carried on in 38 acres of section 296 of the hundred of Anna. I understand that a firm has pegged out a claim on this land, over which the council also has a miscellaneous lease from the Crown, and that it is mining creek gravel. The council's letter states:

The council could use this gravel for road-works as no other suitable material is to be found in that locality. It seems grossly unfair for this material to be transported to the metropolitan area to the detriment of country areas Considerable difficulty has been experienced with the roadway situated through

the creek at the western end of this section and any large excavations on the downstream side will probably result in further washaways on the road.

I understand that the council has made written representations to the Director of Mines, and it has asked me whether I would support its action in this matter. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Mines and the Minister of Local Government whether appropriate action can be taken to stop further mining operations on this section of land and to reserve to the council the sole right to use the gravel on the said land?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to obtain reports from my colleagues and to let the honourable member have them as soon as possible.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Mr. VIRGO: My question relates to correspondence that has been passing backwards and forwards between the Corporation of the City of Marion and the Minister of Roads and Transport. The member for Glenelg and I have both been requested to raise this matter because of the unsatisfactory nature of the replies and because it affects both the Glenelg district and my own district. Regarding the rail crossings at Ascot Park and Oaklands, members may be interested to know that the Minister of Roads and Transport, in his last letter to the council, stated:

Work on these proposals is proceeding as expeditiously as possible with the staff available. However, before they can be discussed with council it will be necessary for Highways Department officers to decide on the various aspects of traffic engineering, design and construction to be used. The comments of South Australian Railways will also be required, and it is possible that some further delay may be involved in obtaining these.

In response to the Minister's rather negative attitude the council wrote:

The council feels that the need for the work is so urgent that it would even go so far as to suggest that if the delay is because of planning, then professional experts outside, but acceptable to the department, could well be engaged to prepare the necessary plans for the work.

I do not think I need emphasize the urgency of properly renovating both crossings by providing divided crossovers. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to ensure that this proposal for improving these crossings is given the highest possible priority?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I cannot accept the honourable member's imputations against the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Mr. Virgo: There's no imputation at all. You're always looking for a loophole.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

Mr. Virgo: Well, the Attorney should not make that sort of insinuation: it is untrue.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: What I have said is not untrue: there were clear implications, in the honourable member's explanation, against the efficiency of the Minister in the discharge of his duties. I do not accept those imputations, but I will take the matter up with the Minister.

Mr. HUDSON: I refer particularly to the problem at the Oaklands railway crossing, which has about five roads coming into it near the southern side and another five coming in on the northern side. Since the opening of the Arndale shopping centre, that crossing has become by far the worst in the metropolitan area. The double rail track also creates problems. Often I have seen traffic move across the crossing when the lights have stopped flashing and, because of traffic attempting to turn to the right or left ahead of the cars on the crossing, the traffic builds up and cars are halted on the crossing when the lights operate again because a train is coming. All this creates an extremely dangerous situation. I understand that a fatal accident has occurred at the crossing within the last three years, and another accident could easily occur. Will the Attorney-General specifically refer to the Minister the extremely difficult nature of this crossing and the problems that have become intensified since the opening of the Arndale shopping centre, and will he suggest to the Minister that, because of these problems, immediate action is necessary and that the work should be given top priority?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will discuss the matter with my colleague.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: Yesterday, when replying to a question asked by the member for Light about gauge standardization, the Premier said:

Independent consultants have been engaged to carry out a study of the route and the work required to achieve a standard gauge connection between Adelaide and the east-west standard gauge railway. The Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport

(Hon. Ian Sinclair) and the South Australian Minister of Roads and Transport announced these arrangements today.

Later, amidst interjections, the Premier also said:

The task of the consultants will be to advise on the route to be taken, the manner of construction of the railway, and the best ways of integrating the new line into the existing South Australian railway system.

Can the Premier say whether that statement means that the work of the consultants will be to consider lines in the northern areas of the State, such as the section from Wallaroo through Brinkworth and up to Gladstone, in relation to standardization?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, the consultants will be asked to consider all those matters, but they will consider them in stages. The first responsibility of the consultants in the five months allotted to them will be to report on the direct link between Adelaide and Port Pirie. After that, they are to report on other aspects that have been set out in a specific order and agreed to by this Government and the Commonwealth Government. I remind the honourable member that I gave him a detailed reply on this matter on August 5. However, I will get the particulars again for the honourable member.

OAKBANK SCHOOL

Mr. GILES: The construction of the new dressing shed to be provided at the swimming pool at Oakbank Primary School has not been commenced. As the school committee has removed the old dressing shed, which was badly cracked and in a dangerous condition, will the Minister of Education find out when work on the new shed will commence and what is the expected completion date, as the swimming season is near?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I remember that when I visited the school with the honourable member some months ago the shed was badly cracked and was dangerous. Appreciating the honourable member's concern because the swimming season is drawing near, and not knowing the present position regarding the building of the change rooms, I will find out for the honourable member as soon as possible.

HOLDEN HILL SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of September 30 about the sewerage of an area at Holden Hill, particularly in Waninga Drive and Karina Crescent?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: Nearly all of the built-up area at Holden Hill has been sewered or sewers have been approved for construction and will be laid in the next few months. There is, however, a small area at the north-east corner, including part of Waninga Drive, part of Karina Crescent and part of Cornish Terrace, which drains to the north through an area of land which is at present unsubdivided. There has also been some uncertainty regarding the houses in and adjacent to Cornish Terrace as some of these houses and blocks of land were acquired by the Highways Department for freeway purposes. Following recent requests from some of the residents in this area, an investigation has commenced to see whether a satisfactory sewerage scheme can be devised for this small area, using a temporary pumping station. Because of the sloping ground, sewers will only serve one side of the streets, and the costs of sewer-ing this area will be high. It is expected that the investigation will be completed in about one month's time.

ANDAMOOKA POLICE

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about security at the Andamooka opal fields?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Everything possible is being done to police Andamooka and Coober Pedy.

Mr. Hudson: Are you going to tell him he should not interfere in another member's district?

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Don't be childish.

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

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am surprised that the member for Glenelg, who has asked about six questions about a district other than his own, should object to this question.

Mr. Hudson: I'm not objecting: I want you to be consistent.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This is amazing. The honourable member has a two-tier stand.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier is now out of order.

Mr. McKee: He's never been in order. He should never have been Premier.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Port Pirie is out of order. I am trying to restrain these interjections and get on with the

business of the House. I intend to take rigid action in this matter, so please maintain order in the House.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The report I have states that an additional officer has been provided in each of these towns and a rearrangement of the duty rosters ensures that, apart from unavoidable absences, there will be two police officers present in each town at all times.

JAMAICA AVENUE

Mr. BROOMHILL: Recently, I asked the Attorney-General whether the Minister of Roads and Transport would consider a petition I had forwarded to him concerning a proposal by the Municipal Tramways Trust to redirect a bus route through Jamaica Avenue, Fulham Gardens, requiring that road to be widened and causing inconvenience to residents. My request was that this proposal be further considered, and I hopefully ask the Attorney-General for the reply to my question.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member's hopes are fulfilled. The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report contains a proposal for a bus service to be operated along Jamaica Avenue, Fulham Gardens, at some time in the future, but the Municipal Tramways Trust has no definite plans at present for the development of such a service and has not sought to have the roadway widened for this purpose. It is likely that Jamaica Avenue would have to be widened were it to be used as a bus route, especially if it became part of a main traffic outlet from the Kidman Park and Fulham Gardens areas. However, if in the development of the area, another east-west roadway suitable for bus operations were constructed nearby it could be used as a bus route in lieu of Jamaica Avenue.

MOORLANDS INTERSECTION

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent questions concerning the signposting at Moorlands corner?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Extra signs have been erected at Moorlands on the approaches to the road junction where there is a potential hazard. Drivers approaching the junction from the Bordertown direction have relatively good visibility of traffic on the Pinnaroo road which is controlled by a "stop" sign. It is, therefore, considered that the existing symbolic "curve and junction" sign gives adequate warning to such drivers. Since the traffic turning right into the Pinnaroo road is mainly local in character, the

finger-post sign indicating Pinnaroo is adequate to identify the road, and no necessity is seen for an advance direction sign such as exists on the other approaches.

COMPASSIONATE LEAVE

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my recent question about the payment of compassionate leave to half-brothers?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I am informed that compassionate leave may be granted to weekly-paid employees, in accordance with a Cabinet approval given in 1966, on the death of a brother or sister. Leave is not granted on the death of a step-brother or step-sister; therefore, the alleged anomaly does not exist.

DRUGS

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: A recent campaign for physical fitness has been successful, but it seems that people are destroying their health by taking what is commonly known as pain-killing drugs to a serious degree. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Health whether the Government has considered action to reduce the taking of these drugs by some warning or other method and, if it has not, will his colleague place this item on the agenda of the next conference of Ministers of Health?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As the honourable member has said, such matters are often debated at the Health Ministers' conference and this matter may have been discussed. In any case, I will refer this matter to my colleague, find out what has transpired at these meetings, and ascertain the departmental attitude to the value of warnings and other means of preventing what is a self-inflicted illness caused by people taking excessive quantities of these drugs.

TELEVISION MAINTENANCE

Mr. JENNINGS: Recently, I asked the Attorney-General a question concerning a complaint I had received about television maintenance. I based my question on a letter, and rather than read the complete letter I tried to edit it as far as I could but you, Mr. Speaker, rather circumscribed my reading of the letter and, consequently, in the end I had to hand the letter in its entirety to the Attorney-General. I did not want to do that, because it reflected somewhat on some of his colleagues, and that is the last thing that I would want to do, of course.

Nevertheless, I understand that the Attorney-General now has—

The SPEAKER: Order! Under Standing Orders no letter or member can refer irreverently to another member.

Mr. JENNINGS: I realize that, Sir, and that is why I tried to protect my friends on the other side. Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member need not have worried about handing the letter to me. Members of this Government, in the dispatch of their business, do not take notice of these things and this matter has been dealt with in the usual efficient and expeditious way. The complaint to which the honourable member referred in his question was forwarded to the Prices Commissioner, who reports:

Investigation shows that the complainant had been visited by a representative from Canberra Television after inquiring for details of a maintenance contract. The records of the company show the servicemen had inspected and rectified minor faults in the set, as he had understood that a maintenance contract had been requested. A charge of \$6 for a service call was made only after the owner had decided not to enter into any agreement. According to the company it is normal procedure to inspect the television set before accepting a maintenance contract, and there is no charge for the service. In this instance minor repairs had been undertaken without first obtaining the signature of the owner on a maintenance contract. Negotiations have resulted in the full amount of \$6 being refunded.

I hope that the honourable member and his friend will be satisfied with the service we have given.

MAIL BOXES

Mr. VENNING: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked some time ago about private mail boxes that were being replaced at some country post offices which were being renovated by the Commonwealth department?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It has been the policy of the Postmaster-Generals' Department for more than 30 years to install metal-framed private boxes and they are provided in large, medium, and small sizes to achieve maximum usage of available space consistent with individual needs. In fact, the internal dimensions of metal boxes are slightly larger than those of the old wooden type carcasses.

MOUNT GAMBIER SEWERAGE

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about a sewerage project for Mount Gambier?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Requests have been received for sewer extensions at Mount Gambier in the area including Betula Road, Lasiandra Crescent and adjacent roads. At the present time there are 24 houses in the area and 39 vacant allotments which give a build up of 38 per cent on the allotments available. A sewerage scheme for the area would cost about \$26,000 and give a revenue return of \$841 with a return of 3.2 per cent on the capital expenditure. Neither the amount of development nor the revenue return is sufficient to warrant the expenditure necessary for the construction of sewers at this stage. Earlier this year, the District Council of Mount Gambier was informed of the position and it sent letters to residents asking whether they wanted the sewerage facilities, and whether they were prepared to pay higher rates for a period to give a reasonable revenue return. Although the residents all wanted sewerage, few were prepared to pay the higher rates, and consequently the department has not proceeded with the proposal.

TRUCK SPEEDS

Mr. GILES: The Minister of Roads and Transport has stated that it is intended to raise the maximum speed limits of trucks, according to their various weights. However, the present problem is that trucks driven at the greater speed must have a satisfactory braking system, and until all trucks are fitted with satisfactory brakes they will not be allowed to travel at the new speeds. The increased speeds consist of 60 miles an hour for trucks up to three tons; 50 miles an hour for trucks up to six tons; and 40 miles an hour for trucks over six tons. I desire to know whether a letter, stating that a certain truck is approved for this purpose, might be affixed to the rear of the vehicle, showing that it is allowed to travel at a new maximum speed, and indicating that the truck's braking system has been tested and approved. As the present situation is unsatisfactory, I ask the Attorney-General to refer my suggestion to the Minister of Roads and Transport with a view to expediting the introduction of the increased speed limits applying to trucks.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will discuss the suggestion with the Minister, although I wonder which letter the honourable member has in mind.

GOLDEN GROVE SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: A property at Golden Grove, which was under the control of the Education Department and previously used as a primary

school and schoolhouse, has not been used for this purpose for some years. As I understand that the property is to be disposed of by the Lands Department, will the Minister of Lands ascertain whether my information is correct? If it is, will he also ascertain whether tenders will be called or what will be the terms of sale?

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

MANNUM INDUSTRY

Mr. WARDLE: My question concerns the employment situation at Mannum, although I have not asked the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) whether it is permissible for me to ask this question.

Mr. Hudson: I'll grant you permission.

Mr. WARDLE: Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member would be out of order in doing that, for this matter rests with the Chair. The honourable member for Murray.

Mr. WARDLE: I am rather loath to ask this question, because I believe that the publicity given this situation has been detrimental in many respects to economic confidence in the town and to the situation generally. It must be borne in mind that five of the people employed by the company were due for retirement and were retired; 15 left of their own accord; 11 were married women who had not been the breadwinner (the services of those who have been the breadwinner for the family have been retained); and 14 single men were put off. Examined in that light, the position does not warrant the publicity which it has received and which has had a detrimental effect. As the firm of David Shearer Limited has a foundry, can the Minister of Works say whether certain Government departments could contract their foundry work to use this foundry?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I agree with what the honourable member has said, and I hope that some of the undue publicity given the township of Mannum does not prejudice it in the long run. I further hope that this publicity is not prejudicial to the efforts being made by the Government to alleviate the position. The departments under my control are mainly contracting and constructing departments, and I have already had discussions with the officers concerned to see what type of foundry work normally called for could be undertaken at the Mannum factory of David Shearer Limited. This matter is currently being investigated closely. Government contracts must always go through the Supply and

Tender Board and the Public Stores Department and that procedure would have to be followed in this case. However, I thank the honourable member for his suggestion. The Government has already taken steps in this regard, and inquiries are proceeding, particularly regarding foundry supplies for the Government.

NOARLUNGA FREEWAY

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question on the route of the Noarlunga Freeway?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This is a question that concerns the honourable member's own district.

Mr. Hudson: Don't be so parochial.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think this discussion would be better held over afternoon tea.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir. The report that I have states that the purpose of a development plan is to set out in broad principle the general proposals for development. In so far as transportation facilities are concerned, the proposals shown in the 1962 development plan must be regarded as schematic only. Considerably more detailed study than was given transportation in preparing the 1962 development plan must be undertaken before the routes and details of interchanges, etc., can be precisely defined. The modifications to the 1962 proposals for the Noarlunga Freeway in the Marion area, to which the honourable member refers, result from such further detailed study. This is necessary if the 1962 proposal is to be compared on a similar basis to the alternative Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposal.

The Reynella Expressway and the Noarlunga Freeway (whichever route is adopted) come within close proximity in the Darlington area. The provision of a connection between these two roads in this area is highly desirable, to provide flexibility and to offer maximum convenience to the motorists using these roads. Failure to provide such a connection would cause additional traffic to use South Road (to the north of Darlington), and possibly require substantially more widening of this road beyond the additional 14ft. presently proposed. Is the honourable member listening?

Mr. Hudson: I'm listening: get on with it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I was not certain; I thought the honourable member was being distracted. As he will be aware, the whole position regarding future freeway facilities in the Marion area is presently under review. Various alternatives which have already been considered and any additional alternatives which may be suggested to the Metropolitan Transportation Committee will be carefully examined before a final decision is made. The honourable member may be assured that particular attention will be given the position of residents in Ridge Crest Avenue, Darlington.

SOUTH-EAST HOUSES

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to several questions I have asked about the reassessment of rentals of accommodation provided by the Woods and Forests Department in the South-East?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have what I think will probably be the final report for the honourable member on this matter. I was informed this morning by a message from the Public Service Board that it had considered the report tendered by the Housing Trust on the reassessment of the Woods and Forests Department's houses and had decided, first, to accept all the reductions in rental and, secondly, not to impose those rents where the trust had assessed increases. The Public Service Board will now let the Forestry Board have its determination on the matter, and the tenants will be advised through the Forestry Board. In making this comment, I thank the member for Millicent for his tolerance in the matter, and also say that the Housing Trust has done its best in the circumstances to get the job done. It has been difficult for the trust to make available experienced officers to do the extra work. Also, in most cases, because the officers relied on the records of the Woods and Forests Department on the state of the houses, they did not go into them. For this reason, with reassessment of the rentals, alterations have been made in a great many cases. I say that to show why these reassessments have resulted in several changes in the recommendation. I believe that now there will be found to be a satisfactory solution to the problem raised with me on several occasions by the honourable member and by the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda).

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yesterday there appeared in the *Advertiser* a letter written by the Secretary of the Port Adelaide Congregational

Church stating that he had been directed by his members to express their concern at the present situation of religious instruction in State schools. Can the Minister of Education comment on any developments that have taken place in the teaching of religious instruction in departmental schools?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: At present the Anglican, Roman Catholic and Lutheran Churches are continuing religious instruction as it has always pertained in departmental schools. As the honourable member knows, other churches withdrew from religious instruction towards the end of last year. As recently as the beginning of August, the Director-General had a letter from the Secretary of a committee set up by the Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, the Churches of Christ, and the Salvation Army to investigate religious instruction in schools. The purpose of the letter to the Director-General was to inform him that the committee had drawn up a report and was sending him a copy for his information. The Secretary made the point that none of the churches involved had as yet considered the report or accepted its recommendations. Therefore, although we have a copy of the report, which was the result of investigations of the committee formed by these churches, we have had no further indication whether they have considered the report or approved its recommendations. The position is very much the same as it was when I last answered a question addressed to me on this matter by, I think, the member for Angus (Hon. B. H. Teusner).

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. CASEY: Will the Premier ask the Wheat Quota Committee when the wheat quotas will be finalized and the farmers notified?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to furnish a reply.

BURRA HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: From time to time, submissions have been made for a new high school at Burra, and the Education Department has purchased about 20 acres for this purpose. The old school at Burra is 100 years old, having been built when the mines last operated. Both the high school and primary school are in the same building and, as the temporary classrooms at the rear of the school are built into the side of the hill, there is little room for a playground. The teachers held a meeting last

week (as the House was sitting I could not attend), and they have informed me that one of their worries is that when they ask for new facilities at the school they are told that, as a new high school is planned, it is not wise to spend money on extending present facilities, but when they ask when the new high school will be built they do not receive a reply. With the re-opening of the mines, about 50 men will be employed and we are told that for every man employed at the mine at least two other people will be employed indirectly, so that population in the area will be boosted. As the Minister of Education has consented to visit Burra on Friday, November 21, to inspect the school, when visiting the school will she consider the points I have raised and seriously consider providing a new school for the area?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes.

SECONDHAND DEALERS

Mr. VIRGO: I refer to a matter which, unfortunately, I have been raising since August 28, 1968, regarding the issue of licences to secondhand dealers by the police, without any concern being given to the attitude of councils. When I last raised the matter on August 14 this year the Attorney-General told me that, when he had come back from the United States of America, he had seen the matter and it was being reconsidered in the light of the points put forward. Although the Attorney-General would not give me an undertaking of what the result would be (nor did I expect one), he assured me that the matter was being reconsidered. In view of his previous reply that all Government Ministers handle these matters expeditiously and efficiently, can he say how expeditiously and efficiently this matter is progressing?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is progressing expeditiously and efficiently, but I am afraid that I cannot give the honourable member any further information at present.

INSTITUTE OF TEACHERS

Mr. CORCORAN: I address my question to the Parliamentary Under Secretary to the Premier (the member for Victoria). The *South Australian Teachers Journal* of October 8 contains an article headed "Objection to Charge of Political Motivation", which states:

A hastily convened meeting of 61 teachers at Marion High School recently carried unanimously the following three motions:

1. That if Mr. Rodda was correctly reported in this morning's *Advertiser* then we call on him to unreservedly apologize to the South Australian Institute of Teachers for his statement that the current teachers' campaign was a political move organized to discredit the Government and that it was organized by Mr. R. Harris who is still an active member of the Australian Labor Party and that his action was influenced by strong political beliefs. The entire responsibility for the institute's campaign lies squarely with the executive, and not the institute's salaried employees, who act only under direction. We wholeheartedly support the efforts of the executive in the institute's campaign to obtain quality education.

2. That we as teachers resent, and regard as unfair, the way in which the political Parties have reduced the teachers' current education publicity campaign to a "political football". This is a genuine and sincere programme designed to further the cause of enlightened education, and not to discredit any particular Party or individual.

3. We particularly resent the implication in Mr. Rodda's statement that teachers of a wide variety of political views can be readily manipulated by a single individual.

Note: Channel 2 (ABC television) asked both Mr. Freebairn and Mr. Rodda to appear on the *Today Tonight* programme with Mr. Harris, following personal attacks on Mr. Harris in the House of Assembly. Both MPs declined.

As the member for Victoria is a personal friend of mine, my question is designed not to embarrass him but to help him, because I believe that on reflection he will realize that, possibly in haste, he made a statement that was not true because it has been pointed out by the institute that Mr. Harris has worked under direction and that it is a mere coincidence that he happens to be the institute's publicity officer. Does the member for Victoria now believe that he was wrong in making this statement and, if he does, will he accede to the requests in the motions carried at the meeting, which I believe would be a fair and reasonable action?

Mr. RODDA: The member for Millicent has put the matter very nicely, but there is some ambiguity in the article. I have in no way branded the institute as a political organization, but I have said (and I say again) that Mr. Harris is a future politician. I do not know what he has to be ashamed of. Is it his membership of the Australian Labor Party? If it is, why should I apologize?

Mr. Corcoran: He's not saying that it is.

Mr. RODDA: Of course he is not: he is getting his friends to say it for him.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RODDA: I am not going to apologize to someone who is proud to be a member of an organization but who expects me to apologize to him under disguise. The campaign is being run by the Institute of Teachers. What would happen if the member for Light and I were public relations officers of the institute?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light was not mentioned in the question.

Mr. RODDA: The member for Millicent said that the member for Light and I had been invited to appear on channel 2 on *Today Tonight* with Mr. Harris because we had smeared him or done something else to him, but we refused to do so. We are not willing to help Mr. Harris in his election campaign, nor am I willing to apologize to him.

LAKE ALEXANDRINA FISHING

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of October 2 whether an investigation has been made into fishing in Lake Alexandrina?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports that no grant has been received from the Commonwealth Government by this State to finance research into the fishing industry, although I believe legislation was introduced recently into the Commonwealth Parliament to provide for the allocation to the States of Commonwealth funds by way of matching grants to supplement moneys raised by the States during 1969-70 for this purpose. Provision is also made in the draft of the new Fisheries Bill, which I hope to place before Parliament shortly, for the establishment of a special research fund. Depending on the extent of funds available for research purposes, I hope that investigational and research work on our fisheries and fish resources can be increased significantly in future years, and that projects such as the one referred to by the honourable member can be undertaken. At present, the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department is collecting monthly statistical data of fish catches in Lake Alexandrina and this information will form the basis of any future research that may be undertaken on this inland fishery.

WHEAT STORAGE

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of September 30 about the storage of non-quota wheat?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that finance for the construction of emergency storages

of about 60,000,000 bushels (including 20,000,000 bushels in South Australia) is being provided from Australian Wheat Board funds obtained from the overdraft advance available for the new season's crop. As both quota and over-quota wheat will be moving slowly because of the expected carry-over of old season's wheat of about 260,000,000 bushels, that portion of expenses required for handling and movement of new season's wheat will not be needed for some time. Therefore, this money is available to finance the building of emergency storages, thus helping to meet to a substantial extent the expected storage crisis.

ST. AGNES SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: The Minister of Education will be aware that on several occasions I have asked questions about the purchase of land by the department for the establishment of a school at St. Agnes and that alternative sites have been considered. On February 5, I again raised this matter in the House and, in a letter dated May 13, the Minister stated that approval had been given by Cabinet for the purchase of land owned by P.G.H. Industries (South Australia) Proprietary Limited in section 846 of the hundred of Yatala and that negotiations were progressing. Can the Minister say what stage these negotiations have reached?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I think the matter is proceeding but, as I have not seen the docket for some time, I will check the matter and let the honourable member know.

BENLATE

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question about the release of Benlate for crop spraying this year?

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

A certificate of registration has been issued for Benlate systemic pesticide, but for use only on non-edible crops. This conforms with the action taken in Victoria, Western Australia, and Tasmania, and is the basis on which the application for registration was made by the manufacturing company. I am informed that the reason for the restriction placed on the use of this product is that investigations are still being carried out in the United States of America on its residual effects and, until more information is available from these tests, it will not be released for use on edible crops. The company that markets the product has taken special precautions to ensure that all containers are carefully labelled with warnings against its use other than in accordance with

the instructions printed thereon, and distributors have been warned not to sell to growers who contemplate applying the pesticide to edible crops. In reply to the honourable member's specific question, Benlate will not be registered for use on edible crops this season. In view of its apparent effectiveness, every effort will be made to release it for general use if and when investigations establish its safety.

SECONDHAND MOTOR CARS

Mr. McKEE: I have received several inquiries from constituents who, having purchased secondhand motor cars and received the contract, have found that \$20 has been added to the price for what is called a pre-delivery charge. I understand, as do my constituents, that a car is supposed to be road-worthy when it is purchased, yet this pre-delivery charge is added to the price. A secondhand car dealer has told me that dealers regard this charge as being in order and most of them add it to the price. Will the Attorney-General say whether this charge can legally be made and, if I give him the relevant particulars, will he have the matter investigated?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I would not presume to express any opinion at this stage on an individual case: that is a matter for private legal advice. I should say that, as a general rule, unless the prospective purchaser knows that an amount of this kind is being charged, or will be charged, or unless the charge is usual in such transactions, it would not be payable, but I do not want the honourable member to take that statement as referring to any particular case, as there may be other facts of which neither he nor I know. However, if the honourable member gives me the facts I will have the matter investigated.

IRRIGATION REBATE

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Irrigation say whether he and his department have considered information about the disallowance of the \$2 rebate on general irrigation placed before him by a deputation from the Chaffey Settlers Association that I introduced to him on Tuesday, July 22?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Much consideration has been given to the matter, although a decision has not yet been arrived at. I will let the honourable member know when I have a reply. The somewhat protracted delay in giving the honourable member a reply should at least indicate that the matters raised by the deputation are being considered carefully.

T.A.B. OPERATIONS

Mr. VIRGO: Representations were made to me on Monday about the operations of the Totalizator Agency Board, it being put to me that the T.A.B. system of betting was introduced to achieve two objectives, namely, the provision of facilities for people who were unable to attend race meetings and the elimination of the illegal starting price betting. That point of view is substantiated in a book given to me and also by *Hansard* reports of speeches made when the T.A.B. legislation was introduced. All relevant documents that I have seen have stressed that the introduction of T.A.B. facilities would in no way encourage or expand betting, but I have been told that, unfortunately, since T.A.B. betting has been in operation the betting facilities have been greatly expanded. Not being a punter, I must rely on hearsay for this, but I have been told that race meetings are held almost every day of the week in some part of Australia and that bets can be placed on these meetings. Can the Premier say what is his Government's policy on the matter and whether, if it agrees with the original concept that T.A.B. should not be permitted to encourage or expand betting facilities, it intends to curb the expansion of T.A.B. operations?

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

SOUTH ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question about the dangerous intersection of South Road and Marion Road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The South Road and Marion Road intersection is amongst those approved for the installation of traffic signals in the near future. Negotiations are in hand between the Highways Department and the two councils concerned regarding the apportionment of financial responsibility and, when this matter is resolved, tenders will be called for the installation of the signals.

LAMB SALES

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked some time ago about lamb sales?

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

The State Lamb Committee, which was formed to look after producers' interests, has been particularly concerned about this problem, and has taken every opportunity to seek the co-operation of all those connected with the industry in an attempt to reduce its incidence.

However, despite intense publicity given to the problem during each lamb export season, the situation has not improved. One reason given for the high percentage of bruising in the early part of the present export season was that a high proportion of the lambs being exported was of a lightweight, rather "unfinished" type. It is considered that this type of lamb bruises more easily than one with a reasonable "finish". Thus, rejections for bruising last season, when lambs were of excellent quality and dressed out at a heavier weight (average 36.4 lb.) were down to 2.4 per cent. The normal figure is about 5 per cent. By comparison, in the current export season rejections for bruising alone are running at about 8 per cent.

Reports on the nature of the bruises indicate that most of them have been inflicted some two or three days before slaughter, most likely during drafting or loading on to transports. A contributing cause here could be that many producers do not have adequate facilities for handling lambs. It has been noted that the worst affected consignments of lambs have been those bought at country markets and subjected to double handling. This is a complex problem and calls for the co-operation of all sections of the industry.

I assure the honourable member that every opportunity will be taken, through the press, radio, and television and in departmental bulletins, to keep this matter before the notice of the industry.

AUDIT ACT REGULATIONS

Notices of Motion, Other Business, No. 1:
The Hon. B. H. Teusner to move:

That the regulations under the Audit Act, 1921-1966, in respect of accounts for land purchase, etc., made on August 24, 1969, and laid on the table of this House on August 26, 1969, be disallowed.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): This Notice of Motion was given by me at the instance of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, but since notice was given the committee has called evidence, which was given and heard yesterday, from the Auditor-General. As a result of that evidence the committee decided that it did not wish to proceed with the Notice of Motion standing in my name. Therefore, I will not proceed with it.

The SPEAKER: This concerns a matter that has been before the Subordinate Legislation Committee and has been placed before the House, but is not now being proceeded with. I draw honourable members' attention to the statement of the honourable member for Angas. It is now a matter for the House, and if no further action is taken the motion will lapse.

Motion lapsed.

OMBUDSMAN

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): I move:

That in the opinion of this House legislation should be introduced during this Parliament to establish the office of ombudsman.

This subject has caused much controversy throughout Australia and in other countries, many of which have created the office of ombudsman. I will refer to newspaper reports and special articles written by prominent Australians and people from other countries. An article by Arthur Richards, headed "So many Bureaucrats are ruling us that we need an Ombudsman urgently", appearing in the *Courier Mail* of Friday, May 15, 1964, states:

He is everybody's benevolent Big Brother, everybody's Mr. Fixit. His main job is to stand as protector between the little individual citizen and the big and powerful Government. Did you suffer injustice when your home was resumed for Government works? See the ombudsman. Have you unfairly been denied a trading licence or a pension? See the ombudsman.

This vague picture is accurate enough in essentials. That is how the ombudsman works in other countries, including our sister democracy of New Zealand.

An article written for the *Australian* by the New Zealand Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, the Hon. J. R. Hanan, on November 26, 1964, under the heading "Any Complaints?", states:

New Zealand has had an ombudsman for two years. The office was created by the Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman) Act, 1962. Yet it is already clear that the experiment is a success and that the right of the citizen to obtain an independent review of his dispute with authority is much prized. The office of ombudsman was introduced because we in New Zealand wanted to ensure that the citizen was always treated fairly and justly and that he was given a right to an independent review whenever the State acted in a way which he thought unreasonably affected his interests.

The appointment in New Zealand has proved successful. Australia is similar to New Zealand regarding legislation, except that South Australia has a bi-cameral system of Government whereas New Zealand has a uni-cameral system.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: How many State Parliaments are there in New Zealand?

Mr. EVANS: I will not worry about interjections, but when I have the right of reply in this debate I will reply to this type of interjection.

Mr. Broomhill: What type of interjection?

Mr. EVANS: The member for Hindmarsh interjected. The word "ombudsman" originated in Scandinavia, and one Swedish translation is "procurator for civil affairs". In Sweden an officer with a similar title has existed since 1713, and his function could be compared with that of our Crown Prosecutor, except that, in addition to initiating criminal proceedings against law-breakers in general, he could take similar action against public officials who had broken the law. The simple translation of "ombudsman" in Scandinavian countries is "agent or attorney." The general interpretation of the word in those countries is "attender to complaints", although British Commonwealth countries have accepted the definition of "Parliamentary Commissioner," who is appointed by Parliament to receive and investigate complaints from citizens against administrative actions considered unjust.

Sweden was the first country to appoint an ombudsman, and he has wider powers than his counterpart in New Zealand or the United Kingdom has. Finland followed in 1919, immediately it gained independence, and Denmark made its appointment in the 1950's. An ombudsman was appointed in Norway in 1961 and, in 1962, New Zealand, with 2,500,000 population, made an appointment. In the United Kingdom, the mother of our Parliament appointed an ombudsman in 1967; he is appointed for life or until he reaches the age of 65 years.

West Germany has established a similar office for complaints by members of the armed forces only. A person of a lower rank is able to go to his commanding officer and make a complaint that would normally be lost in red tape but, with the appointment of an ombudsman, the complainant can make representations to him if he thinks he has been treated unjustly.

Guyana created a similar office in 1965, Alberta in 1967, and Tanzania, which has a one-Party Government (and I believe this is not suitable) also established, by a Government Act, a permanent Commission of Inquiry, which is responsible to the President and not to Parliament, and never reports to the complainant. Personally, I believe that this is not suitable and not the type of office to be created in this State. The type of appointment I believe necessary for this State would need to be based on the New Zealand appointment of a Parliamentary commissioner, known there as the Ombudsman. When an ombudsman was originally appointed in New Zealand, members of the

Public Service thought it would interfere with their duties, but that has proved not to be the case. The publication by Walter Gellhorn, *Ombudsmen and Others*, states at page 91:

"When the Government in early 1961 circulated a proposal to transplant the ombudsman from Scandinavia to Wellington," a top-ranking New Zealand official recently recalled, "my department was strongly against the whole idea. We regarded it as just a political manoeuvre and, as a matter of fact, we may have been right at the time. But now, after nearly three years of experience, we are just as strongly in favour as then we were opposed. The ombudsman has proved to be a good thing for the citizen—and for the department, too."

"'Ombudsman' Bill Sheer Humbug," proclaimed a banner headline in the official organ of the New Zealand Public Service Association, whose 48,000 members in Government posts make it the largest employee organization in New Zealand. The proposal, the *Public Service Journal* continued in September, 1962, "is half baked. It panders to sectional prejudices—those directed against officialdom. If it works at all, it will cause confusion and disgruntlement . . . It is the public servant, and only he, who is to be harassed and hounded as part of the policy of halting the welfare state in its tracks . . . The Commissioner will be a party creature—an apologist for the Government while in office and the spy of the appointing party when in opposition." Three years later the same periodical exulted, in its most prominent news columns, that the ombudsman's annual report had once again exonerated the Public Service from any charge of malpractice and had found fault with relatively few decisions. "In one respect," the journal added, "the ombudsman has proved to be an even better friend of the service than these figures suggest. He has laid down precedents for investigating some of the administrative acts of the State Services Commission regarding individual public servants—and has issued some sharp rebukes to the commission . . . It is becoming increasingly clear that the office of ombudsman is not necessarily the trap for public servants which many of us feared when it was first established. Indeed, the present incumbent is making it probable that public servants will make more and more use of the office for settlement of otherwise unappealable grievances."

Although it is believed that the Public Service will be afraid of the appointment of an ombudsman, the experience in New Zealand has proved that there is nothing to be afraid of. Indeed, the Ombudsman there has helped the Public Service and has proved to be a friend of the citizens. The appointment of an ombudsman is necessary, because there are certain areas which are not otherwise covered and in which a Parliamentarian cannot act effectively. I refer particularly to when an injustice occurs, for instance, regarding the

acquisition of property. Land may be required for town planning purposes, involving reserves, or for the purpose of constructing freeways or reservoirs. Not only those whose land is acquired but also those living near the land in question may be entitled to compensation. These would be matters to be considered by an ombudsman. Also, he could consider the refusal or cancellation of licences for liquor facilities, taxi-cabs and for other purposes. In addition, he could consider licences required in connection with the marketing of certain goods.

Although there is no real way of investigating it at present, I point out that statutory boards at times carry out actions that may be considered to be unjust and individuals so affected may well be helped by an ombudsman. Indeed, I know of one injustice which has occurred and which I have not been able to correct in the short time that I have been in this Chamber. In 1965, a woman wished to sell her property, situated at the bottom of Germantown Hill, but the intending purchaser was informed by an officer of the Highways Department that a freeway would eventually run through the middle of that property. In fact, the purchaser had agreed to paying something slightly less than \$11,000 for the property, but on being told about the freeway he was no longer interested.

This year, however, the Highways Department decided that it needed to acquire this property, which was subsequently valued at \$7,700. The owner, who admits that the property may have deteriorated in some respects, has nevertheless been placed in an unfortunate position. This woman lost her first husband, as a prisoner of war, and lost her second husband, who had returned from the war suffering from injuries. Having borrowed money to discharge the mortgage on her property, she now stands to lose \$3,000-odd. I do not blame anyone for the subsequent valuation placed on the property, bearing in mind the deterioration of buildings, but I believe that an *ex gratia* payment might have been made to the owner, considering that she was unable to sell the property originally as a result of information supplied by the Highways Department. Although this sort of thing may mean nothing to the person born with a silver spoon in his mouth, it is a real problem for the woman concerned, and I believe that this is a situation that could well be investigated by an ombudsman.

I know also of a situation which has concerned the Leader of the Opposition for some time and as a result of which certain people are suffering from an injustice. I refer to caravan parks controlled by councils as opposed to privately owned caravan parks. The authorities concerned are able to erect, at vantage points throughout the suburbs, signs directing people to the caravan parks which they control. Driving around the city and suburbs, one will find a sign at the Hackney bridge (near which there is a private caravan park) directing one to the Levi park. However, owners of the private caravan parks are not allowed to erect such signs. A sign is also erected at the Fullarton Road and Cross Road intersection, directing people to a Government Tourist Bureau caravan park. Similarly, the Norwood caravan park is advertised at the intersection of Payneham Road and O.G. Road, and there are signs at the intersection of Regency and Enfield Roads and at the Gepps Cross intersection. This, too, is a matter in which an ombudsman could take some interest, perhaps being able to convince the authorities of the injustice affecting the owners of private caravan parks. As a result of pressure for about 10 years the Highways Department agreed that one sign could be placed to indicate the location of the caravan park. We can all visualize what it would be like trying to find an area with only one sign to direct us.

I know of one case where the action of a Government department unjustly affected a community. In the early 1960's it was necessary to resume a certain title in the Adelaide Hills that had been left in trust. The title was held in fee simple by the Stirling council. The Education Department needed the land to build a school. A community club incorporated held what it thought was a valid lease over the land. It was informed by the Crown Solicitor that an incorporated body could not lease Crown land left for recreational purposes (park lands) because, in law, it is one person. Therefore, the lease was invalid, so the title was resumed and the piece of land taken from the community that had spent thousands of dollars in the area. After many representations to Governments and indeed to the Premier at the time, the *ex gratia* payment was gradually pushed up from £1,500 to £2,500, which was still far less than the community had spent on that reserve. By comparison, through a special Act of Parliament, a racing club can get a lease for 99 years of Victoria Park Racecourse, so we can see that some injustice was suffered by a small community working for

the benefits of the area, and no compensation was paid. An ombudsman could have helped in this case.

In recent years members of the University Law School have conducted studies into several bodies, such as boards, primary producer organizations and so on, that exercise powers in certain fields. It has been found that often what we should regard as the principles of natural justice are not provided for in the exercising of powers over individuals in this State. In such cases an ombudsman could make recommendations for amendments if he believed that justice could not be gained otherwise. Sometimes, when attempts are made to achieve efficiency and good management, individuals are affected without their having any possible legal redress. One example of what a Government did to avoid breaching the provisions of the Constitution was in the case where, after the Second World War, the Commonwealth Government wanted to acquire certain land in New South Wales for soldier settlement. The Commonwealth Constitution was such that the Commonwealth Government could not acquire the land unless the owner received just terms. To avoid facing up to this, the Commonwealth Government gave the money to the State Government, which bought the land and then carried out the necessary action to develop it as soldier settlement farms. Of course, because of an overlapping of jurisdiction between State and Commonwealth, a State ombudsman might not be able to deal with issues such as this. However, in the case to which I have referred, the Commonwealth Government deliberately went out of its way to avoid the Constitution. Had there been a Commonwealth ombudsman a challenge could have been made on this.

We all know that as humanity becomes more advanced more controls and more forms of control will be introduced, but never should they be introduced blindly, as I believe has been the case on some occasions in the past. Not all complaints are justified, but if people are to be sure of a fair go it should never be the case that the minority should always be the slave of the will of the majority that is expressed at a particular point of time. An individual cannot always win, but surely he should be given the opportunity to win when his complaint is justified. As Parliamentarians we are largely successful as attenders to complaints, but I for one have not been satisfied, as I have shown, that justice has been done in all cases I have had to handle in the short time I have been a member of this House.

An ombudsman would not complicate the present situation or detract from the role which we, as Parliamentarians (or the Parliament) already play in preserving and protecting the rights of the individual to a limited degree. Even though we are to a degree successful in helping remedy complaints, it does not help the person who believes that he cannot or does not receive a fair go from a Government department.

What satisfaction is it to such a person if his member takes up his complaint after it has already been looked at once by the department? When the member does this by inquiring of the Minister, often the same reply is given in different words. I do not blame the Minister, for the same officers obtain information for him as obtained it originally. I do not blame the officers either, for they honestly believe they are doing the right thing. To be sure one is given the full facts one needs to look at the files. It is not desirable that every member of Parliament should have this power, and members would not have the many hours to spare that are needed to investigate the problem to ensure the constituent receives a fair go.

We must remember that the purpose of an ombudsman is not to weaken the role that Parliaments play but to help strengthen and improve the working procedures of the Government and its agencies. If a Government member voted for a particular measure and then found that in his area it adversely affected some of his constituents unjustly, it becomes difficult for that member to condemn his and his Party's actions in introducing such a measure. In my opinion, in the past Parties of both sides have at times unintentionally eroded many of our freedoms unjustly. I do not believe our public servants are sinful or any worse than those in other countries or States; in all fairness I would be surprised if ours were not better. However, they would in some cases be reluctant to admit a mistake if it could be forgotten about. I would hope that, as the power of Government through its agencies increases, we as Parliamentarians realize the vital necessity there is and will be to make sure that a person receives a fair go from us and also from the Acts of Parliament we pass and from those who administer those Acts.

As a State we can use New Zealand's experience as a good example. As I said earlier we can compare this country with that country in relation to population and also legislature. New Zealand's Act provides that

its ombudsman has the power to investigate any decision, recommendation or any act done or omitted relating to a matter of administration affecting any person or body of persons in his or its personal capacity in or by any of the departments or organizations or by any officers, employee or member thereof in the exercise of any power or function conferred on him by any enactment. However, he does not have this power in the case of a legal adviser of the Crown. He cannot take action on matters where the Act provides the right of appeal to boards, tribunals or courts, whether or not his right of appeal has been exercised.

The ombudsman, essentially an impartial, independent officer of Parliament, is assisted by a small staff. New Zealand has an ombudsman, an administrator, a lawyer, a typist and a part-time lawyer and part-time clerical assistant. Investigation takes place almost entirely by correspondence. All formal administrative means of redress must have been exhausted before the ombudsman may take up a case, and he has the power to demand any Government document and to question any witness under oath. The ombudsman has the power to summon witnesses but he has not exercised this right to any large degree. The ombudsman is concerned with administration, not policy matters. His chief action is the publishing of his report, but he has no power to alter an official decision. The whole process of investigation is carried out in an informal, flexible way, with very little disruption to the department being investigated. The New Zealand ombudsman, who has no real power over the Minister administering the department, merely investigates to see that the complainant has received a fair go.

Mr. Corcoran: What if the complainant hasn't received a fair go? Can he do anything about it?

Mr. EVANS: I will come to that point later. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prohibition of Discrimination Act, 1966. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I think it will also be necessary for me to move that the time for notices of motion be so far extended as to enable me to complete the second reading explanation of the Bill.

The SPEAKER: I do not know whether that is necessary, as the House has agreed to suspend Standing Orders. Therefore, that rule does not apply while the Standing Orders are suspended.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Last week, the Attorney-General gave in this House as his opinion and that of the Solicitor-General that the Prohibition of Discrimination Act as it stands at present allows the supplier of services in licensed premises or elsewhere to discriminate against people by reason of their colour, race, or country of origin by imposing conditions on supply but, with great respect, I disagree with that point of view. However, the Attorney-General has refused to grant a certificate for prosecution under the Act to test the present provision in the Act, but has relied on his own opinion instead of allowing the matter to be tested in the courts. Consequently, I believe that the first possible opportunity should be taken to remove any excuse for failing to prosecute under this Act by seeing that the excuse is disposed of and that it is clear that no condition can be applied to service which is a condition discriminating against people by reason of their race, country of origin, or colour of skin.

The Bill's provisions are simple. They replace section 4, which deals with the supply of a service. At present, the section simply provides that it is unlawful to refuse to supply a service, as defined in the Act, on the ground of a person's race, country of origin, or colour of skin. The Bill amends section 4 to provide that a person whose business includes that of supplying a service for reward shall not on demand refuse or fail to supply that service, on the same terms and under the same conditions as that service is supplied by him to any other person, only by reason of the race, country of origin, or colour of skin of the person who demands the service or on whose behalf the service is demanded. That means that a discrimination is not to take place in the supply of the service on the ground of the race, country of origin, or the colour of skin, and that the discrimination cannot be by the imposition of different terms or conditions.

It is possible, of course, to give different terms or conditions to members of the public for other reasons but, where the reason is clearly that of the race, country of origin, or

colour of skin, a differentiation in the terms of service is not to be made and, in order to make it clear that this applies in relation to licensed premises particularly, section 5 of the Act, which relates particularly to premises licensed under the Licensing Act, is amended in subsection (1) by inserting after the words "or accommodation" the words "on the same terms and under the same conditions as that food, drink or accommodation is supplied by him to any other person". Section 5, as amended, provides that the discrimination in terms and conditions is not to be a discrimination on the ground of race, country of origin, or colour of skin. The same provision is made in subsection (2), which covers the provision of food, accommodation or drink in unlicensed premises. Again, the provision that the same terms and conditions as are required to apply to supply as to the general public is to apply under that section. This will mean that those who are seeking to evade the purposes of the Prohibition of Discrimination Act by saying, "We will give you drink, but only in the front bar or at the back door", or making some other condition of this kind, will not be able to impose such a condition without immediately committing an offence under that Act. I hope that, where any such activity occurs in contravention of the provisions of the Act, the Attorney-General will then grant a certificate for prosecution.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE BILL Second reading.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is about 45 years since the first attempt was made to enact such legislation as this in the House. The matter has been contentious, basically because we have a bicameral system, as other States have, but principally because our Upper House has required that it have representation upon a public accounts committee, notwithstanding that, under our Constitution, that Chamber has not the same powers regarding finance as has this House.

When the Hon. R. L. Butler, in 1933, introduced a Bill to establish a public accounts committee, it was passed by this House but was lost in the Committee stage in the Legislative Council. Likewise, I think it was in 1967 that this House passed a Bill that I

had introduced. This Bill was amended before it went to the Legislative Council to provide for the committee to be representative of only this House, and it, too, was lost in another place. There seems to be a difference of opinion between our two Houses about the purpose and function of a public accounts committee.

There is nothing new in this concept. When I have spoken on Bills and on motions dealing with the establishment of such a committee, I have pointed out that a measure similar to this Bill was introduced in the House of Commons in 1861, when Parliament first began to look critically at expenditure by the Executive. That action followed a sequence of developments culminating in the publication of detailed records of expenditure, the appointment of an Auditor-General, who was a servant of Parliament (as our Auditor-General is), and then the appointment of a Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee, which critically considered, on behalf of Parliament, matters raised by the Auditor-General in his reports. Our Auditors-General have submitted a series of reports, and the present Auditor-General, in his introduction to his Report for 1968-69, states:

The review required of me by legislation goes beyond that of a commercial audit and is designed to ensure that Parliament's control of public money is maintained.

At present, Parliament depends entirely on the Auditor-General to tell it whether moneys appropriated by Parliament have been spent wisely and on the purposes for which they have been voted. There are many instances of Auditors-General in this State having recommended the appointment of a public accounts committee; they had drawn attention to many matters which should be considered but which have not been considered. Those recommendations have gone unheeded.

Our Auditor-General serves Parliament well. He is an officer of the Parliament and reports to it wisely and ably each year. In fact, it is customary to try to have his report tabled in the Houses before the Budget debate begins so that cognizance may be taken of his comments on the activities of the Government and the administration of the Treasury in the year before that for which we are budgeting.

In this House we are few in number at present, and the argument that the House has not enough members to support another Parliamentary committee has been used as a counter to suggestions that a public accounts committee should be appointed. It has also

been said that such a committee would irritate the hard-working officers of the Public Service departments, who may be called before the committee to be questioned on some matter which has been referred to the committee or which the committee, in its wisdom, considers ought to be investigated.

I do not think that either of those arguments is necessarily a valid reason for not supporting the appointment of a public accounts committee, because the number of members will increase and, in any case, if the function of such a committee is important, it should not be considered a burden for members to have to serve on another committee to inquire, on behalf of Parliament, into matters that may be referred to the committee.

In the Commonwealth Parliament and other places, there is no problem regarding the Public Service. Permanent Commonwealth Treasury and other Public Service officers are appointed to assist the Joint Committee of Public Accounts of the Commonwealth Parliament and it seems that, because of the good relations between the committee and the officers appointed to assist it, that committee functions effectively in many ways. It is a joint House committee, made up of 10 members (seven from the House of Representatives and three from the Senate), and no problem seems to arise because there is representation from both Houses.

Although I have previously said that the constitutional powers of our Upper House are not as wide as the powers of this Chamber on financial measures, neither are the Senate's powers as wide as those of the House of Representatives. However, the two Upper Houses have some regard for financial measures. In Victoria, New South Wales and Tasmania these committees consist of members of the Lower House, and it seems that their functions are mostly related to investigations of efficiency. I think the same circumstances should apply here. In some circumstances we should improve the efficiency of certain departments, more particularly those which are administered indirectly through Commissioners and over which Parliament has little jurisdiction or control. Members find it difficult to obtain satisfactory replies, even through Ministers, about matters relating to these departments.

This situation applies to the Highways Department. We vote large sums for this department, but we have no chance to discuss the merits or otherwise of the way in which this department functions. Many members

have seen what they consider to be an extravagant waste of money: it may not be so, but it seems to be. We have also seen other problems arise concerning housing: here, there is a little more control with a Minister of Housing and not a Commissioner of Housing, but the trust is a semi-government instrumentality and it is difficult to deal directly through it or discuss its plans and policies in debate in this Chamber. Much criticism has been made of the administration and policies of the Railways Department and, again, Parliament cannot make direct decisions. They can be made only by the Commissioner, and we can only change the Commissioner by direction of both Houses of Parliament.

The present set-up may have been wise in some circumstances, and I think that problems would arise if we brought a department as large as the Highways Department directly under the control of a Minister and a Director of Roads. Doubtless there would be arguments about whether roads should be built and where money should be spent. Parliament is perhaps saved tedious arguments, but it indirectly directs money to be spent by the Highways Department, the Railways Department, and the Housing Trust. Except through their reports, we have no direct information on what they are doing. Our only access to information is through a Minister representing that department. I received a reply today to a question concerning the Highways Department I had asked first on July 22 and again on September 25. This situation would not arise if we had more direct control.

The Public Works Standing Committee and the Highways Department did not have to consider the plans and proposal for building the new Highways Department headquarters, although the cost exceeded \$200,000. This matter was not referred to Parliament, because it was built directly out of Highways Department funds. I am not suggesting that this is a misappropriation of moneys, but Parliament had no say in what was to happen. The money was spent by the department, although it was voted to it under special Acts and not directly by Parliament. It seems wrong to me that this money could have been spent in this way, because it was money which was raised through taxation and for which this House was responsible. In fact, Parliament had no direct control over the way in which this money was spent by the department.

I have spoken previously about the Highways Department and the question of annuality, and I have referred to many instances of waste-

ful expenditure, particularly towards the end of the financial year when the department realizes that it will have funds in reserve. It informs a council that it can make moneys available if the council can spend it before the end of the financial year. Roadworks and other works are undertaken in conditions not best suited to this work. The work is more expensive and far less effective than it would have been if it were carried out at the right time of the year with less haste and less pressure. At present it seems that there is no way to carry these funds forward and for them to be credited to a job to allow the council to spend them at the most appropriate time.

This is the type of thing that a public accounts committee could consider: whether this was the wisest system of finance and whether there could not be a better way of using taxpayers money in the interests of the State and the people for whom the services are being provided. We have witnessed the question of contract versus daywork, another matter that has been resolved as a political issue because of the variance of thinking of the two opposing Parties. This could be investigated by a public accounts committee to decide whether the advantages were in favour of contracting and, if they were, what benefit there would be to carry out Government works in this way, as opposed to the other system of daywork.

Other matters relating to the expenditure of moneys can cause concern: I refer particularly to the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. When this scheme was proposed and presented to councils it was to them a major work. However, today it has grown into a project almost twice as large as was originally expected, and where Parliament was thinking of spending no more than \$4,000,000 on the total project we are now considering a possible expenditure of \$8,500,000. The Public Works Committee has had to look once again at this project, which had previously been referred to it. This matter ought to be looked at critically in order to see why the mistake was made in the first place and whether it might have been avoided, and whether mistakes were not made which proved costly. After all, taxpayers' and ratepayers' money is being used to complete this most necessary project, although it is not being completed in the way originally planned or to the extent originally thought necessary when money was appropriated for the purpose. The Commonwealth Government Public Accounts Committee possibly received

more glory as a result of its investigation into the exercise undertaken in Bell Bay, Tasmania, than it did from any other inquiry.

The F111 contract was a matter into which I understand the Chairman of the Commonwealth committee was hoping his committee would inquire. Had such an inquiry been undertaken, it might have produced some interesting evidence for the Commonwealth Parliament and for people of Australia but, as this matter was not referred to the Commonwealth committee under the provisions of the Parliamentary Accounts Committee Act, Mr. Cleaver, the Chairman, did not have the honour and glory of inquiring into it. I am most grateful for the help that gentleman and his secretary have given me by providing much information on the work of their committee. I am satisfied that, although most of their work is routine, there is a purpose for the committee and that purpose has been established. This committee is continuing to undertake inquiries effectively, and I believe that similar effective inquiries could be made here. There is no need for the committee to be a permanent standing committee, although the Auditor-General's Report would be referred to it annually.

Mr. Broomhill: Whom would you make chairman?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I can think of many people in this House sitting on the back benches who would make an admirable chairman. I refer to the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), who is a qualified accountant, and also the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), an economist. I can see plenty of scope for members of either Party who have special skills to be chairman. A committee of this sort could function whenever there were matters on which the House required specific information.

If we need an ombudsman today to sort out things between the people and the Public Service, having been a member of this place for nearly 12 years I believe it is evident that we need a body to sort things out between back-benchers and the Executive. To suggest that we can obtain the sort of information we require purely by asking questions in the House is completely wrong, because, as Ministers are not obliged to answer questions or to answer them in detail, it may be difficult at times for members on either side to obtain information—

Mr. Clark: You're telling me!

Mr. NANKIVELL: —on important matters. This Bill is drafted in the same way as the Bill I introduced in 1967. I have provided in the

Bill for the constitutional appointment of the committee. I have already stated the reasons why I consider that this committee should be a joint House committee. Similar Bills have foundered in their passages through Parliament, simply because of the differences of opinion existing between the two Houses concerning their authorities in this matter. However, I should now like to see the Bill passed and the committee established.

Clause 4 sets out the committee's term of office, and clause 5 provides for the filling of casual vacancies. Clause 6 provides for the appointment of a chairman and temporary chairman, and clause 7 provides that four members out of a committee of seven will constitute a quorum for the purpose of voting but that a quorum of five members will be necessary to carry a report.

Provision must be made specifically for an officer to be appointed secretary. Once again, the Bill provides for the appointment of an honorary committee and, as I have suggested, the only way in which such a committee could function would be not by making it a permanent standing committee but by appointing it for the duration of the Parliament, functioning whenever Parliament required its services. The committee would comprise members who might be members of other committees simultaneously and who would be required to consider specific matters as they arose rather than merely being required to fill in time by inquiring into insignificant matters. I repeat that the committee would be able to consider major matters affecting this Parliament. I have set out the committee's duties in clause 9, paragraphs (a) and (b), as follows:

- (a) to examine the accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the State and each statement and report transmitted to the Houses of Parliament by the Auditor-General, pursuant to the Audit Act, 1921-1966, as amended;
- (b) to report to both Houses of Parliament, with such comments as it thinks fit, any items or matters in those accounts, statements and reports, or any circumstances connected with them, to which the Committee is of the opinion that the attention of the Parliament should be directed;

It is unlikely that the committee would be, on its own account, investigating the activities of departments. It is also unlikely that matters would be referred to it as a matter of procedure: there would be a special reference. If the committee were appointed, as I

have suggested, as an honorary standing committee, it could function similarly to the way in which, for instance, the Library and Printing Committees function, for these are similar types of committee that meet when there are matters to be considered. Paragraphs (c) and (d) set out further duties as follows:

(c) to report to both Houses of Parliament any alteration which the Committee thinks desirable in the form of the public accounts or in the method of keeping them, or in the mode of receipt, control, issue or payment of public moneys;

and

(d) to inquire into any question in connection with the public accounts which is referred to it by either House of Parliament, and to report to that House upon that question.

The committee would have to have powers similar to those of other committees in regard to summoning witnesses, as well as powers similar to those of a Royal Commission in regard to producing documents. It must also have power to sit when Parliament is not in session. The Governor would need to have the right to set up the necessary regulations to make such a committee effective. I believe the Bill has a useful purpose and that the matters I have outlined merit the consideration of members. Considering that inquiries should be undertaken in certain areas, I have referred to particular departments to indicate this. I have chosen to highlight the Highways Department not because of any vindictiveness on my part but because I have been able to illustrate several instances of the functions of that department that I believe could well be looked at. Of course, other matters affect the functions of the Treasury itself and the use and appropriation of Loan funds for various purposes.

Provision is made in section 5 (3) of the Public Purposes Loan Act for the Treasurer to spend Loan moneys on purposes other than those for which Parliament originally voted them as long as the total expenditure does not exceed the original vote. Also, there are Governor's warrants which, although they come forward to this House in the form of Supplementary Estimates, are not presented to the House in great detail unless challenged. These and other matters of finance I think are important to Parliament. This House has the responsibility for collecting and distributing moneys raised by means of taxation. It also has the responsibility for seeing that the Executive effectively

administers the departments which are under Parliament's control and for which Ministers are directly responsible. As members of this House we have the responsibility also to see that the money collected and voted for the purposes outlined in the Budget is spent efficiently and effectively and in the best interests of the people represented by members of this Parliament.

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

EDUCATION ACT REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hudson.

(For wording of motion, see page 1875.)

(Continued from October 1. Page 1878.)

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE (Minister of Education): I could say that I was at a loss to know why the member for Glenelg moved this motion, but that would not be true. It is almost invariably predictable that, if there is something on which the honourable member can throw suspicion, he does so whether or not there are grounds for doing so. Throughout his speech he suggested there were some sinister motives behind the Government's taking the action it had taken, action which was perfectly constructive and which the Government believed would spread benefit to more students, and incidentally to more parents, than would the continuation of these bursaries, scholarships and studentships. The member for Glenelg said:

I suppose it was done this way—

he was talking about the regulations being dealt with together—
taking the view that if they were all put together it would be more difficult to disallow that part dealing with the termination of the State scholarships scheme.

Of course, that is suggesting that we were trying to cover up something. That may be the honourable member's opinion, but it is certainly not what the Government had in mind. He went on in this rather sneering sort of way to say:

I do not accept this point of view—

and he was referring to the explanation given by the Director-General to the Subordinate Legislation Committee (of course, he had had an opportunity to peruse the report, which was perfectly straightforward and which was accepted by the committee, even though the Opposition members on the committee voted against it)—

I think it is just a way of putting it across to the public, and of mis-representing the position to the public, to suggest that, in order to help pay an increase in the secondary book allowance for fourth-year and fifth-year students, the whole State scholarships scheme must be terminated.

Several factors were taken into account in the recommendation that I made to Cabinet that the State scholarships scheme should be discontinued, and none of these factors included the hypothesis drawn by the honourable member that I was under pressure by Cabinet to increase the secondary book allowance and that, in order to increase that allowance for fourth-year and fifth-year students, it was necessary to discontinue the scholarships scheme. In fact, the position was absolutely the reverse of that.

I will state the main factors influencing my decision to recommend this to Cabinet. Members opposite will probably be interested in this because, since 1966 (during the term of the Labor Government), no bursaries based on the Leaving certificate have been awarded to enable students to study at the University of Adelaide, the Flinders University, or the Institute of Technology. In that year the Leaving examination was discontinued as the matriculation or entrance requirement for the universities. At the same time it was decided not to award the bursaries based on the Leaving Honours examination, which had been replaced by the new Matriculation examination. That decision was made by my predecessor (Mr. Loveday), and there was no outcry against it whatever; obviously Opposition members accepted that action by the previous Minister. The number of bursaries discontinued at that time was 66, and the money devoted to the payment of those bursaries reverted to the general funds of the Education Department, whereas today we intend to put it to a specific purpose.

Regarding some of the other bursaries and studentships, for several years the response to the evening studentships had been poor and, in fact, no award had been made since 1967. These scholarships were offered for competition only among persons attending or intending to attend part-time lectures at the university or the Institute of Technology with a view to graduating or securing a diploma. Each studentship was valued at \$96 a year, plus \$12 for practical or laboratory work, and they were tenable for five years. The cost was met by the University of Adelaide and the Institute of Technology. Further, since 1965 the Commonwealth Government has

awarded secondary scholarships, the number of such scholarships being based on the State's population. Of course, this number will increase in keeping with the increase in population in the State, and the population is already showing signs of increasing under the present Government. In 1969, 1,009 secondary scholarships and 255 secondary technical scholarships were awarded by the Commonwealth Government.

As it was estimated that a saving of \$100,000 a year would ultimately result from the discontinuance of the State scholarships, and as the scholarships applied to fourth-year and fifth-year students, it was considered reasonable to provide worthwhile assistance regarding the books of all students at these levels rather than to assist a few students through scholarships. At no stage has it been suggested that the department should discontinue the State scholarships scheme in order to save money, which was the proposition put forward by the member for Glenelg. The whole proposal was on the basis of using the money to greater advantage.

With the discontinuance of the Intermediate examination as the basis for the award of State secondary scholarships, an alternative examination would have had to be used to continue the award of State scholarships but, as we had just discarded a general education examination at the third-year level, we were not anxious to institute another one, because this step was considered to be a definite advance. The tests prepared by the Australian College of Educational Research, and used for the Commonwealth secondary scholarships scheme, could have been used but, instead of continuing to award 660 additional secondary scholarships, it was decided (rightly I believe) that the benefit of an increased book allowance to 16,741 secondary students was preferable.

The member for Glenelg said that it was double talk by the Government to suggest that in order to increase the book allowance for fourth and fifth-year students it was necessary to discontinue the scholarships scheme. But this was not said. He also said that the Minister indicated that 733 exhibitions, scholarships and bursaries had been discontinued following a recent amendment of the education regulations. As I said earlier, about 75 of them were discontinued by the previous Minister of Education (Hon. R. R. Loveday), a member of the Opposition Party, and there was no protest made at the time of their discontinuance. The member for Glenelg also claimed that the State scholarships scheme and the Commonwealth secondary scholarships

scheme did not distinguish between the means of the parents of the children concerned, but admitted that there was a problem of finding a satisfactory way of making these awards. He suggested that because of the tests conducted for the Commonwealth secondary scholarships scheme—

Mr. Lawn: Who prepared your report?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I prepared it.

Mr. Lawn: Couldn't you give it off the cuff?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I think that I can decide that matter, not the member for Adelaide.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Education.

Mr. Lawn: You might guide the Minister, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The member for Glenelg suggested that, because of the type of test conducted by the Government for the Commonwealth secondary scholarships, probably a higher proportion of the scholarships went to students from better-off families, but I suggest that this statement conflicts with his later statement that the tests did not put any significant extra pressure on students because they were the kind of tests which, in general, involved the students' intelligence and were not the sort of thing requiring much learning to be done. The member for Glenelg has not produced any evidence to substantiate his observation that a higher proportion of scholarships goes to students from better-off families. The member for Glenelg said:

It has always seemed to me that the real case for scholarships of this kind, which are designed to encourage students to continue their secondary schooling to the Matriculation level, involves providing additional financial assistance for parents of bright children who are in difficult economic circumstances.

I suggest that the recently announced increased boarding allowances help to do this very thing.

Mr. Langley: The honourable member must have made a good speech.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: There were so many inaccuracies in it that I am quoting from it verbatim. He also said:

The State Government has taken the easy way out. It was committed to certain increases in secondary book allowances, and in many cases these increases will be welcome.

I would like to know how the idea was conceived that the Government was committed to increases in secondary book allowances. I should like to know on what ground the honourable member made such a statement,

because there are no such grounds. He is always suggesting that I am under pressure by my fellow members of Cabinet to do certain things, but the Attorney-General will agree that I can more than hold my own in Cabinet on matters relating to my department.

Mr. Clark: You must admit that the competition is not very keen.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It's very keen.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It has been proved time and time again that the member for Glenelg jumps to conclusions on so many things and is later proved wrong. His speech was full of so many comments he later contradicted that it is interesting for me to quote from it. He also said:

In an ideal state one would like to see as much assistance as possible given to parents but, in establishing priorities, we must see that we give the maximum assistance to those groups within the community that most need it.

But why did the previous Government not do something about it instead of discontinuing bursaries?

Mr. Hudson: If you were less interested in Party politics and more interested in educational problems, it would be better.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Of course, the member for Glenelg is not interested in Party politics! He is talking tongue in cheek.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The previous Labor Government discontinued bursaries based on the Leaving and Leaving Honors examinations. The honourable member asked me the following specific question last Wednesday:

Is the purpose of providing book allowances or scholarships in place of book allowances just to provide more money to parents or is the purpose of scholarships to provide an award for the honour and glory of the students?

I have always believed that the whole idea of scholarships was that they were awarded on the basis of sheer academic merit. I believe this is the definition that most people would place on the word "scholarship".

Mr. Clark: What is the purpose of a scholarship?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: How elementary can the honourable member get! I thought he would have known.

Mr. Clark: It seems fairly obvious that you don't.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Obviously, I have got under the skins of some honourable members. Members opposite are full of interjections because they do not like what I am telling them; they do not like being told the truth.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The whole trouble with the member for Glenelg is that when he hears the truth he cannot accept it. He is the first one to doubt any statement made by a Minister. Last Wednesday he said:

I do not accept for one moment the following answer given by the Minister today:

No annual saving in money will accrue to the Education Department as the result of this decision, as the money which will be saved will be used to pay the recently increased book allowance for fourth and fifth-year secondary students.

Then, the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) interjected:

What relationship is there between these two subjects?

Who said there was any relationship? This is where the whole argument of the member for Glenelg breaks down. There is no relationship between these two things. It was a statement of fact in reply to a question from the member for Glenelg, who later said:

It is simply gobbledegook on the Government's part to suggest that its scholarships have to be terminated in order to finance the increase in the secondary book allowance.

No-one said this: this was merely the honourable member's own interpretation. The member for Glenelg later said:

What I think has happened is that other Cabinet members have said to the Minister of Education, "If you want to increase the secondary book allowance you must find some other way of financing it, because you are not getting any money from the Treasury to increase it."

What nonsense!

Mr. Clark: That is not an answer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The member for Glenelg suggested that the State Government should continue to award scholarships on a different basis by using the tests used by the Australian Council for Educational Research and by requiring the students to be subject to a means test. I do not think we should entertain awarding scholarships subject to a means test. I believe that the scholarships should be

awarded on the basis of academic merit without any restrictions on the students competing for the award.

Mr. Hudson: Would you award scholarships to the Leader's children?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: They are children with a wealthy father, of course.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will deal now with the reasons why this action was taken. The question of providing an incentive to parents in poor circumstances to give their children an opportunity of completing the fourth and fifth years of secondary education should, I believe, be considered separately as a social welfare problem, not as part of a competitive scholarship system. We all know that many difficulties are associated with determining the level of income that should be used as a basis for a means test. The administration of a State scholarships scheme that is based on a means test would place the Government in an invidious position, because no matter what means test was devised there would always be deserving cases that would fall outside the limit and less deserving cases that would fall within the limit. Also, the administration of this scheme would become costly because more officers would have to be appointed to police the means test and to process the applications.

The honourable member said, too, that he does not accept the fact that additional money above the savings from terminating the scholarships scheme will be needed to meet the cost of the increased book allowances. Well, he is in for a shock, because it is estimated that a saving of \$100,000 a year will result from the discontinuance of the State scholarships system. In May, there were 16,471 secondary students in fourth and fifth year classes and, with the increase of \$6 a year in the book allowance for these students, the cost of the increased allowances will be \$98,826 a year. To this figure must be added the cost of the State secondary scholarships, which will not be discontinued until the end of 1970. For the year 1969-70 the estimated cost is \$47,000. So, the Government has been required to find an additional \$45,826 in 1969 on account of the increased book allowances.

Mr. Hudson: Where did I make the statement that you attributed to me?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: You referred to what Cabinet members were supposed to have said. You said:

I think that statement is also gobbledegook. What I think has happened is that other Cabinet members have said to the Minister of Education, "If you want to increase the secondary book allowance you must find some other way of financing it, because you are not getting any money from the Treasury to increase it."

The honourable member suggested, too, that the Government did not consider any other ways of continuing the scholarships previously awarded on the basis of the examination. All I can say about that comment is that it just is not true. Before this decision was made we considered three courses of action. One was that we might continue awarding the scholarships based upon an internal departmental examination at the third-year secondary level. I pointed out the disadvantages and the difficulties that would have occurred had we done this. Secondly, we could have arranged for the Australian Council for Educational Research to conduct tests similar to those conducted for the Commonwealth secondary scholarships and to award State scholarships on the results of those tests.

Thirdly, we could have discontinued all scholarships that were based upon an examination at the third-year level. It was decided not to do any of these things because it was considered that the benefit could be spread to a greater number of students by the granting of additional book allowances than if the secondary scholarships scheme was continued. As I said before, it would have meant that, instead of 660 students benefiting from the secondary scholarships scheme, nearly 16,500 fourth-year and fifth-year students would derive a benefit from an increased book allowance, which would naturally have been of considerable financial benefit to their parents also.

Of course, a precedent had already been established for the discontinuance of the Leaving scholarships and bursaries because of the discontinuance of the Leaving examination. The same step was therefore followed because it was considered that greater advantage would accrue than if these secondary scholarships were continued, when the examination on which they were based at Intermediate level had also been discontinued.

I believe that the Government acted correctly in moving that the regulations be deleted and that the money, which would otherwise have been spent on scholarships that were no longer easy to apply because of the circumstances I have mentioned, should

be devoted to giving a wider spread of advantages to fourth-year and fifth-year students. Of course, when the previous Minister approved the discontinuance of the Leaving bursaries and scholarships, the money that was saved was put to no particular purpose at all: it simply reverted back into the general funds of the Education Department. Here we are doing something positive that will help the students and their parents. If these regulations are disallowed (and I leave it to the good sense of members to vote against the motion)—

Mr. Hudson: We are not moving to disallow the book allowances; I hope you realize that!

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I realize that. That was perfectly clear from the disallowance motion moved by the honourable member. I hope honourable members will reject the disallowance motion, believing that the action taken by the Government will give the greatest spread of advantages to fourth-year and fifth-year students and their parents, who will benefit from increased book allowances.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I have sat here for some time and listened to the Minister, and I have tried to follow the argument that she has been putting to the House.

Mr. Clark: You should get a scholarship for your patience.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I must confess I was unable, giving it all the attention I could, to follow the extraordinary discrepancies in the Minister's argument.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: They are nothing compared with the discrepancies in the speech of the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister became aerated at interjections from this side of the House. I sat quietly and listened to her because evidently she wanted members on this side to listen to her with great attention. I paid her that courtesy to discover what it was the Minister was trying to tell the House. I confess I was not able to find that out with any great clarity, but I will try to wend my way through the thicket. The Minister said there was no connection at all between the matter of increasing secondary school book allowances and the discontinuance of the bursaries and State scholarships, and that the Government was doing the two things separately. The fact that they happen to be mentioned in the regulation together was purely

fortuitous and it was wrong, indeed deceptive, of the member for Glenelg to suggest that they were dependent on one another! I refer the Minister to her words and to those of the Director-General. On October 1, when replying in this House on the question of the discontinuance of the bursaries and State scholarships, the Minister said:

The money saved will be used to pay the recently increased book allowance for fourth-year and fifth-year secondary students.

There was no equivocation about it: it was perfectly obvious. In his evidence before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, the Director-General (and apparently the Minister would approve of what he was saying in evidence on her behalf before this committee) said:

To compensate for the discontinuance of the State scholarships scheme and to put to wider use the moneys previously expended on the scheme, regulation 3 of Part 20 has been amended to provide for an increasing book allowance by \$6 a year to secondary students at fourth-year and fifth-year levels so as to have a book allowance of \$24 for fourth-year and \$26 for students in the fifth-year.

Mr. Clark: But today that is not so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is what the Minister said in part of her speech; in other parts she tended to repeat those things that were said elsewhere. I was not able to follow the vehemence with which she tried to dissociate the two matters. They are clearly associated, and they have been clearly associated in Government statements. The Opposition contends that it is necessary to maintain the State bursaries and scholarships system, but to revise it so that it provides a benefit to keep at school the children of poorer families. That should be the main benefit, because the Commonwealth scholarships scheme is not used basically for that purpose. That is the difficulty we face at present: we are not getting an equality of educational opportunity, because children who come from families with poor provision in money are still finding difficulties in continuing secondary school attendance and going on to tertiary education.

A high proportion of those going on to tertiary education at present come from the wealthier sections of the community. Of the Commonwealth secondary scholarships, 4 per cent of the students eligible to sit for them (that is, students in the relevant years at State schools) get them; 7 per cent of students at Catholic schools get scholarships; and 14 per cent of children at other non-government schools get these scholarships.

Mr. Broomhill: Completely the reverse of what the Minister said a while ago.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is a percentage of the total student number, not a percentage of the scholarships themselves. This clearly means that the scholarships scheme is not being used to redistribute income to ensure that the children who come from families in economic difficulties are assisted by the scholarships system to stay in secondary school.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: Why didn't you do something in 1966?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At that time there was a transitional stage in the arrangements for the examination system in South Australia, as the Minister well knows. At that time we had the transition from the Leaving Honours examination to a Matriculation examination on a different basis, and it was forecast that there would be alterations to the other public examination systems. In order to get a satisfactory bursary system in consequence, it would be necessary to revise the whole of the bursary system in due course to enable bursaries to be granted on the new type of test that was subsequently adopted by the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth is not now awarding scholarships on the Intermediate examination: it is awarding them on a test that was referred to by the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: We were awarding scholarships on the Intermediate examination.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: True, but it is not necessary to do this any longer, because we could attach a bursary system, in addition to the Commonwealth system, to the kind of test that the Commonwealth is now making, but see to it that the money from our bursary system went to those particular areas in the State where students needed help in order to stay in secondary school, in the cases where they are not able to get Commonwealth scholarships. This is an essential work to be undertaken by Governments in Australia but, at present, this is not being undertaken. If the bursary system is removed, the mere increase of the book allowance by this small amount proposed is not going to keep a child from a poor family in a secondary school.

I am not protesting about the increase in the secondary school book allowance. I am saying that there is a real social need, which is not being coped with and which will not be coped with if the State bursary system is ended. It will be much better and more

advisable to revise the State bursary system, so that those children who would stay in secondary school if they had a State bursary and who do not now get Commonwealth scholarships were to be given help. Surely this should not be a matter of Party politics. Surely the Minister can see that there is a basic merit in that argument. She must know that there are children in the categories to which I have referred. The statistics returned to the Education Department of the drop-outs from secondary and technical schools must show that there is some relationship between the drop-out and the means of the parents.

That being the case, are we to say, "Well, it is better to do nothing at all about it, so we will forget about it. The Commonwealth scholarships system will be sufficient, because it is based on a competitive test. The people at the top get them regardless of a means test"? The fact is that the Commonwealth scholarships system in these circumstances is, in fact, increasing the disadvantage of children from poorer families. It is doing little to assist those children unless they are particularly bright students. The statistics I have given show just how greatly the students in State schools are disadvantaged by a system without a means test.

Why should we stop an additional system of bursaries and grants that could give very real relief in this area? The Minister's answer is to suggest that on this side of the House what we say is so different from what she is proposing as to be playing Party politics. It is not. I wish the Minister would listen to a case from this side of the House occasionally and realize that there is merit in a case put forward on behalf of the poorer children in our school, that there could be real advantages if she were to revise the bursary system. It is no answer to a case of this kind to say, "Why didn't you do something about it when you were in office?"

The Hon. Joyce Steele: What about the increased book allowance?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister must know that the increase in the school book allowance would not keep one of the children at school who would now be dropping out of school because of the lack of means of the parents. Does the Minister really suggest that the increase in book allowance for fourth-year and fifth-year students will keep one more child at school? She cannot; it is absurd to suggest that. What is happening is that a redistribution of income to the parents of the poorer children

in the community is becoming ignored in favour of spreading the money as widely as possible among those who need help as well as those who do not need help. We need to do something about the rate of drop-out of children of poorer families. I do not believe that by discontinuing bursaries we are doing the right thing. The bursary system should be revised so that we can assist the children who need assistance in this State.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

MURRAY RIVER STORAGE

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

(For wording of motion see page 1560.)

(Continued from October 1. Page 1880.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I support the motion. The Premier said that if we passed it we would be tying our hands and that therefore we should not do so.

Mr. Hurst: That is ludicrous.

Mr. HUDSON: It is ludicrous coming from the Premier; he would not worry about what he voted for on this occasion or on any other occasion, so why he should be worried about that is something beyond my understanding. I want to deal with certain matters raised by one or two members opposite. First, the member for Chaffey (Mr. Arnold) peddled certain stories which have been put around but which have no basis in fact or in any document or statement that I have seen or that has been publicly circulated. For example, he said that if Sir Thomas Playford had been Premier in 1967 South Australia would never have agreed to the deferment of the Chowilla dam, and presumably it would have been proceeded with and built. Nobody, least of all the member for Chaffey, has informed this House what South Australia could have done at that time against the opposition of New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth to the letting of the contract for the Chowilla dam. The honourable member refused to say what the alternative was and what Sir Thomas Playford would have done or what any other person could have done. That statement by the honourable member was merely a piece of political window-dressing. In fact, members opposite were so confident about the position of Sir Thomas Playford in this matter that this Government, no doubt in co-operation with the Commonwealth Government, has ensured Sir Thomas Playford's absence from the country until the election is over.

Mr. Evans: No politics!

Mr. HUDSON: Will the member for Onkaparinga explain why it is that Sir Thomas Playford's trip to Bangkok (I think it is) on behalf of the Commonwealth Government means that he will not arrive back in South Australia until October 24 or 25? What a fortunate coincidence! Am I playing politics if I point out that this Government had nothing to do with the convenient absence of Sir Thomas Playford from South Australia while campaigning for the Commonwealth elections is taking place? Do members opposite mean to tell me that Mr. Gorton did not say to Mr. Hall, "What on earth do we do with Sir Thomas Playford?" Are members opposite prepared to deny that discussions on the advisability of Sir Thomas Playford's going overseas at this time took place between the State and Commonwealth Governments?

Mr. Evans: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Onkaparinga says that, but that proves nothing at all.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: What rubbish!

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that Sir Thomas Playford's absence has anything to do with the motion.

Mr. HUDSON: I consider it to be very relevant. The Minister says it is rubbish. I am amazed that Sir Thomas Playford will not get back from his trip until October 24. The pleasure on the faces of members opposite reveals their true feelings about the matter. Nobody is more delighted than the members opposite that they have managed to get Sir Thomas Playford out of South Australia for the four vital weeks of the election campaign, because he is not likely to issue statements on Chowilla from Bangkok. He said that it was in the hands of the people of South Australia to decide whether or not Chowilla would be built.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: As I was saying, Sir Thomas Playford said that the people of South Australia had it in their hands to determine whether or not Chowilla would be built. What he meant to do by that was to give the Commonwealth Government a nasty shock at the first opportunity on October 25, and someone has seen to it that he will not be around to say it again prior to the Commonwealth elections. I suggest the Prime Minister will be embarrassed that the South Australian

Parliament has been kept sitting while the election campaign is in progress. The member for Chaffey and other members opposite have said that, had Sir Thomas Playford been in power in 1967, he would have waved the magic wand and that the River Murray Commission would not have dared not to let the contract for the dam. That is nonsense. Do they mean to tell me that the representatives on the commission of Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth would have bowed down to Sir Thomas Playford if they had disagreed on this particular issue as violently as they have? The member for Chaffey knows that what he has said, although no doubt it goes down well in his district, is rubbish and that he should not repeat it here.

Mr. McAnaney: It is not rubbish.

Mr. HUDSON: It is rubbish.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUDSON: Not one Government member has ever said what was the alternative to deferment. The only alternative, which no Government member has ever said should be taken, was to go to arbitration immediately, instead of waiting for further information on the issues on which he had to go to arbitration, involving the cost of the alternative and the problem of salinity in particular. What, in 1967, were the alternatives to going to arbitration immediately?

Mr. McAnaney: What you didn't do in 1965-66 is relevant.

Mr. HUDSON: Let me remind the member for Stirling of what the present Treasurer said in the 1967 debate, namely, that the planning for the Chowilla dam started to run into difficulties in 1962-63. Any member who knows the record of this matter knows the difficult engineering problems that had to be solved and how these problems caused delays in preparing plans to go to tender. Surely the member for Stirling is aware of this. The Treasurer was certainly aware of it and said so in this House, and the reference is in *Hansard* for everyone to see. What was the alternative to what we did in 1967? I suggest the only alternative was to go to arbitration immediately. The risk at that time in going to arbitration immediately was that the arbitrator would have said, "All the River Murray Commission wanted to do was undertake further studies in order to get information on the issues before me, and I want that additional information."

Therefore, the deferment was agreed to by the South Australian representative. It is simply not true that anything else could be done to ensure the letting of the contract at that time. Even if Sir Thomas Playford had been Premier, nothing could have been done about it, and the member for Chaffey, like every other member, knows that to be true. No-one has ever suggested what the alternative was. All members opposite have done is come out with such statements as, "The Labor Government was responsible for deferment in 1967," as though we had the majority of votes on the River Murray Commission, and, "If Sir Thomas Playford had been there, it would have been different."

Mr. Venning: That's right.

Mr. HUDSON: Not one member, let alone our intellectual friend from Rocky River, has been able to suggest what could have been done or what Sir Thomas would have done. I suppose he would have waved the magic wand.

Mr. Venning: They wouldn't have pushed Sir Thomas around.

Mr. HUDSON: Really and truly, honourable members opposite are so ridiculous! Anyone can be out-voted—even Sir Thomas Playford. He was out-voted in 1965 and had to accept it. He had only one vote on the commission, so what would he have done? Members opposite should cease being so abysmally and ridiculously pathetic in the remarks they make on this subject.

Mr. McAnaney: What you didn't do from 1965 until 1967 is the important factor.

Mr. HUDSON: What has that got to do with determining what he should have done in 1967 compared with what we did? Will the honourable member explain that? There has been no explanation of it from one member opposite, and this whole matter is a nice stinking fish (I will not even dignify it by saying that it is a red herring) drawn across the trail in an attempt to shift the blame on to the Labor Government.

Mr. Venning: Are you referring to the motion?

Mr. HUDSON: I am referring to the statement made by the member for Chaffey about 1967. He made it clear that he considered that the Labor Government was entirely responsible and that all this had nothing to do with the Liberal Governments of Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth. We all know from the minutes of the River Murray

Commission, so kindly provided to me by the Minister of Works, who are the people on the River Murray Commission attacking Chowilla. The Minister and every other member know that the Commonwealth Minister for National Development, Mr. Horsfall (the Victorian representative under Sir Henry Bolte's direction) and the New South Wales representative are the people who have expressed themselves openly on the commission.

It is recorded in the minutes that those people are completely opposed to the Chowilla proposals and were so opposed nine months before the technical committee ever produced a report, having made up their minds on the matter. Let me remind honourable members of what happened at the commission meeting on April 24, 1968, recorded in the minutes 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 did not kid anyone about its being purely a technical matter; he knew it was political. The minutes continue:

He quoted both major political Parties in South Australia as having undertaken to proceed with the construction of Chowilla, 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.

This refers to Mr. Fairbairn, nine months before the technical committee published its report.

Mr. Clark: He was log-rolling.

Mr. HUDSON: That is right; he knew what the score was, and it did not matter what the committee said. The following passage occurs later in the minutes:

Mr. Horsfall—

that is, the Victorian representative—said 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.

He meant, "We all know what the answer will be, but I will have an informal talk with Mr. Beaney at this meeting and he can have six months to convince his Government." The report continues:

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 clearly the main attitude of the President, who is concerned at the agitation in his district along the river.

Mr. Evans: Did he refer to his district?

Mr. HUDSON: No, but what does the honourable member think he had in mind?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: We think you're making an unfair imputation.

Mr. HUDSON: The Minister of Lands should grow up. He knows what was the score with the Minister for National Development and he knows the Minister was determined to kill the project long before these minutes were made.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You're very good at accusing people.

Mr. HUDSON: If the Minister wants to read the minutes, I have no doubt the Minister of Works will give him a copy, and he can then find out what was Mr. Fairbairn's attitude. Mr. Fairbairn was concerned with the excess demand for water in New South Wales and Victoria.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Did he say that in that document?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You're a great man for making insulting imputations.

Mr. HUDSON: If this implication is not in this document, I do not know what implication can ever be drawn. The Minister for National Development makes it clear that he is concerned about the needs of irrigators for more storage, and honourable members know where the demand for excess water for irrigation exists.

Mr. Evans: In South Australia.

Mr. Nankivell: South Australia.

Mr. HUDSON: That is another little untruth that members opposite have been peddling around. Proportionately the excess demand for water for irrigation in New South Wales and Victoria is many times greater than it is in South Australia, and this can be seen from the River Murray Commission minutes, where Mr. Beaney comments on the matter. The minutes state the following:

Mr. Beaney said South Australia was slightly over-committed on diversion requirements and, in answer to a question, quoted volumes totalling 720,000 to 740,000 acre feet a year as its diversion commitment compared with what is understood to be the divertible component of South Australia's entitlement of 690,000 acre feet.

As everyone connected with the Engineering and Water Supply Department knows, that estimated divertible component of 690,000 acre feet has quite a little in reserve. I think that is generally accepted, certainly by Mr. Dridan and I am sure also by Mr. Beaney. Regarding the excess demands for water from the Murray River, the technical committee's report makes it clear that the current requirements for water in New South Wales and Victoria are about 2,800,000 acre feet a year against an assured supply that comes out, by implication, from this report at about 2,250,000 acre feet. In other words, excess demand for water in New South Wales and Victoria for irrigation at the time of the technical committee's report was about 600,000 acre feet a year, while the excess demand in South Australia, probably exaggerated, was only about 30,000 to 50,000 acre feet a year, and that was for all uses—irrigation, industrial and metropolitan domestic. Members opposite should check their facts.

It is clear that pressures have been building up in New South Wales and Victoria because of their system of allowing for water sales as well as for water licences. Where a water sale provision is introduced, the person concerned does not have a permanent entitlement to water and, if it is a year of restriction, he cannot get it. On the basis of water sale, the irrigation is carried out, commitments are entered into by the irrigator, and naturally he screams in a dry year when he cannot get the water he wants because it has to go along the river to South Australia.

Members opposite know that New South Wales and Victoria have been irresponsible in allowing unregulated growth in irrigation demands to occur, yet again they try to spread around the false story that the main problem is in South Australia and that the Labor Government did not face up to its responsibilities. We faced up to our responsibilities, our Government introducing control along the lower section of the river. The fact of the matter (and I believe this is understood generally in the Engineering and Water Supply Department) is that we could currently get by at least for a year or so more.

Mr. Giles: What about the licences issued on the river?

Mr. HUDSON: I would agree that, taking the longer-term view and anticipating the difficulties over Chowilla, certain licences should not have been granted in South Australia. All I am saying is that anything that

occurred in South Australia is nothing compared to the excess demands that have developed in New South Wales and Victoria and will be nothing compared to the further irrigation development that will occur in those States if Dartmouth is built and they reckon they have more water to play around with.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Aren't you concerned with the diversion problem in South Australia?

Mr. HUDSON: That is ridiculous. I have just said that, if the long-range view is taken, certain licences granted under the Labor Government should not have been granted. It is obvious that I am concerned about the diversion problem, as the Minister should know.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You've said nothing so far to help South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: I will come back to the Minister in a moment. I was replying to an interjection from one of his back-bench colleagues. Presumably what the Minister is saying is that his back-bench colleagues are not interested in making interjections that help South Australia. I want to deal with a further canard spread around, particularly by the member for Chaffey (Mr. Arnold) and by other members, that the Chowilla dam will fall apart. What does the member for Chaffey mean by that? I do not know what he means, and he will not explain it.

Mr. Arnold: Ask the engineers and they will tell you.

Mr. HUDSON: They should make public statements about it. If they think the design will not stand up, why are we not told about it? I have said before that I have heard a story from a Canberra source alleging that the design for Chowilla is incompetent and that Chowilla will not work. Is that what the member for Chaffey is saying?

Mr. McAnaney: No.

Mr. HUDSON: What is he saying, and what is the member for Stirling saying? What is wrong with the design of Chowilla, and what are members opposite hiding?

Mr. McAnaney: You're making the speech.

Mr. HUDSON: I am trying to find out the meaning of the member for Chaffey's statement that, if the Chowilla dam were built and if its water level fell below 400,000 acre feet, it would fall apart. In answer to what I said about this, he said that I should

ask the engineers, and that is what the member for Stirling says too. What do they say is wrong with the Chowilla dam and why has no public report been made? Why are snide remarks made about the design of Chowilla not only in Canberra but now apparently in this House also? Who is casting aspersions on the engineers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department?

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You cast plenty of them on the technical committee.

Mr. HUDSON: I did not: I cast doubts on the assumptions made. One cannot disagree with the technical committee's conclusions without casting aspersions on the people who drew up the report or on the people who instructed them on the assumptions they made.

Mr. Nankivell: Fair go.

Mr. HUDSON: Does the member for Albert mean to say that, when a technical committee is asked to make an inquiry, it is not told to assume certain conditions. Whose fault is it when these conditions are assumed? Is it the experts' fault or is it the fault of the people who told them to assume those conditions, and why is it that certain studies—

Mr. Nankivell: Economists may be told to assume things, but scientists never are.

Mr. HUDSON: If the member for Albert reads a copy of the minutes of the River Murray Commission he will see that the technical committee was told to assume certain conditions and that certain studies, particularly those concerned with a minimum flow of 300 cusecs past Mildura, were not carried out. For example, in reply to a question I asked last February, about what would happen with Chowilla with South Australia getting a 1,500,000 acre feet entitlement and a minimum flow of 300 cusecs or zero past Mildura, the Minister replied:

The recent studies indicated that Chowilla could supply South Australia's entitlement of 1,254,000 acre feet in all years and that this was not dependent on the base flow at Mildura. Higher entitlements could only be supplied out of Chowilla with reduced benefits to the upper States, and in this connection it should be noted that the new studies all fail to show benefits to the upper States to the degree promised in the 1961 studies. As has been explained, this is in large part due to the provision of minimum flow conditions past Mildura and applies to flow levels down to 300 cusecs. A precise answer cannot be given to the question of yield to South Australia at a 1,500,000 acre foot

entitlement with minimum flow at Mildura of either 300 cusecs or zero, as this particular condition was not the subject of a study run.

Those studies were supposed to be the subject of a study run, but it was not carried out. Why has the technical committee's report only minimum flow conditions at Mildura of 600 cusecs or 900 cusecs, whereas the 1961 report was based on a zero flow past Mildura in the dry summer months? Members opposite know that that assumption makes a difference and that the technical committee was told to make certain assumptions about minimum flow conditions.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You're struggling.

Mr. HUDSON: I am not. The technical committee demonstrates that, with a reduction in the minimum flow past Mildura from 900 cusecs to 600 cusecs, it increases the yield to the up-river States by 200,000 acre feet a year. The Minister knows that in the terms of the technical committee's report, and this makes a substantial difference. If we received a proportionate increase, again as a result of reducing the flow still further to 300 cusecs past Mildura in the dry summer months, we have a further 200,000 acre feet yield to the up-river States. Why were studies not undertaken?

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I do not think you understand the principle based on flow or no flow.

Mr. HUDSON: I understand that the 1961 studies were undertaken on the basis of a zero flow past Mildura. The whole concept was that the river would be pooled at lock 10, I think. In 1967, one of the big problems was the scream at Mildura about water quality, and we have since been told that a minimum flow of 900 cusecs past Mildura is necessary because the irrigators in that district will not accept anything less. It is necessary to maintain water quality at Mildura, one assumes.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: That is necessary for South Australia.

Mr. HUDSON: If it is necessary to maintain water quality at Mildura, why cannot the irrigators at Waikerie or Mypolonga demand 900 cusecs? Everyone knows this, as well as the Minister.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: If they get 900 cusecs at Mildura, it will help those people, but a zero flow will not.

Mr. HUDSON: If there is a flow of 900 cusecs past Mildura, as against the zero flow proposed in 1961, then 900 cusecs extra in the dry summer months would be coming into Chowilla if Chowilla were built—and Chowilla will do a better job for South Australia as a result.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Rubbish!

Mr. HUDSON: The Minister knows that that is not rubbish but common sense, if Chowilla is constructed.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You're turning your argument around.

Mr. HUDSON: I am not. The Minister knows that the technical committee never asked what would give the highest yield to South Australia. That was not a term of reference the committee had to study. Its term of reference was what would be the maximum yield to New South Wales and Victoria with certain entitlements going to South Australia—1,250,000 acre feet or 1,500,000 acre feet. The critical question was what would give the biggest yield to New South Wales and Victoria. What the Minister has never answered is that, if there is a minimum flow of 900 cusecs past Mildura and Chowilla is built, that will mean more water flowing into Chowilla.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: The question was never asked about the whole system.

Mr. HUDSON: True. There is a comment in the technical committee's report that the yield of the whole system increases with increasing entitlement to South Australia because of the greater use of tributary inflow. That is the only comment in the whole report that departs from giving maximum yields to New South Wales and Victoria.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: If it is increased, the yield from the whole system goes up.

Mr. HUDSON: That is right. That is the only comment made in the report, but there is no attempt to study what system of storage would give the best result to South Australia or to set out in detail what system of storages would maximize the yield of the whole system. There is only this comment: "It is to be noted that these figures do not add up", or words to that effect, "because the yield for the whole system rises with the increase in entitlement to South Australia because there is a better use of tributary inflow, as does the use of Chowilla." I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

THE ESTIMATES

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from October 7. Page 2026.)

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF
FORESTS

Chemistry Department, \$225,963—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$1,556,237.

Mr. GILES: Can the Minister of Lands give details of the provision of \$52,750 for demonstrations and research in connection with the Bushfire Research Committee? Country people will welcome the provision for fire-fighting equipment. I refer to the item "Committee of Inquiry into Wholesale Marketing". The research officers of the Agriculture Department are working to increase the efficiency of the various sections of primary industry. However, research is also necessary into wholesale marketing in South Australia. This work is at present left to the industry itself. Because of the increasing production of our primary industries we must increase our marketing efficiency. Can the Minister of Lands say whether the Government could assist primary producers in the marketing programme in South Australia? Of the 4,700 lb. of cream sold in South Australia at present, an estimated 70 per cent is imported from Victoria, and we should do more research into promoting the sale of our cream. We have an organization promoting sales of fresh fruit, but departmental officers who assist in increasing our production could also help us market our produce. Can the Minister comment on this suggestion?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): The Bushfire Research Committee, now 10 years old, was established by a former Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) with Dr. Melville as Chairman. As well as being a research committee it has also acted as a publicity committee. Through its efforts at fireproofing fence posts it has been shown that creosoted posts are more fireproof than other kinds. It has also made everyone in the State more conscious of the danger of bush fires.

The question about marketing research is more difficult to reply to in a general way. A campaign for the sale of cream is controlled by the Milk Board and the dairying industry, and, unless the Government is specifically asked, it cannot initiate research into the sale of this product. The same would apply to other commodities the marketing of which is conducted by statutory boards, co-operatives or unofficial organizations. The organization marketing the

commodity of which the honourable member is thinking should make a specific request to the Minister of Agriculture for help. I am sure the Minister would be happy to listen to any such request.

Mr. HUDSON: What happened to the \$2,700 provided last year for the Committee of Inquiry into Agricultural Education, when nothing appears to have been spent on fees and expenses? This year only \$1,000 is provided. Also, is it intended that the Committee of Inquiry into Wholesale Marketing shall continue?

Mr. GILES: Having had some association with the committee on agricultural education and Professor Flentje, I commend the committee for its work. There is a gap between the agricultural education now available and that required to enable young men to return to the land. This committee is trying to ascertain the necessary requirements. The course at Urrbrae Agricultural High School appears to fill the bill. I hope the findings of the Committee of Inquiry into Agricultural Education will soon be made public so that specific action can be taken to bridge the gap I have mentioned.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Committee of Inquiry into Agricultural Education is constituted and in operation but I do not know why there was no expenditure last year. It would be a case of sitting fees, because I do not think it travelled very much. The sum provided is a notional figure. All I can say at the moment is that the committee has been sitting, but I shall have to get further information on that. The Committee of Inquiry into Wholesale Marketing sat for a specific period in 1968-69 and has now ceased operating.

Mr. HUDSON: The Committee of Inquiry into Wholesale Marketing may have ceased operating last year because nothing was spent last year. It may have been a committee to be appointed but it did not come into operation. Also, may I have further information on the Committee of Inquiry into Agricultural Education? Having received a letter from the staff of Urrbrae Agricultural High School, detailing deficiencies that members of the staff believe apply at that school, I should be interested if the Minister could say whether or not the committee will be examining thoroughly the position at Urrbrae and, if it has not done so already, whether it will make a complete investigation into that school.

There is a danger in agricultural high schools and in agricultural research work for things to be done in a way that may not be

completely up to standard, because those who are interested in agricultural education do not constitute a significant pressure group within the community and are not able in general to bring much pressure to bear. While agricultural education clearly benefits not only farming people but also the whole community, it is nevertheless true that the publicity given to agricultural education is not significant and that there is not much knowledge within the community generally of the function fulfilled by a school such as Urrbrae Agricultural High School.

There being agricultural high schools in the other States, I should be interested to know whether the committee would be making any comparison of the kinds of activity and work that go on in South Australia with the practices of other States. We are a little inclined in South Australia to be parochial in these matters and to conclude that anything we do here is likely to be better than what is done in the other States, whereas this is the case only some of the time. I would appreciate it if the Minister could later, by way of reply to a question or even by letter, provide me with the additional information for which I have asked.

Mr. VENNING: For the item "Country agriculture and horticultural and field trial societies" there is an increased allocation of over \$5,000 this year. I do not think it is necessary for me to refer to the great benefits to the community, and particularly the farming community, from the activities of country show societies. Only recently, in company with another member, I was present on Northern Yorke Peninsula at one of the finest displays of agricultural machinery ever held in the State. I am pleased that the Government has seen fit to increase the allocation for these societies. Because of an unfortunate change of procedure two or three years ago, concerning the date by which societies were to forward returns to the Agriculture Department, many country show societies missed out altogether on an allocation. Instead of having to be lodged by March, returns were to be lodged by the end of January, and I know this considerably affected societies' building programmes. I trust this situation does not arise again.

Mr. McKEE: I refer to the provision of \$400 for repairs to fishing boat slipways, ramps and facilities. The same sum was allocated last year and only \$100 was spent. Much work of this type could be done, and well over \$400 could be spent in my district

alone. Why was the sum allocated not spent last year, and is the full sum likely to be spent this year?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This reference in the Budget can be misinterpreted as being the total provision for slipways, whereas it is not. That provision is in the Loan Estimates and is \$225,000 for this year. This reference in the Budget was probably originally included years before the slipway programme was ever thought of. It has stayed in the Budget so that from time to time the Minister of Agriculture can use it to provide for small projects, such as self-help projects where a ton of cement or something like that is requested to help people build a slipway for which specifications have not been drawn up by engineers. When requests for small sums are made the Minister and his officers deal with them, and what is provided is not planned from year to year. I doubt that there is any planned expenditure for this year.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF MINES

Mines Department, \$2,184,144.

Mr. HUDSON: I understand that the number of inspectors of mines has been reduced from four to two during the last year and that there is a distinct possibility that this State will be left without any inspectors of mines. I understand that a large discrepancy now exists between the salary of an inspector of mines and the kind of salary that can be obtained by people qualified in this way either in private employment or in Government employment elsewhere. I understand further that the two officers of the department who have left have gone to better paid jobs. I also believe that an approach has been made to the Public Service Board by inspectors of mines and that they have been turned down. The board said that their salaries would not be considered until the professional engineers award had been brought down.

I believe that a special request was made to the board to investigate the differential that applied between the salaries paid to inspectors of mines in South Australia, compared with salaries paid in other States and by the Commonwealth Government. The board's answer is unsatisfactory because this discrepancy will only be heightened by any new professional engineers award and the salary differential will still exist even after the professional engineers award is brought down.

The people involved in this matter, and those who have prospects of promotion to inspector of mines, consider that the board has fobbed them off with its unsatisfactory reply, which is also unsatisfactory from the State's point of view because, after all, the Government has made a great song and dance about its interest in mining and in the encouragement of mining. One would have thought that the Mines Department's professional officers were important people in the field of mining development. It must be a very short-sighted policy which results in significant salary differentials persisting for any length of time. I also point out that the department's overall provision is almost \$50,000 less than the amount provided last year.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: There was an increase last year.

Mr. HUDSON: That is no excuse. The Government made a song and dance about what it was doing for the department last year, but now it has reduced its financial commitment. Last year, the department went nowhere near spending the money provided. For example, the provision for the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, which plays an important role, remains static at \$240,000, although I should be surprised if the laboratories were not experiencing increased operating costs. The continuation of the same grant for the current financial year will involve a reduction in the real value of its activities.

Why has the \$80,000 provided last year for a deep well for petroleum exploration not been spent? Why, of the \$5,000 provided last year for expenses for consultants, has only \$2,000 been spent, and why is the current financial year's provision only \$2,000? Why is it that nothing has been spent on the investigation of ores, etc., whereas \$1,000 was provided last year? Why is it that the payroll tax paid by the department last year was \$1,200 less than the amount voted? Was there a reduction in staff during the year and, if there was, how great was the reduction?

Why is it that the provision for geological and geophysical survey this year is \$6,866 less than it was last year? I would have thought that, if the Government was doing anything more than paying lip service to the need for further development and exploration, this would be one line at least that would show a significant increase. Regarding the drilling and mechanical engineering branch, I should like to know why there is only a minimal increase for boring, drilling and testing of mineral deposits, materials and stores, etc.

Why is it that, for the buildings at the Thebarton depot, only \$9,985 was spent out of the \$29,000 voted last year? Why is the provision of \$14,000 for this financial year a reduction on the amount voted last year? In connection with underground water investigations, will the Premier explain why only \$70,000 is provided for the current financial year? Did the work on underground water investigations proceed a good deal further last financial year than was expected? This may have been the cause, because \$156,886 was spent, whereas only \$100,000 was voted. Did the work proposed proceed at a much faster rate last year, resulting in less need for the work to continue this year? Or, is the work on underground water investigations of a more permanent variety? I would have thought it would be of a more permanent variety, because it is an area where our knowledge of our resources is limited, an area where we have certain fears regarding the permanency of our existing resources, particularly in the basin north of Adelaide.

I would have expected that, in our present state of knowledge and in view of the kinds of problem that face us in connection with underground water, no Government could afford a substantial reduction in the amount spent on underground water investigations. In general, the recital I have given shows that the Government has quite a bit of explaining to do to justify its actions in the past financial year in relation to announcements made and to justify the proposals for the current financial year.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): The honourable member has raised points that are based on variations between actual payments and the amounts voted. I remind him that many jobs in the mineral field are not predictable and quite easily result in expenditure over or under that estimated. Jobs in the mineral field may become matters of urgency within several days or their urgency may disappear altogether. Therefore, it is likely that there will be large variations between the amount voted and the amount spent in respect of some items, especially when they are related to work in the field. Professional mining staff are the backbone of one of the most expansive industries in the world, particularly in Australia, and there is an enormous demand for them. It would be outside the limits of any Government to maintain effective salary competition with the resources available to the great private mining enterprises. This matter receives constant attention from the Public Service Board, but it is not easy for the

board to vary the salary structure of the Public Service for a particular group of its officers, because anomalies are then created.

The member for Glenelg is not entitled to conclude that the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories is reducing its activities, because this is not so. The demand by the Australian mining industry for the laboratory's services is growing, and as it provides a valuable service, its future is one of great expansion. As Acting Minister of Mines this week, I have learned that there has been a great reduction in the demand for well sinking, and the department is probably more slack on this work than it has been for a considerable time. This aspect will show up on next year's Estimates, so the honourable member should expect these variations. I will obtain details about the individual items asked for by the honourable member.

Mr. CASEY: In relation to Mount Painter mining activities, about six or seven years ago the Government was working a mine at Ediacara, west of Beltana, and there were hopeful signs of nickel and copper: eventually, this was found not to be a feasible proposition. As much money was spent on the mine will the Premier ascertain how much money the Government invested in mining the Mount Painter uranium deposit? It would appear at this stage that it would be most unlikely that the Mount Painter deposits could measure up to the new uranium finds in the Northern Territory, which, I am told, are a very high grade ore and are workable on the open-cut system. I understand that the mining at Mount Painter is open-cut. Can the Premier report on the progress made in that area, the amount of money spent, and anything relating to the percentage of ore that is likely to be, or has been, encountered in that area and its possible future?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get the information for the honourable member, if I can. I neglected to say earlier that the money was not spent on the oil exploration mentioned by the member for Glenelg, because successful farm-out arrangements were concluded by the Delhi-Santos group for its leases in the north of the State, and the State Government, through the Mines Department, prior to the farm-out of the leases was engaged in discussions with those companies to try to push on with the exploration of the promising areas they had. The Government was pleased to find that this could be privately arranged

but at the time we set money aside with the prospect in view of drilling a hole in the farm-out area if private industry would not join in.

Mr. HUDSON: I appreciate the problem of obtaining staff for Government departments in almost every professional field, but the fact remains in this case, according to what I am told, that the rate of salary for mining inspectors in South Australia is significantly below that obtaining in other State Departments of Mines. Therefore, will the Premier look into this alleged salary difference and, if the difference is at all significant, will he also request the Public Service Board to look further into the matter in view of the overall urgency of the position of mining inspectors? After all, the quality of a department like the Mines Department depends to a significant extent upon the professional staff it has available. If for any reason there is a drifting away of that professional staff, the quality of the job the department can do is adversely affected. I am not sure of the position; otherwise, I would quote chapter and verse to the Premier.

However, I understand it is not merely a matter of the salary rate being significantly below what is available in private employment. One would expect that sort of differential to exist, but there is also a substantial difference between our Mines Department rates of pay and those in other States. I understand, too, that the Public Service Board has just notified the people concerned that no decision on this matter will be taken until the Professional Engineers Award comes down. They are not happy about that because, when that award comes down and the effect of it is passed on, the differential will still exist.

Professional people are often sensitive about differentials in rates of pay, but I do not think all of them are that sensitive about a differential that exists between Government employment and private employment. When it comes to a substantial differential applying as between Government employment in South Australia, Western Australia and New South Wales, feelings become exacerbated, and the overall problem of retaining staff and of maintaining morale among existing staff may become a serious one. I ask the Premier to examine that particular matter for me to see whether or not the information I have given him is correct and, if it is correct, to ask the Public Service Board to have a further look at the whole matter of salaries in this area to see whether something of an interim nature cannot be done.

Mr. CASEY: I should like also to have some information regarding the investigation carried out into underground water supplies. Several years ago the Queensland Government was alarmed at the low rate of flow of many bores in the Great Artesian Basin, some having almost cut out. The South Australian Labor Government at the time also viewed the situation with alarm, and the Premier will be aware that the basin extends south almost to Copley in South Australia. Instructions were issued within the Mines Department that an investigation be carried out in South Australia into the quality of existing casings of permanent bores. Many of these casings were being replaced, involving a long and rather hazardous job. Water can cause bore casings to deteriorate over a period, with a result that rocks the size of one's fist may come out of the bore and block the valves leading to nearby sheep troughs. Many sheep may then be left without water for a long time.

This was one of the problems encountered several years ago on Muloorina Station. The Mines Department having undertaken to carry out work in this regard, can the Premier say whether that work is still being carried out? A charge was made not against the Government but against property owners, who eventually had to pay for the new casings. Can the Premier tell me just how many bores have been treated along these lines in the last 12 months? If none has been treated, can he say whether any applications have been made for this work to be carried out? Unlike the member for Glenelg, I am concerned not so much with the underground water supply in the area just north of Adelaide, or in the South-East concerning which a survey by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization has just been completed, the results of which were published recently in the newspapers. Being concerned with the Great Artesian Basin, I should be pleased if the Premier could obtain this information for me.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get the information requested by the member for Glenelg and the member for Frome. I am aware of the importance of the artesian basin that extends down almost to Copley. I remember travelling through the area about four-and-a-half years ago and observing the work being done. At that stage it was obvious that some of the work had been completed and that work on other bores was still in progress. I had an early morning

shower under the Lake Harry bore, which was the right temperature, although the water in bores farther up the track was too hot. I will get the information requested by the honourable member.

Mr. McKEE: I understand that private mining companies and departments in other States pay more to geologists than does the department in South Australia. Apparently geologists stay here long enough to gain experience and then go to other States or to other parts of the world. As I know there is a shortage of geologists in the department and that they are difficult to retain there, will the Premier consider offering more attractive salaries to them in an endeavour to stop the loss from this State?

Mr. ALLEN: I was interested to read that copper was discovered in 1843 in the Burra district at Princess Royal, which is eight miles south-east of Burra. In the early days they mined 588 tons of ore which was sent to England for treatment and yielded 25 per cent to 30 per cent copper. In 1867-68 a further 46 tons was forwarded that yielded 8 tons 6 cwt. of copper, a yield of about 20 per cent. In recent years the Mines Department and Mines Exploration Limited have carried out extensive drilling in that district and I have been privileged to see maps and the result of the drilling. Has any drilling been carried out at Princess Royal and, if it has, what are the results?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will do my best to get the information.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF MARINE

Department of Marine and Harbors,
\$3,889,480.

Mr. HUGHES: Regarding the \$1,371,775 provided for maintenance of wharves, jetties, lights, dredged channels, bulk loading plants, commission to Harbormasters, expenses of launches, haulage, working expenses of ports, motor vehicle expenses and sundries, I assume that, in the increase of \$32,307, provision has been made for the cost of the seismic surveys that have been carried out at Port Lincoln and Wallaroo. The people in my district, and for many miles around, are disappointed because the Premier announced at Port Lincoln that a seismic survey had been carried out there but he did not mention the seismic survey of the Wallaroo channels. Both surveys were carried out within a day or two of each other and, because of

this, the people in my district maintain that when the Premier made an announcement concerning a "super" port he should have reserved the announcement until announcing the results of the surveys in connection with "super" ports generally, not just one "super" port. The Premier addressed a public meeting in the Wallaroo Town Hall on July 15.

Mr. Freebairn: It was a good meeting.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, although the good attendance at the meeting was not a result of what the member for Light would have us believe: that the people were supporting the Government; far from it. The Wallaroo meeting, at which the Premier mentioned the seismic surveys, was one of the best-attended meetings that have been held in the town hall, which demonstrated conclusively the concern of a great many primary producers over the export of their grain. The Premier spoke to that large audience for quite some time and explained that the Government had not decided where these "super" ports would go.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Which line is the honourable member speaking to?

Mr. HUGHES: I am speaking on the item dealing with maintenance of wharves and dredged channels.

The CHAIRMAN: The remarks the honourable member is making do not come under the line.

Mr. HUGHES: I will obey your ruling, Mr. Chairman. Does this matter come under "Miscellaneous"?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes; investigations into port sites come under "Miscellaneous".

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$29,175.

Mr. VENNING: Regarding the provision for port sites, I understand that a seismic survey has been conducted not only at Wallaroo but also at Port Lincoln. Can the Minister say whether the provision is sufficient to cover the cost of investigations into a deep sea port in the central area of Yorke Peninsula?

Mr. HUGHES: I wish to refer to the Premier's remarks to the 700 people at the meeting in the Wallaroo town hall. He said that the report on the seismic survey would be available within one month, but it was not available in that time. Although I am not quarrelling about that, I do believe that the Premier should have reserved his remarks until both surveys had been reported on. These surveys were to deal with future "super" ports. Since the

Wallaroo meeting some people have been concerned that the Premier said that, in his opinion, before a decision could be made on a "super" port for Yorke Peninsula it would be necessary to conduct a similar survey at Ardrossan. The people I represent are very concerned that no survey of this kind has been conducted at Ardrossan.

In reply to a question earlier this session the Minister of Marine said that the Government did not intend at that stage to conduct a survey. Some Wallaroo people thought that the views of the Premier and the views of the Minister of Marine conflicted, and many of them are now beginning to say that the wrong person addressed the meeting: it should have been the Minister of Marine, who would have had the facts and figures at his finger tips. If the Premier thought that a similar survey would be required at Ardrossan before it was decided where the "super" port on Yorke Peninsula was to be built, we maintain that it should have been done at that time. We were told that the seismic survey would be more accurate than the pin-pricking method, but people in my district are concerned about what is in the harbour. We understood the Premier to say that when the seismic survey was conducted we would know, but the Minister of Marine said that further investigations of the harbour would have to be made, although the report had been received. People of Wallaroo are concerned, because this is a most important matter and concerns the export of grain from that port. On September 24, a report in the Yorke Peninsula *Country Times* under the heading "Record breaker in Port" states:

The 664 feet *Nestor* berthed at the Wallaroo grain gantry. Longer by seven feet than the State record wheat ship the *Pontos*, the Greek vessel *Nestor* is loading 21,700 tons of wheat in bulk at Wallaroo this week. Destined for China the cargo will be topped up at Geelong, Victoria, with 4,600 tons.

I hope that the Government is concerned about this matter, because large bulk grain carriers are beginning to appear and they should be able to load much greater cargoes than can be carried by present shipping. It is high time that this survey of the harbour was made known. The people at Wallaroo went away from the meeting saying to each other, "We cannot say any more now until we really know what is there; there appears to be some doubt. Some say that the rock there is only soft, with clay underneath." That night we were under the impression that this survey, which would be back again in one month, would reveal what was in the

channel. No good purpose can be served until the Minister can say what is in the seabed. Wallaroo is the logical place for grain to be taken to, and we want these bulk ships to be loaded there.

A report of the comments of Captain W. H. Hilder (Ports and Traffic Manager of the Department of Marine and Harbors) is as follows:

In answer to a question on feasibility of further deepening at Wallaroo, Captain Hilder said that a further 3ft. dredged from berths and channel would enable the port to take double the size ships to which it was at present limited. He thought these could be up to 50,000 dead-weight tons or cargo capacity. So far the port had been able to handle all ships put into it.

That may be so, but when the *Pontos* was there it did not take away a full cargo; it had to leave the port with a whole hatch empty. We had plenty of wheat at Wallaroo and the captain would have been happy to load his vessel there if it had been possible to leave the port fully laden. Wallaroo is the only suitable port in that area, irrespective of what some people may say. A ship of very large capacity has called at the port, and before long ships like that will be calling more frequently at ports that can accommodate them. At present, there is not a port on Yorke Peninsula that can do that.

Mr. Ferguson: But it will not be long.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes; it will not be long before we can accommodate ships at Port Giles, but many farmers do not want to cart their grain there. There may be a good depth of water there, but it will not attract the grain so far down towards the bottom end of the peninsula. Many farmers are out of pocket already; in fact, some of them will be out on the roads soon because of the rise in costs of primary production. They will not be able to meet the added expense of carting their grain from just south of Port Pirie to Port Giles. No doubt, eventually Port Giles will serve a useful purpose, but it is Wallaroo that is the central port because all the grain for many miles around can be channelled into Wallaroo, which, incidentally, has one of the best rail marshalling yards in South Australia. Also, the Government owns the conveyor system there that takes the grain from the silos to the ship's side. We were in considerable trouble concerning the storage capacity for grain to feed the port of Wallaroo. Whereas the Liberal Party has not seemed to be showing much interest in this matter, the Australian Labor Party has been. We are tak-

ing evidence from well-informed people and visiting ports on Yorke Peninsula to ascertain what is required.

Since the committee has been operating, Wallaroo has already been allocated an additional storage capacity of 3,000,000 bushels, and this goes to show that the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited has confidence in Wallaroo. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Venning) is a director of the company, and I am pleased to know that he and his colleagues have confidence in Wallaroo and agree that if the channel and berths there are deepened there will be no difficulty in having wheat shipped from that storage area.

Mr. Hurst: The member for Eyre is smiling; I think he must have had a fair cut.

Mr. HUGHES: I think he is already on my side here and has already referred to this matter in the Chamber. If he follows me tonight, I am sure that he will support me again. This agitation to get the Government on the job is nothing new. I know it takes time to conduct and process surveys, but it seems mighty strange that, although the surveys were conducted within one or two days of each other, the result of one is announced at such an appropriate time, namely, on the eve of a Commonwealth election.

Mr. Virgo: Do you think the Treasurer's representing Port Lincoln might have had anything to do with the announcement?

Mr. HUGHES: I have no doubt that Port Lincoln is well represented by its member, whom I do not blame for one minute if he has been influential in having this announcement made. I say, "Good luck to him"; I should also like to be able to go to a meeting with the Premier at Wallaroo and to make a similar announcement. The people are entitled to know the result. The Premier said at the meeting that it would take a month for it to be known, but that was on July 15, nearly three months ago. It is time the Government did the right thing and did not delay this matter. Believing that the Minister of Marine is genuine in his attempt to have the result of this survey made available, I hope he will prod his officers into making that result known to us soon.

I am particularly concerned about the grain that has to be shipped away from the area. If people are prevented from storing their grain and from having it shipped away, it has to be carted over longer distances, involving additional costs. I do not think any honourable

member representing a country district will disagree with me when I say that primary production costs are rising. This matter has been referred to only recently by an honourable member opposite. I was a primary producer some years ago, and I have always kept closely in touch with the affairs of people in my district; therefore, I know that their costs are rising. If the Government does not do something soon in connection with the Wallaroo harbour, many people will begin to feel the pinch, because it costs them more to transport their grain farther south.

I have had to go to the trouble of outlining the representations I have made about this matter since the session began. However, there is nothing new in having to prod the Government to do something. When the Treasurer was Minister of Marine I had to prod him to get something done, but I did not blame him for he was only one member of Cabinet. Eventually he was strong enough to have his way, and it is through his efforts that the port of Wallaroo can now accommodate ships of the size it can accommodate.

I have said this before not only in this place but also at primary producers' meetings, and the Treasurer was present at Paskeville when I gave him credit for this before a crowded meeting. I hope I will also be able to give the present Minister of Marine credit in this way. We know that the results of the seismic survey will be in our favour. One reason that the Government does not wish to announce the results of the survey is that, when they are known and it is obvious that the job can be done, primary producers, as well as I, will be pressing to have money allocated to have the work carried out. I assure the Government that many of the 700 farmers who waited on the Premier to hear what he said at Wallaroo on July 15 will certainly be making their presence felt soon if something is not done.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I refer to the line "Subsidy towards research into beach erosion". This subsidy is made to the university on the basis, I believe, of \$1 by the Government for every \$2 spent by the university on this research work. I have seen the wonderful work being done with the limited funds available. Can the Minister say how long it will be necessary to continue this research?

Mr. BROOMHILL: I agree with the member for Hindmarsh that the university is doing splendid work, bearing in mind the sum

provided. I am concerned that the sum is limited and that therefore the work able to be performed is also limited. I believe that the Government is not doing enough to ensure that our beaches are properly protected.

Mr. Freebairn: What about groynes?

Mr. BROOMHILL: Perhaps the member for Light has a greater interest in seaside councils than have other members and therefore his knowledge is greater. Some weeks ago I pointed out to the Minister that the Henley and Grange council was undertaking work at West Beach to preserve the beach there. At its own expense it had placed along West Beach some iron mesh fences to collect the sand and to ensure that there would be natural sandhills at the top of the beach. This would have the effect of preventing sand from blowing off the beach, thus enabling the sandhills to be built up. The council was also hoping to plant grass on the sandhills to hold the sand. Week after week it is not uncommon to see great heaps of sand being blown off the beach on to the fences of seafront houses. This sand has to be removed by the council but, shortly thereafter, it is back again. Many other seaside councils could do similar work to this, although it should not be their responsibility to undertake this work as the beaches are not for the sole pleasure of the people living in seaside council areas.

The \$6,000 provided, together with the money made available by councils, is not sufficient to carry out this work. Once sand has been removed it cannot be replaced, and once a beach becomes barren and rocky it is likely to stay that way for a great length of time. Additional money is required to ensure that the beaches are properly protected. A problem exists at Normanville, where the sand dunes are to be removed and the sand used for industry. I attended a seminar in this connection and was most impressed by the way a case was presented in respect of this matter. It seemed obvious to me that this was a backward step, because of the sandhills' historical interest and because they serve as a buffer against the high tides in that area. We can only guess what effect this will have on other areas. If these sandhills go, other beaches will be gouged out and the effect could spread along our coast.

At the seminar some slides were shown, one of which was a photograph taken from the sea; in this photograph one could see that the area above the sandhills was completely bare,

because the sea air had retarded the growth of the vegetation. If the sandhills are levelled, the countryside behind them will suffer, too, because the areas protected by the current sandhills will be left open to the weather. Will the Minister of Marine seriously consider taking greater steps toward preventing beach erosion? Is he aware of the problems of the Normanville people, and does he believe the Government is right in refusing to listen to them?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE (Minister of Marine): I thank members for their interest in these matters. This is the last year of the five-year programme connected with our metropolitan beaches that has been undertaken by Dr. Culver (Reader in Civil Engineering at the Adelaide University). Dr. Culver has presented his interim report, which is based not only on laboratory work but also on investigations and observations of the metropolitan coastal strip. My officers and I have studied the report, which includes certain recommendations on how the beaches can be permanently protected against erosion. I am studying the report to prepare proposals for Cabinet on the steps necessary to implement its recommendations. The report deals entirely with the metropolitan beaches but I believe the lessons learnt could well be applied to some country beaches, too. I am preparing my proposals for Cabinet so that we can place money on next year's Estimates to implement the recommendations in the report. The timing of the work will depend to some extent on the final report.

I am aware of what the Henley and Grange Council has been doing. My officers regularly inspect its work, and I have seen examples of similar work in other parts of the world, particularly Europe. If cover grass could be grown this could be successful. I am aware that parts of the metropolitan beaches are building up with sand whereas others are being scoured out because of the northern littoral drift that occurs on the eastern coast of St. Vincent Gulf. These matters are being considered, and I will also consider the question of the Normanville sands.

The item "Port sites—investigations, etc." has been increased from \$700 voted last year to \$23,175. All that the member for Wallaroo has asked is what we are trying to do, although he made a great point about the matter of one port being determined before the other. I gave him as much information as I could in my replies to his questions, and if he had read

between the lines he would have realized that we were trying to help him by having a seismic survey at Wallaroo as well as at Port Lincoln. The survey was carried out by the survey vessel at Port Lincoln, and the information recorded and posted to Sydney. The boat sailed to Wallaroo, did the job there, and that data was posted to Sydney for processing. Naturally, the results of the Port Lincoln survey were received before that at Wallaroo.

The seismic survey is an accurate method of determining the depth of water in a harbour, channel, or any point at sea. It indicates on a graph details which when interpreted from the computer, show on a chart the various depths which can be interpreted and indicate igneous or sedimentary rock, which could be solid rock or limestone deposits of shells and sand in layers. At Port Lincoln the chart indicated clearly that the main depth of the channel was down to 50ft. or more. This information enabled us to make a decision about Port Lincoln immediately, because the Government had decided that there should be two "super" ports in South Australia for use of vessels no longer of tramp size but the larger ones we hoped to attract of up to 60,000 deadweight tons. A 50ft. draught indicated that vessels of up to 100,000 deadweight tons could be handled if we were able to build facilities to attract that type of ship.

If we are going to develop in order to handle ships of 60,000 deadweight tons we should build in such a way that, with the minimum of additional expenditure, larger vessels could be handled. This is common sense and would help farmers because of the benefits available to them. It is an additional benefit and, unless we can attract these larger vessels, South Australia may be by-passed. It would not attract here the large vessels that are willing to take away from South Australia our grain, because the trend today is towards larger and larger vessels. Shallow ports are diminishing in importance. Of course, we shall always need many of our ports, but there is a pressing need for some "super" ports. In South Australia we need two. One has been announced for Port Lincoln, and the other will be in a central area, obviously on Yorke Peninsula. The Government was able to make an announcement about Port Lincoln at that early stage because the seismic survey indicated a sufficient depth of water.

The member for Wallaroo said, first, that the survey was being delayed inordinately and, secondly, that the Government while carrying

out a seismic survey at Wallaroo was not undertaking any investigations at Ardrossan. I thought that the honourable member, who lives adjacent to that area, would have known a simple fact about Yorke Peninsula: that on the western side of it, which is the weather side, there is rock, and on the eastern side there is much sand, the soil adjacent to the Ardrossan jetty being very sandy; the department has no knowledge of the presence of any rock there. That is why we did not carry out a seismic survey at Ardrossan but carried one out at Wallaroo, because we knew of the presence of rock there, which has so far inhibited any deepening able to be carried out at Wallaroo.

Mr. Hughes: There is no evidence for the Premier's statement on Wallaroo that before any decision could be made it would be necessary to carry out a similar survey at Ardrossan.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: We must carry out a survey at Ardrossan, but not a seismic survey. I want the honourable member to understand this fully. The Government decided to carry out a seismic survey at Wallaroo so that it could assess the merits of the two ports. We do not have to carry out a seismic survey at Ardrossan but we have to make investigations there and, when we get the complete results of the seismic survey at Wallaroo and the investigations at Ardrossan, we shall be able to compare the costs and benefits of the two ports.

As regards the allegation of the enormous delay at Wallaroo, I have seen the preliminary charts evaluating the depth of Wallaroo harbour. As the honourable member knows, the depth that we determined at Port Lincoln is simply not available at Wallaroo. There is much rock at Wallaroo, most of it being, however, sedimentary. Although it is a fairly costly job, sedimentary rock can be dredged. Fortunately, there is no igneous rock, which is commonly called "mother earth" (the very hard rock). Having determined the extent of the layers and the depths available at Wallaroo, I have authorized drilling to take place there in order to ascertain more accurately the various types of rock shown by lines on the graph. I previously told the honourable member that this could not be carried out accurately until we experienced summer conditions. As soon as the weather permits, the work boat will go to Wallaroo and carry out this drilling.

The important thing is that to develop Wallaroo to the desired depth, extensive dredging will be necessary. There is no alternative: dredging would have to be carried out in the channel in the area adjacent to the pier and in the turning circle. Until we know the extent of the various types of sedimentary rock (hard, medium and soft) we cannot accurately assess how much dredging will have to take place. I believe this is elementary, and I hope the honourable member can now see what the Government is trying to do at Wallaroo. We must formulate a feasibility study relating to how much it will cost to make Wallaroo a deep harbour and how much it will cost to make Ardrossan a deep harbour. These are only two facets of the whole matter, other facets to be considered relating to the presence of a rail system, which Wallaroo has but which Ardrossan has not, to the road system and to the convenience of farmers who wish to take their grain to one of the ports, and to access to and the presence of silos.

As the honourable member knows, another silo will be built at Wallaroo under the crash programme now under way. I have set out to explain to him, without the need for his getting as heated as he has, that the Government has carried out its promise and is doing what he hoped it would be doing, that is, finding out whether Wallaroo can be made a "super" port. But I emphasize that we are talking here about many millions of dollars; these ports do not cost peanuts. I have insisted that the most detailed investigations be carried out at Wallaroo and Ardrossan, similar to those carried out at Port Lincoln. Having now determined that Port Lincoln can be the major port on Eyre Peninsula, we must determine one or two other matters. I emphasize that I have insisted that the most detailed investigation take place. I should prefer that this investigation be not unduly rushed, so that we might avoid making any mistakes, because once we build one of these ports we are stuck with it for the rest of our lives. If we put the port in the wrong place, everyone will regret it.

This big increase represents part of the Government's policy of investigating two major or "super" ports in South Australia. However, I warn members that it will be some years before the first port is ready for use, because it will take a few years to investigate the design of the shipping, the method of providing loading galleries and the facilities leading up to this. Added to this is the time taken for the Public Works Committee's investigations, for funding

the project, for seeking the co-operation of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited and for the actual construction. However, the Government is moving as fast as it can, so that we can at least ensure that, instead of by-passing us, larger vessels will be attracted to South Australia, and so that we can move from this State the wheat delivered to silos.

Mr. CORCORAN: I was pleased to hear the Minister's explanation. The conditions that made this State the granary of Australia years ago no longer apply, the situation having changed completely with the advent of large grain carriers. I am glad to hear that the Government is aware of the State's future needs. The Minister has said that the Government intends to develop only two "super" ports in the State whereas I thought it had intended to develop three: one on the West Coast, one centrally, and one near the Outer Harbour. The Minister has said that the Government will develop one port (either at Ardrossan or Wallaroo) and the other at Port Lincoln. He has said that the deepening of the port is only one facet and that matters such as existing silo accommodation, facilities for loading, road and rail facilities, and, of course, the quantity of grain grown in the area to be served by the port, are involved.

My Party having set up a committee to investigate these matters, I visited Ardrossan and Wallaroo not long ago in the company of the member for Wallaroo and other members of my Party to see at first hand what was involved. I was impressed to see the facilities established at Wallaroo, which has better handling facilities for loading vessels than has Ardrossan. Also at Wallaroo there is space for the development of a further silo and an excellent rail marshalling yard (I think it is one of the best in the State), and the road is available. On the other hand, the loading system at Ardrossan has only one boom, which I believe presents some difficulty in loading vessels. Also, the belt is not owned by the Government but by Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, which has first call on the belt.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: The jetty is there.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes. The things I have instanced seems to indicate that Ardrossan would not be entirely satisfactory from the Government's point of view. Considering what needs to be done to develop a "super" port, Wallaroo certainly has advantages. As has been said, the eastern side of Yorke Peninsula

is known to be sand and the western side is rock, which means that the problem the Minister has detailed to us at Wallaroo does exist.

I think that he has explained to the satisfaction of the member for Wallaroo and to the people of Wallaroo the reason for the delay on the report on the seismic survey of Wallaroo. I believe that the reasons he has given are legitimate and that he is doing everything possible to obtain a detailed report and assessment of the costs involved as soon as possible. This is not an exercise that can be undertaken lightly or quickly, but I urge the Minister to do this expeditiously so that the decision can be made and so that the people in this area may know where they are going. Having seen both sites (and despite the difficulties that might be encountered with dredging at Wallaroo), it is my view that the most suitable site for the port appears to be Wallaroo because of its location and other facilities. The Minister has been able to give members detailed information on what is involved and the difficulties the Government faces.

Regarding beach erosion, no doubt the Minister is aware that this problem exists not only in the metropolitan area but also in my district. I was interested to learn that this is the last year of a five-year programme of research into beach erosion undertaken by the University of Adelaide, and I look forward to the report. I was pleased to hear the Minister say that he was looking into means of recommending to the Government methods by which the report's recommendations could be implemented. I hope this means that the Government will provide financial assistance to carry out the report's recommendations. The problem of beach erosion also exists at Robe, where the council cannot find the money necessary to solve it. The council needs not only expert advice on the problem but also financial assistance. I was pleased to hear the Minister say that there was a likelihood that the Government would not only accept the report's recommendations and forward the information to all interested councils but that it might also be able to help financially. If this is done for metropolitan councils, I hope it will be extended to country areas where the problem exists.

Mr. EDWARDS: Regarding the deep sea port at Port Lincoln, the people in my district are also hoping for a deep sea port farther north. Because Eyre Peninsula produces a great deal of grain, the decision to establish a

"super" port at Port Lincoln is wise. Regarding the statement of the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) that I would back him up, I point out that I should like to see the second "super" port established at Wallaroo, because a railway leads into it. I am not happy with the way South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited has provided so much storage away from the rail. If other storages are filled up, it is only natural for the people to cart grain to where storage is available. Wallaroo is far better than is Ardrossan as a "super" port. Ships could start loading at Wallaroo and go to Port Lincoln to top up.

Mr. HUGHES: I thank the honourable member for his support in this matter. He is a man of wide experience in primary production. He has mentioned before the points he made in regard to C.B.H. and in regard to storage away from railways. I appreciate the Minister's explanation tonight, which was more complete than explanations he has made in the past. Practically once a week he has replied to questions I have asked on this matter, but his replies have not been as detailed as was his explanation tonight. It clarified the manner in which the Government is tackling this difficult problem. It can be solved and, eventually, it will be solved in favour of Wallaroo.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF ROADS AND TRANSPORT AND
MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Minister of Roads and Transport and
Minister of Local Government Department,
\$310,770; Highways Department, \$4,537,029—
passed.

Railways Department, \$35,416,676.

Mr. VIRGO: In dealing with the curtailment of rail services I shall discuss the closing of the Angaston line, because I wish to correct an incorrect statement that I made in a recent debate. I said that, although there had been numerous railway lines closed and that the Angaston line had been closed to passenger traffic, the member for the district (Hon. B. H. Teusner) had not raised his voice in protest. He rightly drew my attention to the fact that he had protested as reported at page 1917 of *Hansard* when he requested that the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to restore the passenger rail service, the Blue-bird. Needless to say, the Minister turned down his request.

The CHAIRMAN: Can the honourable member indicate to which line he is speaking?

Mr. VIRGO: I am dealing with the line for which \$35,416,676 is proposed to be spent on the Railways Department.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, but which particular line? There are many lines.

Mr. VIRGO: I am dealing primarily with the Transportation and Traffic Branch, at page 91 of the Estimates, although my remarks will of necessity deal with one or two other things—for instance, the decrease in the money proposed for the Rolling Stock Branch, as that is an important item, too. The Transportation and Traffic Branch is an important part of the railway services. I make a plea to the member for Stirling that, in view of the obviously expressed view of his constituents, he will now join me and other members on this side of the Committee in opposing the anti-railway policy of the Minister of Roads and Transport and the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn).

Mr. McAnaney: That gets back to one vote one value; that is a minority complaint.

Mr. VIRGO: That is the joke of the year, that the member for Stirling is talking about one vote one value and saying this is only a small minority so we should take no notice of it. If that is the case, we should take no notice of the Government, because it is here today as a minority.

Mr. McAnaney: Be consistent!

Mr. VIRGO: It is not a matter of being consistent. The honourable member this afternoon presented a petition containing 1,350 signatures of people in his electoral district. Presumably, they would represent 2,500 to 3,000 electors in an electorate of 7,000; they do not count!

Mr. McAnaney: There were more electors than railway men at the inquiry at Victor Harbour.

Mr. VIRGO: No wonder this is called a hill-billy State when the member for Stirling comes up with this sort of tripe. Several questions have been asked about the Angaston rail service and it has been referred to by the member for Light, who on one occasion suggested that the whole line be closed down. Then he tempered his remarks by suggesting that, as the passenger services had been cut out altogether on the Angaston line, the staff should be reduced. There was a little echo of his sentiments apparently, in another place, where a question was asked of the Minister of Roads and Transport who, in his typically arrogant fashion, did not answer it. He did

what the Premier does: he rushed to the newspaper and gave the answer there, later on giving it to the member concerned merely as a formality.

On Friday last in the *Advertiser* the Minister said that the Railways Department had confirmed that there had been 10 staff transfers from stations in the Barossa Valley. He was replying to a question in another place by Mr. Hart, who was seeking clarification of a letter that had been published in the press. That information, like much more that the Ministers give us, is not true. I have had it checked. Prior to the curtailment of passenger services, at the Angaston station there were 11 employees, and there are eight today; there were 12 at Nuriootpa, and there are still 12; there were four at Tanunda, and there are still four; at Rowland Flat, there was one, an agent, who is still there; and at Lyndoch there were seven and there are still seven.

In fact, there has been a reduction involving three persons, consisting of a junior clerk, and two porters who were fully engaged on running duties as guards on the trains. Those employees have not been dispensed with; they have merely been transferred, because the trains do not now go to the area, merely operating from Gawler. To say that there has been a reduction in staff is completely untrue. In fact, staff cannot be reduced (and this is where the member for Light shows his stupidity) unless the line is closed completely, because I point out that two freight trains a day are still running, and this operation is spread over a period, from arrival to departure, from about 4 a.m. to anything up to 12 midnight.

Mr. Hurst: What have they lost in passenger revenue out of it?

Mr. VIRGO: I have never taken out that figure. However, as you well know, Mr. Chairman, and as you have said when asking questions of the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, the Government has incurred the ire of the people in the area because, whereas previously they had a reasonable (not good) rail passenger service to Adelaide, today they have a second-rate road passenger service to Adelaide. The important thing is that they could have a first-class service if the Minister desired to provide one. Rail passenger services are still operating to Gawler and, for the sake of an additional 25 miles or 40 minutes, the passenger service to the Barossa Valley has been dis-

continued. This has been done merely to pursue a policy of encouraging private enterprise and of destroying the State's public institutions.

What is happening within the Railways Department is a tragedy and is in direct contrast to the reply originally given by the Attorney-General a week or so ago, and confirmed this week, when he was able to show me rebuilding plans for the country booking office at the Adelaide railway station. We have the ludicrous position that, on the one hand, we are cutting out country passenger trains and, on the other, we are building a new country ticket booking office so that the people can go there to buy tickets for trains that are not running.

I deal now briefly with the matter raised by the impatient member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) concerning the Railways Department's deficit. Recently he read from the South Australian Railways Commissioner's report of 1967-68, which is the last published and in which the Commissioner said:

Due for the greater part to the severe drought experienced in South Australia and to the reduced tonnage of lead and zinc concentrates railed as a result of successive industrial disputes at Broken Hill, there was a marked drop in earnings compared with those of 1966-67. The decrease of \$2,172,443 . . . or 7.1 per cent was more than accounted for by these two factors. Revenue from grains decreased by \$1,755,514 or 45.6 per cent, from manures by \$282,022 or 20.9 per cent, and from Broken Hill concentrates by \$451,035 or 7.2 per cent.

It is clear from that that the reason railway revenue tumbled was that there was a severe drought in South Australia and that there were industrial disputes at Broken Hill. Members opposite have said that the Labor Government was the reason South Australia went downhill but the Railways Commissioner does not agree. On the front page of the September, 1969, issue of the *South Australian Railways Rail News*, issued by the authority of the Commissioner, Mr. Fitch states:

I am now able to advise that the revenue for 1968-69 reached a record figure of \$30,521,928, an increase of \$2,277,859 or 8 per cent over the previous year.

At the conclusion of this article the Commissioner states:

All of this goes to show that, given the opportunity, we can deliver the goods. The member for Light is not prepared to let the railways have an opportunity to do that.

Mr. Freebairn: Yes, I am.

Mr. VIRGO: I am amazed to hear that, but unfortunately no business will function on the stop and go, yo-yo attitude of people such as the member for Light.

Mr. Freebairn: Just cut out the lines that do not pay.

Mr. VIRGO: That is ridiculous. The honourable member knows better than I do that, if it is worked out on hard cold economics and the Railways Department is charged with the incurred debts over the years, no line is paying. The railways are not there to pay but to provide a service and, if it had not been provided in the past and was not still being provided, the farming community would be in dire straits. I suggest that the member for Light should have listened to what the member for Eyre had to say because, when he is able to convince the member for Eyre that the railways on Eyre Peninsula should be discontinued, he might be making a little headway. Unfortunately, the Government is pursuing a policy of piece-by-piece closing down of line after line. Although we have not had a satisfactory reply to the question that was asked here recently regarding the survey taking place on the closing of passenger services after 8 p.m. on weekdays and all day on Sundays—

Mr. Freebairn: Or about the document that you stole.

Mr. VIRGO: I am pleased that the member for Light has made that stupid interjection. What he has just said is not only untrue, but I believe that he knows it is untrue. The document was handed to me in a proper and open fashion and, if any Government department is functioning on the basis of secret documents that have to be stolen in order to find out what is going on, it is a grave reflection on the Minister, on whom the member for Light is casting aspersions when he accuses me of stealing the document. It was a normal type of document that circulates within the Railways Department; it had a number attached to it, and it was issued to numerous persons within the department.

Mr. Clark: Did it have "Strictly Confidential" on it?

Mr. VIRGO: No, it did not. In regard to the rolling stock branch, there has been a reduction of \$79,409 in the provision for mechanics and labourers. Has yet another reduction in staff been made? If it has not, why is there this reduction in the provision? I fear that here we have evidence of yet another squeeze upon railway operations.

Is the Railways Department now saying that it no longer needs the staff to build rolling stock because services are being curtailed?

Mr. Freebairn: That is correct.

Mr. VIRGO: I refer the honourable member to a letter that I wrote to the Railways Commissioner a few months ago at the request of some of my constituents; the letter asked for an improved rail service. The Commissioner's reply acknowledged that there was a desire for an improved service but said that the Railways Department did not have the rolling stock to provide it.

Mr. Freebairn: Ring up the Municipal Tramways Trust!

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): Order!

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member's interjection leads me to point out the ultimate answer, public transport. In New South Wales the authorities are experimenting with a rail-road type of transport, which ought to be further investigated. Our railways have not made the progress that they should have made. I recently read an article that said that the Flying Dutchman, which operated between London and Bristol in 1871, was at that time the fastest train in the world, having travelled 77½ miles in 90 minutes; yet trains in this State in 1969 are not travelling 77½ miles in 90 minutes.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Trains are not travelling at that rate in England today.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not know the Attorney-General's source of information. The article I have referred to says that in 1936 the Coronation Scot, which operated between London and Scotland, had a maximum speed of 114 miles an hour. I do not know how the Attorney-General can say that trains are not travelling at such speeds in England today. In a booklet I have here in regard to permanent ways the view is expressed that concrete sleepers are better than timber sleepers because of the lower maintenance cost and lower capital expenditure, and the booklet also publishes details about trains in England travelling at what we would regard as astronomical speeds.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: They are not as fast as they were 30 years ago.

Mr. VIRGO: That may be so, but our trains, too, are not as fast now as they were 30 years ago. The Overland still takes the same time to travel to Melbourne as it did then. By using Mountain-type engines in the

1930's the train departed from here at 7 p.m. and was scheduled to arrive at Melbourne at 9 a.m. the next day, and I am sure that this time table has operated for many years.

Mr. Ryan: For the last 30 years, at least.

Mr. VIRGO: The details given to me last week about the Overland's record of arrivals on time in Adelaide would be laughable if it were not so serious.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Much of the delay occurred on the other side of the border.

Mr. VIRGO: I readily appreciate that, and perhaps we will get some satisfaction in saying that Victoria is at fault. We must remember that we are trying to encourage people to travel between our States by train, and if the trains do not arrive on time people will not use them. The Railways Department has a responsibility to ensure, to the best of its ability, that the Overland and other trains run on time. There is much room for improvement in this aspect.

The sum of \$600,000 is allocated under the item "Way and Works Branch" as a provision for deferred maintenance. Therefore, with the \$600,000 that we have in the Loan Account we now have \$1,200,000 altogether. However, the Minister admits that \$8,500,000 is required. This means either that the report of the special committee appointed by the Minister to investigate derailments is not true or that for a period of seven years the tracks in South Australia will remain unsafe. That is a situation that the Government and the people cannot or should not tolerate. We have been warned by this committee that there could be a serious railway mishap in South Australia, and a serious attempt should be made to prevent that occurring. The present position of the railways results from the Government's not wanting them to continue. I am pleased to see the Attorney-General shaking his head. I hope he can show where the Minister or the Government has done something to expand railway activities, because I have not been able to find any evidence of it. We are in this position because of the negative attitude of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): Obviously, I cannot reply to all the points made by the honourable member, and it is not fitting that I should. First, let me refer to one specific matter about which he asked me, namely, the line dealing with mechanics and labourers under the Rolling Stock Branch, where there is a reduction of about \$79,000. The honourable member's

surmise is, to the best of my information, correct: there have been variations in wages pursuant to awards, which would increase the total amount, but this has been offset by a reduction in the number of men employed. If the honourable member would like me to, I will obtain from my colleague more detailed information on this matter, but that is the only information I have at present. The other matters he raised I shall bring to the attention of the Minister. Of course, the Government is caught between two things, as all successive Governments here have been and Governments all over the world are where the railways are Government-run: on the one hand, there is the problem—

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It is not only Governments.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is so; I think all the railroads in America have gone into liquidation and are owned by insurance companies, which are trying to make them pay. From my experience while in America, most of the passenger services there have been cut out.

Mr. Virgo: But they are there to provide a service, not to make a profit.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As I was saying, all Governments are caught between the two—the tremendous weight of debt that the railways have to carry, their losses thus having to be propped up by Government moneys, and the fact that they are there to provide a service. We are trying to steer a course between doing what the member for Edwardstown has been advocating and doing what the member for Light (who I think is on the other side of the argument, if I understand him correctly) would like to do. He would like drastically to reduce the service, whereas the member for Edwardstown believes we should do not that but rather the reverse. We have to try to steer a middle course, as all our predecessors have done. I shall bring these matters to the Minister's attention, and on this specific point I shall try to obtain more information.

Mr. RYAN: Once again, I wish to criticize the administration of the Railways Department regarding a number of unoccupied houses it owns in my district. This matter is causing grave concern to residents and local councils in the area. Under the Local Government Act, if Government-owned houses are not occupied for a specific period during the year no council rates are payable but, if they are occupied at least for the minimum period,

the normal rates are payable. Certain parts of my district probably have more unoccupied railway houses than has any other district in South Australia. I would not be complaining if these houses were unoccupied for only a small period each year, but unfortunately some have been unoccupied for many years. Only the other day when members of the Public Works Committee were driving through the area, some of them (including Government members) asked about the dilapidated houses we were passing at the time.

Although these houses were probably good in years gone by, I had to say that they were unoccupied South Australian Railways houses. They are a disgrace to any owner, even though gangs of men are continually maintaining them and clearing up around them. The worst aspect of it is that over the years a considerable amount of local government money has been spent in the area in order to bring it up to modern-day requirements. As no rating is levied on the department, private owners in the district have had to foot the bill, and the department has not been fulfilling its obligations. There are many people in the area in drastic circumstances who are awaiting some type of roof over their heads, and they complain bitterly when they see these unoccupied railway houses.

The member for Light has spoken about increasing the revenue of the Railways Department. I point out that here is one way in which the Railways Commissioner could increase his department's revenue considerably, because these houses would fetch a minimum rental of \$10 a week. When one considers that probably at least 50 of these houses have been unoccupied for years, one can work out the department's loss of revenue. Further, when one approaches the department to see why these houses are unoccupied, one is told that it is departmental policy to keep so many of the houses available in order to accommodate employees who may transfer from the country to the metropolitan area. When one of the conditions of such a transfer is that an employee must be provided with accommodation, the department has to have a house available for him. However, immediately the employee occupies a particular house, he must sign an agreement to the effect that he will remain an occupant for no longer than 12 months.

At the end of the 12 months, if he is still an occupant, the employee is told to go or he will be evicted, and immediately he leaves the dwelling it remains unoccupied.

From actual inspections that I have made over the years and from reports that I have received from the department, I can verify the fact that some of these houses have remained unoccupied for a continuous period of five years. I do not think this is good enough. The Government is continually running to the Commonwealth Government, claiming that it is not able to cope with the demand for houses, especially rental houses. However, we find that, through the Railways Department, the Government owns many houses in which many families could be accommodated. The Enfield council has approached me about the matter several times. Recently I was asked to meet certain council officers and discuss the matter with them, because they were gravely concerned about it.

The cost of providing this amenity falls on ratepayers living nearby; therefore other people pay because the Railways Department does not pay. The council asked me to bring this matter to the notice of the Government whenever I could. I have informed members of the council that, when I receive information from the Minister, I will convey it to them but, although I have raised the matter several times in this place, so far the Minister has not even had the decency to reply. The council having sent me a reminder letter, I have said that I have raised the matter in a question and that I have not received a report from the Minister. It is apparent that these matters are being ignored and that the Minister has no interest in them.

Mr. Rodda: I do not think that's right.

Mr. RYAN: Facts prove that it is. This set of circumstances has obtained for years, and something must be done about it. It has been suggested that the Commissioner should know from past experience how many of these houses he would want for employees transferred to the city, and that he would not want the number that are now left vacant. Besides the loss of revenue involved, many thousands of dollars a year must be spent on maintenance because of vandalism that occurs while the houses are vacant. When I visited the area last Tuesday, I saw windows broken, doors smashed and fences falling down. Such things would not happen if the houses were occupied. If this matter is not dealt with, I will continue to bring it before the Government at every possible opportunity.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Attorney General ask his colleague to find out from the Railways Commissioner how many houses

are now unoccupied, how many have been sold since the beginning of this financial year, and why the houses are not sold or made use of? I met an officer of the Auditor-General's Department the other day and he said that the Auditor-General was upset because he submits his report but members do not take any notice of it. If we had a public accounts committee, these matters would be investigated. Members must show more responsibility in these matters and take an active part in getting them straightened out. An extra \$674,000 is being provided to give railway employees an extra week's leave each year and, although I like to see such things as this being done, surely it is a question of priorities regarding how the available money should be spent. The extra week's leave was not the result of a court decision but an offer made by the Labor Government, and this money could have been put to more useful purposes. The member for Edwardstown said that the railways must be kept as a public service, irrespective of what they lose.

Mr. Virgo: If they are serving the public.

Mr. McANANEY: Should we go to the Commonwealth Government and demand more money for such things as education when we are making such losses on our railways? Railway services should be cut only where there is an alternative service. It is the Transport Control Board that makes a recommendation to the Public Works Committee regarding the closing of a line.

Mr. McKee: Do you agree that the Victor Harbour line should be discontinued?

Mr. McANANEY: I am not saying whether or not it should be discontinued. One of the 1,350 signatures on the petition I presented was put there by a man who took it around for other people to sign. They said, "I do not use the railways; why are you asking me to sign? You have your livestock carried by carrier and your superphosphate delivered by contract, so why have you signed it?" He said, "I signed it because I like to see the train going through each day." Some people are genuinely concerned about the closing of this line and have signed the petition in the belief that the line should not be closed. The closing of the line would save \$200,000 a year. There is no efficient passenger service to Victor Harbour at present, and the board's responsibility is to see that a good road passenger service is provided.

Some time ago some people at Port Elliot organized a petition because there was no goods service into that town, and I believe

they had a genuine complaint. However, a young carrier who has commenced business there has prospered. Now, the Port Elliot people can have their goods transported more quickly, and they can be sure of getting them. Strathalbyn people found that the railways carried some essential goods right through to Victor Harbour. If there is a reasonable alternative service we must not waste the taxpayers' money simply on the pretext that we must provide a service. As Parliamentarians we must act responsibly.

Mr. Broomhill: Speak for yourself.

Mr. McANANEY: Members opposite are the most irresponsible people I have ever met. The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) said that the Railways Department had incurred losses because it had not carried as much freight as it used to carry. The more freight the railways carry the bigger the loss, because the department is not even covering running expenses. The railways must be made more efficient; alternatively, unprofitable sections must be eliminated.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you support the petition that you presented this afternoon?

Mr. McANANEY: I will do anything that my people ask me to do. I have stated my case publicly. I asked the people, "Do you want to use the money for schools and hospitals?" and the majority said—

Members interjecting:

Mr. McANANEY: I can see I have made my point.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: One thing that makes my blood boil is to see the Railways Department waste public money. Over the operations of the Railways Department we see the shadow of the \$12,000,000-odd deficit. To bring that figure into perspective for Opposition members, I point out that in two years the deficit would almost pay for the original cost of Chowilla dam, which Opposition members have lost for South Australia. I make this point so that Opposition members may understand the deficit we sustain from operations of the Railways Department, a deficit which they seem to aim to continue.

The member for Edwardstown spoke about maintaining uneconomic passenger services: we all know that these services are costing the taxpayer an enormous sum. It has been suggested that every time a passenger steps on to a suburban passenger train he is being subsidized by about 25c. Opposition members would like to see the public purse continually

pilfered to maintain passenger services that are not required to pay their way. I should like to refute some of the arguments put by the member for Edwardstown, who seems to be able to obtain confidential documents from the Railways Department with an amazing aptitude, for which I should envy him. He spoke about employees at railway stations in the Barossa Valley and pleaded for the restoration of the passenger rail service to the Barossa Valley, but people in the valley would not agree with him, because the number of people using public transport from Barossa Valley to Adelaide has almost doubled since the substitution of the railway service with a passenger bus service. The number of rail passengers has been declining in my district, whereas the number of people using the bus services is almost twice the number using rail passenger services.

Mr. Broomhill: I think you made that up.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is a fact of life, and if the honourable member was not so ignorant of conditions in South Australia outside his parish he would know that. I will quote the Railway Commissioner's report.

Mr. Broomhill: You got off that subject quickly when you were challenged.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I shall be happy to get back to it if the honourable member wants me to.

Mr. Broomhill: I wish you would.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The honourable member has reminded me of the 11 station personnel at Angaston. The member for Edwardstown said that it required that number to keep the railways open for a staggered day and he said that one station in the Barossa Valley had a station agent. The first economy I would advocate in the Railways Department would be to substitute station agents for the gangs of personnel at present manning small country stations. In my district there are at least one or two station agents doing an excellent job for a modest stipend and, because of their efficient management, they replace expensive shift labour that is—

Mr. Hudson: Your Government increased by \$3,000,000—

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The honourable member knows everything about public expenditure in South Australia and is a know-all about railway finances. No doubt he will contribute to this debate and tell members whether he supports the policy of subsidizing every

passenger on the Brighton line by 25c. I want to hear how an economist can justify this waste of public money.

Mr. Lawn: There should be a public inquiry into your allegations.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I hear a member opposite saying something about a public inquiry. That is the sort of thing a public accounts committee could investigate and open up for public scrutiny.

Mr. Hudson: Since you have been a Parliamentary Under Secretary, the Railways Department has lost \$2,000,000.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have made the point that we could introduce station agents to replace the expensive shift labour we now have to maintain at country railway stations. When we remember that we have almost as many railway employees in South Australia as we have teachers in our public schools, we realize how imbalanced the railways set-up is. The Government is not taking sufficient action to reduce expenditure on the railways.

Mr. Virgo: Do you advocate sacking railway employees?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, I do not advocate that. The Highways Department is forever short of labour and it would be a simple matter to transfer some of the excess railways staff to that department. I hope that my remarks will be published in railways union journal. If members opposite had any degree of honesty at all, which sometimes I question, they would see to it that my remarks were published.

Mr. VIRGO: Mr. Acting Chairman, on a point of order, the honourable member has questioned the honesty and integrity of a member of the community who is not here to speak for himself or to defend himself. He was talking, I understood, of railway officers.

Mr. Freebairn: No—"members opposite", you goat!

Mr. VIRGO: Obviously, the member for Light is not quite sure what he said. In view of this, I ask for an unqualified withdrawal of a filthy smear.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If the honourable member would indicate the nature of the filthy smear, I should be only too pleased to withdraw.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): As I understand it, the honourable member for Light has questioned the honesty of members opposite. Will he withdraw his remark?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If I impugned members opposite with dishonesty, I shall be only too pleased to withdraw.

Mr. HUDSON: I, too, rise on a point of order. While the member for Edwardstown was speaking, the member for Light said "You goat". I ask that he withdraw that remark.

Mr. Freebairn: I was speaking privately to the Attorney-General.

Mr. HUDSON: Even if the member was referring to the Attorney-General, I ask him to withdraw.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member taking a point of order?

Mr. HUDSON: I take the point of order that you, Mr. Acting Chairman, were about to rule on a point of order when the member for Light said that. It was while the member for Edwardstown was taking his point of order that the remark was made as an interjection and you immediately ruled on the member for Edwardstown's point of order. At the first opportunity after that, I take this point of order now and ask that the member for Light withdraw.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am not quite sure what is now expected of me. The twisted mind of the member for Glenelg—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The question is whether the member for Light referred to a member of the Opposition as a goat. The honourable member for Glenelg asked that, as you used that terminology, you should withdraw.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I hardly heard the words you were uttering, Mr. Chairman, against the background of Opposition remarks, but I believe there was some remark made about my using the term "goat" to describe a member opposite. If that is so, I withdraw that remark. Does that satisfy members opposite?

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Light should be required to give an unqualified withdrawal. He said, "If that is so, I withdraw," but the fact of the matter is that it is so and that he should give an unqualified withdrawal. I ask you to rule on that, Mr. Acting Chairman.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I remind the member for Light that Standing Orders require him to withdraw and apologize for the use of the word.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw and apologize. I am sorry that the member for Glenelg has such a twisted mind.

Mr. HUDSON: I take a further point of order. I ask the member for Light to withdraw that remark, and I ask for your ruling on that.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I rule that the use of the term "twisted mind" is offensive.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I withdraw that remark, although the member for Glenelg made that remark about me last week and I took no exception to it because I thought it was part of Labor's in-language and part of its Socialist terminology. I was keen to find out—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Light to get back to the line.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I wish to get back to the Railways Department line and to continue dealing with some of the arguments raised earlier by the member for Edwardstown, who quoted from the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Report for the year 1966-67. He talks about strikes at Broken Hill which caused the Railways Department to sustain losses in the last financial year, but the honourable member did not go on to deal with page 5 and to quote the rest of the Commissioner's remarks, which are relevant. It is my plan not to speak much longer but merely to correct the unfortunate impression given by the member for Edwardstown. I hope that members opposite listen to this quotation, and I hope that the Deputy Leader also listens to it, because the day may come (unhappy day though it will be) when he has to administer the State's finances, and it will be of benefit to him to have some understanding of the railways—

Mr. Corcoran: Stop this gobbledegook, and get on with it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not quite know what gobbledegook is, but I presume it is more of Labor's in-language.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Commissioner states:

In general it could be said that the revenue from freight and livestock traffic met its working expenditure but that from passenger traffic did not.

That sentence should be sufficient to indicate to the member for Edwardstown just where the problems in the Railways Department lie: they lie not in the freight and livestock service but in the passenger service being provided by the department. Overwhelmingly, the passenger services being provided by the department in South Australia involve the suburban railway

lines. We all know that the only persons who are really able to use passenger rail services are people living within half a mile of a railway line.

If members opposite recall the intense study they made on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, they will know that this is part of the submission made by the officers. The people who live within half a mile of metropolitan railway lines are causing much, if not most, of the passenger service losses. I can see now the Attorney-General paying rapt attention to my remarks, and I realize that one of those services is in his district. I have again commented on this sink that absorbs public money. I hope that the good work the Minister has done in closing down uneconomic services will continue until we reach the stage when the only services provided by the Railways Department are those that pay or those that provide at least a reasonable return on the investment of public money in them.

Mr. VIRGO: The member for Light said that the number of passengers on the Barossa Valley service had doubled since the private bus took over from the railway service.

Mr. Freebairn: Slightly more than doubled, actually.

Mr. VIRGO: What a wild allegation to make! The honourable member has not given any figures to prove what he says.

Mr. Freebairn: I represent part of the Barossa Valley.

Mr. VIRGO: When the honourable member makes a statement such as the one he has made I question its accuracy.

Mr. Freebairn: Careful, or I might take a point of order.

Mr. VIRGO: The member for Light can take 100 points of order if he wishes. He has produced no figures whatever to substantiate his wild allegation, and frankly I do not believe him. The member for Angas asked the Attorney-General, on behalf of the Minister, to restore the passenger rail service in this area, and I would rather believe him than the member for Light, as he is a far better representative of the area than the member for Light will ever be. The member for Light also suggested that station staffs should be removed and replaced by station agents, but this only displayed his gross ignorance.

I will not waste the time of the Committee by enlightening the honourable member on the situation, but I strongly advise him to approach

an officer of the department, who may be prepared to explain to him the facts and to show him how his suggestion is not capable of implementation. In typical fashion, the member for Light grabbed hold of one of the two reasons I had quoted from the Commissioner's report for reduced revenue for the Railways Department in 1967-68. Naturally, he took the reason involving industrial disputes at Broken Hill and conveniently ignored the other: the drought, which affected railway revenues, the building industry and the economy of the State as a whole. He then referred to the Commissioner's concluding reference when he said that freight services had met their working expenses but that passenger services had not. In the pursuit of his vendetta against the railways, he said that metropolitan trains must be subsidized by 25c every time someone got on a train, but he had nothing to back this up.

Mr. Freebairn: Only the Commissioner's report.

Mr. VIRGO: The member for Light is, apparently, unable to see the forest for the trees, because the Commissioner goes much further than that. Did the member for Light read in the Commissioner's report that he advocates that the railways are a necessary service to the community and, as such, should be a charge on the community? The member for Light did not quote those factors. The country areas would be in a calamitous position at present were it not for the pioneering work carried out by the Railways Department. The 1967-68 Commissioner's report also refers to the socially necessary services which the department is called on to operate and which tend to obscure other vital operations. The report states:

It was then suggested that it would appear to be not unreasonable if the costs of these community services were directly underwritten by it.

The report also refers to the United States of America Interstate Commerce Commission's report for the year ended June 30, 1966, which has the same attitude. This is the basic principle of railway service: it is a community service and a socially necessary service. One just cannot take in isolation a specific line and say, "It is not paying; therefore, it should be discontinued." Page 6 of the Commissioner's report states:

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.

Mr. Freebairn: That's what I've been telling you.

Mr. VIRGO: Apparently, the member for Light is not completely hopeless after all if he agrees that successive Liberal Governments have failed to provide the finance for the Railways Department to extend its services to the expanding metropolitan area.

Mr. Freebairn: Spare us that.

Mr. VIRGO: Thirty seconds ago the honourable member was agreeing with me, but now he is disagreeing. Not one new railway line has been built to serve the expanding metropolitan area, other than the spur line to Tonsley Park—and that is for freight traffic. Anyway, the railways do not have enough carriages to run an adequate passenger service on it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Regarding the proposed closure of the Eudunda-Morgan line, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what plans he has for providing transportation for firewood?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will be happy to do that.

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Light said that the bus service to Wallaroo carried twice as many passengers as the rail service carried. If he is correct, I ask: what is the matter with the Railways Department? Why was it not given the service?

Mr. Virgo: The Transport Control Board would not give the service to it.

Mr. HUGHES: Then, the Minister is to blame. If a service could have been provided that was comparable with the bus service, the people would have supported it: this is where the Government has fallen down. I have travelled between Wallaroo and Adelaide by both road and rail, and I can assure members that I would much prefer to travel by the Bluebird railcar than by bus. Some of the facilities now being provided for bus passengers are simply disgusting. The Bluebird railcar service provided good toilet facilities, but the bus service does not provide such facilities.

I notice that the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) is laughing: he forgets that the bus service has to cater for women, children, pensioners and elderly people, as did the rail service. If Government members travelled on these buses they would agree with what I am saying. There must be something drastically wrong with the top administrators if the Railways Department cannot give the same service as that being given by these road

services. Can the Minister say whether, where these rail services are not now required, the same number of administrative staff will be retained in Adelaide, or will they be reduced as are other employees?

Mr. EDWARDS: According to the Auditor-General's Report rail passenger services do not pay, but the freight services do. On Eyre Peninsula people are happier travelling by road passenger service than they were when using the rail services. If the metropolitan area could be served by a type of railcar-road bus, which could leave the railway lines at the terminus and then travel on the roads, much benefit would accrue to the travelling public. This type of transport would be of great assistance in South Australia: it could be used on some country lines and would be a definite advantage in the metropolitan area. An agent should be present at all freight stations on the railway service so that he could inform people when their freight had arrived on the train.

With no agent present a person often has to travel to the station several times in order to collect freight consigned to him, because he does not know when it has reached the station. We have an old chap at Darke Peak who acts as an agent. He gives great service to the people there because he can go across to the station and check the orders that may come in. He can tell the people by telephone when their goods have arrived. When he is on holiday, there is no one to replace him and, if there are any queries there, they cannot be settled. A man on duty at the station saves a lot of time spent on running around. Will the Attorney-General take up those two points with the Minister?

Mr. Jennings: Does it have to be an "old chap"?

Mr. EDWARDS: No, but it needs to be somebody who can give this service. It could be a local storekeeper, because he could go the station to see whether any orders had come in. The Minister can decide who shall be the agent.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to refer these matters to the Minister. I regret I cannot tonight give the member for Wallaroo the information he requires but I shall make inquiries and give him the information as soon as possible.

Mr. HUGHES: I hope the Attorney-General will do that, because this is a serious matter for me. Whilst in the initial stages

there would be no retrenchments, because of the fear of being transferred somewhere where it would not be possible for them to find suitable accommodation and not wishing to leave the country areas, some employees resigned from the railways and took up residence in Whyalla, where they thought their future would be safe; they joined the railways there. Whilst there may not have been retrenchments, some people have been forced to seek other occupations through fear of services being cancelled, resulting in less administrative staff being needed at Adelaide.

The study being made of services in the metropolitan area concerns me greatly. Although I live in the country, I still like to think that I represent not only the country but also the State as a whole. If passenger service cancellations continue, as has been advocated by the member for Light, many people in the metropolitan area will be seriously inconvenienced. He said the railways were used only by people living within half a mile of the railway line. Apparently, the member for Light does not move about much, because he should know that the railways are used by people living much farther away from the line than that. I referred earlier to some of the disgusting conditions under which people have to use road transport. When the bus stops at Port Wakefield, people use the toilet facilities there only because they are forced to do so.

This is an unsatisfactory state of affairs, and it is time the Government examined the facilities provided in connection with alternative services. On one occasion while I was in the men's toilet at Port Wakefield (only a wall one brick in thickness separates the entrances to the men's and ladies' toilets, although this does not matter much once one is inside) two little girls, one about 12 years and the other, I should say, about 5 years, came into the toilet, thinking they were going into the ladies' toilet.

Mr. Broomhill: Are you sure you were in the right one?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, I was in the right one. I took the liberty to inspect the toilet again on one of my return trips home, and lo and behold, on this occasion two ladies came into the toilet.

Mr. Evans: You were definitely in the wrong one.

Mr. HUGHES: No. This may seem funny to honourable members opposite, but it was

not funny to me, and it certainly was not funny to the two ladies. Honourable members may think this a laughing matter—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! To which line on the Estimates is the honourable member referring?

Mr. HUGHES: We are discussing the railways and the alternative service provided (a service that is different from that which apparently seems to be in the minds of honourable members opposite!) What I have described should never happen nowadays. There should be clear signs whereby people know at night just which doorway they are entering, but this is not so at the toilets at Port Wakefield. Although I know nothing about the ladies' side (because I have not been into that section), I point out that the men's facilities at Port Wakefield are far from good and are not doing the alternative service any good either. In fact, many people who would normally use the railways or the bus are now reverting to using their own cars.

I have received many complaints about this matter. When the Bluebird service operated, adequate facilities were available at Bowmans, and people had time to have refreshments or visit the toilet. Some people think I have a quarrel with Yorke Peninsula Bus Lines, but my quarrel is with the Government, which cancelled the railway service. I do not blame the company that got the contract to provide the bus service. The Minister should suggest to the bus proprietor that adequate facilities be provided where the bus stops.

Mr. LANGLEY: Only last week I received a letter from a constituent of mine about the facilities at Port Wakefield. He said that only 10 minutes was allowed for him to go to the toilet and to the refreshment rooms, and that he had to eat on the bus what he purchased. He suggested that more time should be allowed. He was travelling to Moonta Bay, and he had also made the journey by car, when he had used facilities at a cafe in Port Wakefield that he had found to be far superior to the facilities where the bus stopped. If the Government intends to continue with this mode of transport, it should ensure that bus passengers are provided with adequate facilities, because most railway services operate on certain schedules and provide refreshment rooms, and so on. I hope the Minister will ensure that the facilities at Port Wakefield are improved.

Mr. BURDON: Regarding the remarks made by the member for Light, I wonder what the Government's attitude is to the closing

of further railway lines in the State. The member for Light said that any line in South Australia that was not running at a profit, irrespective of the service it provided, should be discontinued, but I remind him and other Government members that, for many years, the people in the South-East have been campaigning for a better railway service. If a better service were provided to the South-East the railways would get the response the service warranted. It appears that, from the thinking of the member for Light and some other Government members, they favour the closing of lines that do not pay. Possibly, the South-Eastern lines might be closed.

The South-East, which is an important part of the State, is destined to play a leading role in the future growth of the State, and anything that would restrict the railway service in the South-East is to be deplored. If there is a reduction in the services provided to the South-East, the people in that area, in common with other people in the State where rail services are withdrawn, will be the ones who will suffer the most. I believe that this will happen to some country services. I look forward to support for the future of the railways in the South-East from the Government members who represent districts in that area.

The South-Eastern railways were built originally for the development of that area and the broad gauge line was constructed in 1954 for its further development. If the railways are rehabilitated to provide the services to which the South-East is entitled, they will strongly compete with other forms of transport and thereby benefit the people of the South-East. The railways are used for the cartage of superphosphate to the South-East and the trains can return with wool and other produce. I believe that the South-East will eventually become the most productive area in South Australia. It has vast water resources.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member can talk about the railway potential but not about other potential.

Mr. BURDON: These other things will eventually lead to more business for the railway system. Like every other service, the railway service has problems. There is an overnight service to Mount Gambier and a daily passenger service, but the latter is not as well patronized as it might be. Improvements are necessary, such as the provision of dining facilities on the daily passenger train. The overnight service must also be improved.

There is an overnight freight service from Mount Gambier. These services greatly benefit farmers in the area and, if they were taken away, every primary producer would be the poorer. I hope that first-class rail services will be provided between the metropolitan area and the South-East.

Line passed.

Motor Vehicles Department, \$1,005,696; Miscellaneous, \$245,640—passed.

MINISTER OF SOCIAL WELFARE AND MINISTER OF ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Department of Social Welfare, \$3,693,509.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): First, I refer to the item "Promotion of social welfare within the community". This year \$200 is allotted for "After-school activities" and \$1,000 for "Youth activities", and I should like to know what course is being followed by the department in this field. These activities were first set up when the Social Welfare Department was established in order to experiment with activity that had been advocated as a result of a survey in a selected area of Adelaide. We tried to get a satisfactory spread of constructive activity for youth as a positive measure to ensure both improvement in youth facilities and as a prevention from delinquent activities. They were designed to cover the whole range of energies of young people in such a way that they could fit satisfactorily into the community, and to give some relief from boredom. We could see some positive results; an after-school activity centre was established, and proposals were prepared for a joint scheme between the Social Welfare Department, the Education Department and local government to establish youth recreation facilities throughout the State on a Government subsidy. As it seems that there has not been much expansion in these activities, can the Minister say what is being done in this field of Social Welfare Department responsibility?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Minister of Social Welfare): The Norwood Centre, which was the pilot centre, was established when the Leader was the Minister, and it has continued. However, I have not considered it justified, from the experience at Norwood, to expand the activities, because other matters have had a higher priority. It would be desirable to expand the activities if more funds were available, and this is a matter that I will continue to look at. It is not intended to discontinue the activities at Norwood, but I considered that they should not be expanded at the expense of other matters.

We hope that a scholarship holder who has been doing group work at the Institute of Technology will be available in 1970 to promote youth activities throughout the State. The Leader will know that at the last election one of my Party's undertakings was in this direction, and we hope that it will be possible, now that those who are attending the group work course are about to qualify, to do something in this direction.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Can the Minister say what the position is about expanding the provision of officers who can prosecute for maintenance arrears in areas of the State other than the metropolitan area? This request has been made repeatedly by the Law Society. When I was in office, I did not consider that we could immediately expand the staff, but I expected that by this stage we would be able to make some country appointments. I imagine that the Minister would have had the request from the Law Society that I had, as it came up regularly when I was Minister of Social Welfare, for the Law Society to be relieved of maintenance enforcement work in country areas, because this is normally and properly the work of the Social Welfare Department. We were unable to provide regional officers immediately, although there was at that time some expansion of other regional offices of the department. We were not at that stage able to provide officers trained to do the maintenance arrears work, but we hoped to be able to expand the department's staff to a certain number of regional officers in the State to provide maintenance enforcement activity. What has been done so far in this regard?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Soon after I came into office, I had the same request as the honourable member had had from the Law Society. I must confess that at the moment I cannot quite remember the detailed arrangements we made, but I know I have been able to meet the request. I will look up the file and let the honourable member know what the arrangements are. I am confident that we have made them here, although my memory does not run to their detail. During this current year we hope to open an office in the Upper Murray area, where such an appointment is justified.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I now refer to the line dealing with Struan Farm, which has been used for a considerable period for boys who, while at the McNally Training Centre, have expressed some interest in training for rural activities, in some kind of rural

avocation, or in spending the remainder of their period of training in a farming environment, which was attractive to some of them. It is true that the cost in respect of each inmate at Struan Farm has been high and that the number of boys placed there has varied from time to time but, while objection has been taken on occasion to the high cost of maintaining boys there, for one reason or another (I know I was concerned about the cost of Struan Farm when I was Minister and caused some investigations to be made on that score), to have no other provision than McNally for older boys who are undergoing training at a training centre where they are under a form of detention seems to me a short-sighted policy because I do not think that McNally can provide a sufficient variety of training programmes for all the various boys who have been committed to an institution for institutional care and training and with whom we have to deal. What is the Government's proposal now in respect of having some other means of varied training beyond that obtainable at the McNally Training Centre?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We have no specific alternative. One of the reasons (and this is one that really clinched it, so far as I was concerned) for the closure of Struan is that we have had extreme difficulty in finding boys who are interested in going there. The daily average occupancy has dropped to about 14, and my officers advised me that it was only with great difficulty that they were able to encourage boys to go to Struan at all. This being so, I was advised (and I accepted the advice, after a visit to the institution myself and an inspection of it) that the institution should be closed. Apart from the complaints which all honourable members will recall have been made by the Auditor-General over the years, I accepted the advice substantially because there does not seem to be at present, from the experience of the department, a need for facilities such as these. If the need should grow again, we will have to look for some alternative, but at the moment there just are not sufficient boys interested in this sort of occupation to justify any alternative arrangements.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Minister personally attended the placement review meetings at the McNally Training Centre at which cases of boys in the centre are discussed and assessments made of the possibilities for the future? I ask him this because I found it necessary to do this myself

when there were a few placements being made at Struan on a previous occasion, and significantly there was some change in the placement rate after this. It is easy at these placement committee meetings to make assessments in relation to the boys upon reports which are before the committee and which do not always take account of all the factors involved and, what is more, where the alternatives are not by any means clearly put to the boys concerned.

I wish to raise a further point on this matter of placement and training at the McNally Training Centre. One of the problems which we were facing previously in regard to training at McNally was that the training programme was not one with which every officer having to deal with a boy at McNally was fully conversant. A boy could be (and often was) sent to a particular work-room without the officer in charge of that work-room having any idea of the boy's background or particular problem or of what it was that the department was seeking to achieve with him. It was a complaint of the staff there that the future of the boys was a question for the senior welfare officers or for the Superintendent. Often, people who were supposed to be directly involved in a boy's training had no real idea of the background or problem of the boy.

It was difficult in the old building to get anything very much better done, because the whole of the programme there was proceeding under considerable difficulties. However, one would have hoped that in the new centre some better provision would be made to involve the whole of the staff in the programme, contrary to what had been done previously. So far, as reports have reached me, I can see little sign of this, and it seems to me that the training is proceeding in very much the manner that it did in the old building, with what I think are understandably somewhat poor results on occasions. I ask the Minister whether any action has been taken to alter the situation within McNally, and whether he has personal experience of the workings of the placement committee.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have not been to a meeting of the placement committee and the matters that the Leader has raised have not come to my notice, nor have I taken any action on them. Now he has raised them I will discuss them with the Superintendent (Mr. Graham), and also with the Acting Director.

Line passed.

Department of Aboriginal Affairs,
\$1,793,512.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Earlier this year I asked the Minister about the position of Aboriginal wages on reserves, citing what I had been told in relation to Davenport: that the wages on reserves had at last been brought up again to the previously existing position, namely, that the living wage was paid. However, with the increase in the wages there was a decrease in the amount of employment on the reserves, and specifically at Davenport I understand there was a decrease from about 80 to about 40. If, in fact, there was a decline in employment on the reserves, this meant that unemployment benefit was payable on southern reserves. This is a policy against which the department, under the previous Government, had resolutely set its face, because the payment of unemployment benefit on southern reserves returns them to very much the conditions that existed before we set up the programme of uneconomic employment on the reserve whereby we required people to pay for what they got as an essential part of their training on the reserve.

Once people on reserves are being paid money at less than the living wage level, this tends to depress the living standards of the remainder of the people on the reserve and induces the pauperizing of the Aboriginal community. This has been a terrible inheritance for them over the long period of the hand-out system that existed in South Australia previously. The rule that previously existed was that, on the southern reserves, if a man was able-bodied he had to have work on the reserve or off it but he must have employment. This was something that was insisted on and had been insisted on by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs before I became Minister, and it is a policy with which I entirely agree. As I understand it, that policy has now been departed from. The Minister, when I put it to him, said that what I was saying was substantially correct and that he would get a full report. I should like to know from him now what is proposed to be done on these reserves in relation to these matters.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): The note I have here reminds me that I told the Leader during Question Time on September 4 that I had a reply for him, but he did not ask me for it on that occasion. I appreciate the argument the Leader has put with regard to employment, but

the plain facts of the matter are that experience has shown (and this was the advice of my officers, although the decision by the Government was on my recommendation) that some persons were taking advantage of the fact that they could not be dismissed and this was creating an extremely difficult situation on some of the reserves. Aborigines employed on the reserves knew that it did not matter what they did they would be given work and would be kept in employment. I could not ignore the situation that had arisen in some cases and, therefore, the policy that had been in operation for a number of years has been altered so that superintendents now have the power to dismiss in the case of unsatisfactory work performance. However, this power will be used (and this is the direction that has been given) only sparingly and certainly, I hope, not as it would be used in open employment; but the sanction of dismissal is there, and it is thought that this is desirable in the light of the experience we have had. This means that Aborigines on reserves are in a rather more similar situation to that of others in the community and this, in itself, is a measure of preparation for full integration.

Furthermore, the Commonwealth Employment Service in South Australia now has an officer whose prime responsibility it is to place Aborigines in employment. While unemployment benefits are payable on reserves, every effort is being made to place Aborigines in employment, and these efforts have been increased, in co-operation with the employment service, in the last few months. We had to choose between continuing with the old policy, the benefits of which the Leader has outlined, and ignoring what was happening or facing the reality of the situation and modifying that policy. It was felt desirable, taking into account all factors, to modify the policy and to allow of the dismissal of Aborigines where their work performance was unsatisfactory. That policy has been in operation since May this year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not the case that on reserves under the policy previously existing there was no sanction against Aborigines for unsatisfactory work, because there was: they could be dismissed for a portion of a week, and their pay could be docked for the time they were not on the job. This was a specific remedy that was agreed by me with the trades union movement in South Australia because it agreed that there were special problems in relation to employment in which complete dismissal was not

available. That sanction was used to effect on many occasions. I received many reports at the time we were in office that it was effective and I cannot see that, in the short time since, there can have been a marked change in the results of work policies. To say that it is better to have a sanction to dismiss someone entirely than it is to put him on unemployment benefits on a reserve immediately disposes of the policy that anyone who is on the reserve must have work on it or off it but must work at a wage-earning occupation.

Once we admit of the payment of unemployment benefits on the reserve for those who choose to live on unemployment benefits we get the sort of situation that now exists on a number of Northern Territory reserves. As the Minister must know, a number of our officers came to South Australia specifically because they agreed with the policy of requiring people on our reserves to be employed and refusing payment of unemployment benefits to a number of people doing nothing on reserves and simply getting an inadequate handout in unemployment benefits. I hate to see the old established reserves in South Australia, over which we had such a struggle, returning to what is basically the handout system.

[Midnight]

There is a real danger of this occurring if large-scale unemployment benefits are provided for on those reserves rather than an insistence that the people be in employment on the reserves. I do not know whether the Minister went to Point Pearce in the old days before the recently-introduced policies took effect there. The difference in the situation on that reserve, compared with the situation 10 years before, is very marked; the great improvement in the standards and attitude of the people and their pride in themselves resulted from policies initiated not during my term as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs but during the present Treasurer's term. I followed through with those policies. I do not like to see these policies go, because of the dangers that can occur. There is no means of avoiding the build-up in population that is taking place at Point Pearce; the people want to live there. If a large group of people there are on unemployment benefits, there will be a revival of the trouble previously experienced.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$163,045—passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

The Estimates were adopted by the House and an Appropriation Bill for \$246,606,034 was founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. G. G. Pearson, and read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is for the appropriation of \$246,606,034, details of which are set out in the Estimates which have just been dealt with by the House. Clause 2 provides for the further issue of \$166,606,034, being the difference between the amount authorized by the two Supply Acts (\$80,000,000) and the total of the appropriations required in this Bill. Clause 3 sets out the amount to be appropriated and the allocation of the appropriation to the various departments and functions. The clause also provides that if increases of salaries or wages become payable pursuant to any determination made by a properly constituted authority the Governor may appropriate the necessary funds by warrant, and the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased accordingly. The clause further provides that, if the cost of electricity for pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide main, the Morgan-Whyalla main, and the Swan Reach to Stockwell main should be greater than the amount set down in the Estimates, the Governor may appropriate the funds for the additional expenditure, and the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased by the amount of such additional expenditure.

Members may recall that in previous Bills the provision for unforeseen pumping covered the additional costs in respect of bores in the Adelaide water district, but did not, of course, extend to the newly constructed Swan Reach to Stockwell main. The provision in respect of bores was required in the very dry year 1967-68.

However, in present and prospective circumstances I think it more reasonable that the clause be kept relatively simple, that the three major mains be specified, but that the reference to bores be deleted. Following the recent rains and further run-off since early September, I would say it is most unlikely that the special provision will be required this year.

Clause 4 authorizes the Treasurer to pay moneys from time to time up to the amounts set down in monthly orders issued by the Governor, and provides that the receipts obtained from the payees shall be the discharge to the Treasurer for the moneys paid.

Clause 5 authorizes the use of Loan funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Commonwealth and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by Clause 3. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1969. Clause 7 authorizes the expenditure of \$4,000,000 from the Hospitals Fund during 1969-70, and of \$1,300,000 in the early months of 1970-71, pending the passing of the Appropriation Bill for that year.

Clause 8 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly authorized. With the slight variations I have noted in these comments, I think the House will find that the Bill conforms to that usually presented at this time.

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

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.12 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 9, at 2 p.m.