

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. T. C. Stott) presiding.

The Acting Clerk (Mr. A. F. R. Dodd) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.9 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Governor's Speech. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.23 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

ABSENCE OF CLERK

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That leave of absence for the Clerk of the House (Mr. Combe) from April 20, 1970, to August 23, 1970, be approved.

Members will be aware that, accompanied by his wife, Mr. Combe is now overseas on a private trip for which purpose he is using recreation and long-service leave. It is necessary, however, to have formal approval of the House for his absence during the sitting of Parliament.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, during the Clerk's absence, under Standing Order 30 his duties will be performed by the Clerk Assistant. Pursuant to Standing Order 31 I have appointed Mr. J. W. Hull (Second Clerk Assistant) to carry out the duties of Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker, the Hon. Robin Millhouse, Messrs. Arnold, Broomhill, and Lawn.

Library: The Speaker, Messrs. Clark, Evans, and Venning.

Printing: Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Edwards, Ferguson, Giles, and Langley.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT ACT

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of the House to the proclamation in the *Government Gazette* dated March 12, 1970, notifying Her Majesty's assent to the Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1969, which proclamation I now ask the Acting Clerk to read.

The Acting Clerk read the proclamation.

South Australia } Proclamation by His Excellency the Governor of the
to wit. }
J. W. Harrison } State of South Australia.

I, the said Governor, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, do hereby proclaim and make known that a certain Act, namely, the Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1969, passed by the Legislative Council and House of Assembly of South Australia, and reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon, was laid before Her Majesty in Council, and that Her Majesty was pleased to assent to the same.

Given under my hand and the public seal of South Australia, at Adelaide, this 12th day of March, 1970.

By command,

R. C. DeGARIS, Chief Secretary

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN!

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that, in compliance with the summons from His Excellency the Governor, the House attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which Speech I obtained a copy which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That a committee consisting of Messrs. Arnold, Evans, Nankivell, Wardle and the mover be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament, the committee to report today.

Motion carried.

Later:

The Hon. R. S. HALL brought up the following report of the committee:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I move:

That the Address in Reply, as read, be adopted.

I understand that the Whips on both sides have conferred and that we have agreed formally to adopt this Address in Reply.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I wish to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive the House for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 2.25 p.m. [*Sitting suspended from 12.32 to 2.15 p.m.*]

The SPEAKER: I now invite the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and any other honourable members of the House of Assembly who so desire to accompany me to present the Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor.

At 2.16 p.m. the Speaker and members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 2.30 p.m.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech, together with several other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address adopted by this House, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the fourth session of the thirty-ninth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

DEATH OF FORMER MEMBERS

The SPEAKER: It is with profound sorrow that I draw the attention of the House to the deaths of the following former members of this House: the Hon. Sir Robert D. Nichols, member for Stanley from 1915 to 1938 and for Young from 1938 to 1956, Chairman of Committees from 1927 to 1930, and highly esteemed Speaker for a record term of 23 years from 1933 to his retirement in 1956; and Mr. C. R. Dunnage, member for Unley from 1941 to 1962 and Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees from 1956 to 1962. As Speaker of the House, I express the deepest sympathy to their respective relatives. In tribute to their services and as a mark of respect to their memory, I ask honourable members to observe a minute's silence.

Members stood in their places in silence.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of the several sums for all the purposes set forth in the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure by the Government during the year ending June 30, 1970.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Governor's Speech and a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Mr. Chairman, I place before the House for consideration Supplementary Estimates for 1969-70 totalling \$1,320,000. Before dealing with them in detail, however, I believe it would be useful to members if I were to give a brief summary of the main factors which have influenced the Revenue Account in the first 10 months of the year, the trends as they now appear, and the possible results for the full year.

REVENUE BUDGET, 1969-70

Original Estimates:

On September 4, 1969, the then Treasurer, the Hon. Sir Glen Pearson, presented to members a formal Revenue Budget which forecast a deficit of \$2,240,000. This was based on the known circumstances, including provision for salaries and wages in accordance with rates then applicable and an estimate of Commonwealth grants which might reasonably be expected in the absence of further awards. However, it was pointed out to members that the Government was bound to be involved in additional expenditure commitments as the result of new salary and wage awards, and that the cost could easily be about \$5,000,000. It was a reasonable expectation that award increases of that order might lead to an increase in the taxation reimbursement grant from the Commonwealth of \$1,800,000 or thereabouts. Accordingly, the realistic Budget forecast was that the deficit could increase to between \$5,000,000 and \$5,500,000 in the absence of any special Commonwealth support or other unusually favourable factor.

Cost of wage awards:

It is clear now that the cost of salary and wage awards will be much greater than originally forecast, and it appears that the Revenue Budget may be adversely affected to the extent of about \$7,500,000. The two major movements have been a new award for South Australian teachers and a determination by the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission in the national wage case of a general increase of 3 per cent of total wages. These two awards were operative from September and

December, 1969, respectively. Other determinations have increased the scales for the Police Force, for engineers, and for clerical and other groups.

Commonwealth grants:

On the other hand, however, the increase in the taxation reimbursement grant will be much greater than earlier anticipated. The Australian wage level used in calculating the grants is now relatively high not only owing to the effect of new awards but also because of increasing overtime and over-award payments. Further, at the conference held in Canberra in February last, the Commonwealth Government agreed to make available a special grant of \$12,000,000 to assist in meeting the Budget problems of the six States this year, our share being about \$1,300,000. As a result, South Australia now expects to receive increases in Commonwealth grants which will go close to offsetting the additional cost of awards handed down since the Budget.

Other receipts:

The shipment of grain from South Australian ports has been surprisingly heavy this financial year, having regard to oversea marketing problems and the lower volume of shipment from Australia as a whole. This has led to a marked increase above estimate in freight revenues of the railways undertaking and in wharfage and bulk handling receipts of the harbour services. The continuing recovery in the State's economy, with considerable industrial and commercial development, has also helped to increase a wide range of revenues.

Other payments:

On the payments side of the Budget there is a number of variations both above and below estimate, but overall it seems that a firm control has succeeded in holding the aggregate within the original provision—that is, apart from the special matter of wage awards, of course.

Summary:

With a full two months of the year yet to go it is too early to make forecasts of the probable end-of-year result with any great confidence. Railway receipts alone could vary by hundreds of thousands of dollars from the present pattern. However, I believe that with a continued firm control of expenditures there are now good prospects of a balanced Revenue Account for 1969-70, with some possibility of a modest surplus to partially offset earlier accumulated deficits now standing at about \$7,500,000.

APPROPRIATION

If the appropriations approved by Parliament in the principal Appropriation Act (supported by Estimates of Expenditure) early in a financial year are not sufficient in any particular category to cover the Government's actual commitments during that year, it is then necessary for the Government to call on other sources of appropriation authority. There are three such sources; namely, a special section of the main Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund, and a supplementary Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates.

Appropriation Act—Special section 3 (2) and (3):

In the main Appropriation Act is a special section which gives additional appropriation to meet increased costs due to awards of wage-fixing bodies and to meet any unexpected upward movement in the costs of pumping water through the three major pipelines. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover the larger part of the costs of awards, though it has been possible for some departments to meet portion of these costs out of the original appropriations. It has not been necessary, at least to the present stage, to call upon the special authority to cover excess costs of water pumping.

Governor's Appropriation Fund:

Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund, which in terms of the Public Finance Act may cover the expenditure of up to \$1,200,000 in addition to that otherwise authorized. Of the \$1,200,000, up to \$400,000 is available, if required, for new purposes: that is, for purposes not previously authorized either by inclusion in the Estimates or by other specific legislation. The appropriation in the fund is being used this year to cover some smaller excesses above departmental provisions and the costs of a number of new purposes, but it is not sufficient to provide for all the expected claims for additional appropriation.

Supplementary Estimates:

Therefore, the Government has decided to put before you Supplementary Estimates to cover the expected excess expenditure in three areas of the Budget and to relieve the fund accordingly. The proposals are for additional appropriation totalling \$1,320,000 as follows:

	\$
Hospitals Department	300,000
Minister of Education—Miscellaneous	770,000
Minister of Roads—Miscellaneous	250,000
	<hr/>
	\$1,320,000

DETAILS OF APPROPRIATIONS

The details of the appropriations listed in the Supplementary Estimates are as follows:

Hospitals Department:

The costs of many items essential to the normal operation and maintenance of Government hospitals are now running at a level higher than provided in the original Estimates. The Government will ensure that drugs and other supplies continue to be available as required to provide those essential services and that the requisite accounts are met without delay. Accordingly, appropriations of an additional \$190,000 for the Royal Adelaide Hospital and \$110,000 for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are included in these Estimates.

Minister of Education—Miscellaneous:

After consultation with the States, the Commonwealth Government has appointed Mr. Justice Eggleston of the Commonwealth Industrial Court to advise it as to the appropriate levels of salaries it might support for academic staff in Australian universities retrospectively from January 1, 1970. Mr. Justice Eggleston carried out a similar inquiry in 1964, while in 1967 the Australian Universities Commission itself made the necessary investigation.

The South Australian Government proposes that the salaries of academic staff of the South Australian Institute of Technology should also be reviewed and increased from January 1, 1970, and in this review will have regard to the order of increase eventually approved for university staff.

At this stage it is, of course, not possible to say either exactly when the result of the inquiry may be known or precisely what order of salary increases may be proposed. Nevertheless, it is most desirable that some provision be made in Supplementary Estimates so that, if additional grants are required before June 30, adequate appropriation will be available to cover the increases retrospectively to January 1. Accordingly, these Estimates contain provisions of round sums for grants as follows:

	\$
University of Adelaide	400,000
Flinders University of South Australia	150,000
South Australian Institute of Technology	125,000

The arrangements for the sharing of the additional costs between the Commonwealth and the State for the two universities under universities legislation, and for the Institute of Technology under advanced education legislation, are similar: that is to say, in each case for the Commonwealth to provide 35 per cent and local sources 65 per cent. The Commonwealth contribution, which will require further legislative authority, will be credited to Crown revenues when received.

The original Estimates provided for a grant of \$627,000 towards the operation and maintenance of the services of the Kindergarten Union. During the year the union has adjusted salary scales having regard to the new teachers' award and the general 3 per cent determination, and has incurred additional costs in meeting certain long service leave entitlements. The Government has agreed to make additional grants of \$55,000 this year towards meeting the salary and leave costs, and is proposing supplementary appropriation accordingly.

Members will probably recall the legislation which made the Public Examinations Board an autonomous body. Whereas in the financial year ended March 31, 1969 (that is, the period covering the 1968 public examinations) the board was a responsibility of the University of Adelaide, it operated as a separate entity for the period covering the 1969 examinations. In the original Estimates it was expected that the board's expenditure budget of about \$200,000 in the 12 months to March 31, 1970, would result in a deficit of about \$80,000, and provision was made accordingly. Having regard to a recent review of the board's operations, to some costs for computer services in the previous year actually billed in the present year, and to the desirability of now providing for 15 months' operations to place the board's accounts on the basis of financial years ending on June 30, it is necessary for the available appropriation to be increased by \$40,000.

Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local Government—Miscellaneous:

Members will recall from the debate in Parliament in August, 1969, that the Government, in accepting most of the proposals set out in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, stated specifically that it did not

accept the proposals for the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway. However, the Government stated that its policy was to continue to authorize land acquisition along the M.A.T.S. routes, based on hardship considerations. Unfortunately, there is no power at present in the Highways Act to authorize such expenditures. While the Act empowers the Commissioner of Highways to acquire land and property for future roadworks and to use moneys in the Highways Fund for that purpose, it does not extend to the acquisition of land and property in cases of hardship in areas where it is possible, but not certain, that a road may be approved at some future time upon a route recommended but as yet not finalized. The Government has now taken the initial steps to have amending legislation drawn up so that the powers of the Commissioner under the Highways Act may be suitably extended.

In the meantime the only authorities available to the Government to enable settlements to be made with people who may incur hardship in the areas of the originally proposed Hills Freeway and Foothills Expressway are a special Parliamentary appropriation in Supplementary Estimates will be applied to Governor's Appropriation Fund for a purpose "not previously authorized". The special limited section of the fund for new purposes has been used as far as practicable, having regard to other requirements, for settlements up to date. The authority of \$250,000 sought in Supplementary Estimates will be applied to make good the amount drawn against the fund and to authorize further necessary settlements in the next two months. When the Highways Act is amended, provision will be made for the recovery to Revenue Account of any amounts spent from Revenue Account under this authority. The total additional appropriation for the purposes I have explained is \$1,320,000.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the first line of the Supplementary Estimates.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

I do so pursuant to leave granted earlier today.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I do not intend to detain the House long, but there are certain matters of grievance which are very real to the Opposition and to the people of this State and which should be dealt with at the first possible opportunity. The House has now been in recess for a considerable period and there have been urgent matters which have needed attention but which have not been dealt with. They could have been dealt with if the House had sat at an earlier time. There has been much work to do, but it has not been accomplished, and people have suffered as a result. Furthermore, while we need to do the things to which I shall turn my attention in a moment, other matters are rapidly arising that will cause grave difficulties for South Australia unless the State Government can persuade the Commonwealth Government to adopt other courses.

In certain areas of South Australia's industrial undertakings there has been a steady reduction in the involvement of certain kinds of industry. There is a whole list of industries that have reduced their activity in or taken their activity out of the State. In certain cases the most bitter feelings have arisen from industry because of the Government's actions. I cite one example that must be known to every member of the Government: some time ago the Municipal Tramways Trust called for the building of a certain number of buses; tenders came in and were dealt with, opened and known. The trust then called tenders for a larger group of buses, recalling the tenders received previously. Most of these buses had been built in South Australia by Freighter Industries Limited which had maintained a capacity in order to be able to meet the peaks of Government demand. As a result, that organization was from time to time putting what was for it uneconomic work into South Australia in order to maintain that industrial capacity, and Freighter Industries Limited was a long-established and valuable industry. When the tenders came an interstate concern, having seen the original tenders of Freighter Industries Limited for the first set of buses, significantly undercut that firm's costs on the initial tender.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: How could they have known?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The tenders were opened and known, and then they were entirely recalled. Then the contract was awarded away from Freighter Industries

Limited to a concern that was not at that time established in South Australia. The result has been a significant reduction in the establishment of Freighter Industries Limited in South Australia, with a promise of further reduction.

Mr. Broomhill: That's not how the Premier announced it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is not the kind of industrial expansion that the State needs; we need to protect the long-established industries of the State. It is not the slightest use the Government's coming forward and saying that this is a decision of the Tramways Trust. The Government has the power to nominate the members of the Tramways Trust Board, and it has direct representatives on that board. As the Chairman of the trust is an officer of two Government departments, and as the Treasury keeps a close eye on the workings of the trust through the Under Treasurer, it is clear that the policies of the trust should be well known to the Government; yet this is the sort of action that occurs.

A long list has been compiled by unions in South Australia of reductions in many areas of industry, particularly the engineering industry, in this State. This is an alarming situation. What is happening is that we are not showing signs of diversifying our economy to protect us from what will happen if consumer spending is cut back in the markets for our products. I point out that 85 per cent of the industrial product of this State is sold on the Eastern States' domestic market. As soon as the Commonwealth Government cuts back credit or reduces consumer spending power by budgetary means, this State gets hit harder than any other State because 75 per cent of its secondary production consists of consumer durables, which are the first things that people stop buying. Already the financial journals of Australia are talking about the credit squeeze situation. The Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasury have called the economy menacing. Already we have had from the Housing Industry Association a Commonwealth-wide warning about what will happen with building in the whole of Australia as a result of the reduction in house finance now becoming available. If this sort of policy goes on, South Australia will get hit harder than any other State.

What action are we taking to counter this effectively by diversifying our economy and seeking export markets directly through Government and private co-operation? In Western

Australia a Minister has promoted activity, from a much smaller industrial base than we have, to markets in South-East Asia. Where is our promotional activity, with people who are much better qualified and better tooled up to supply those markets? As this activity is not taking place, South Australia will run into trouble unless action is taken urgently. It is no use South Australia's simply relying on the occasional whim of someone who may choose to invest here as a result of the handing over of a glossy pamphlet.

In addition, South Australian consumers are being hit hard. During its period of office, the Government has removed from price control more than 32 items including food, children's clothing, work clothing, hair cuts, soft drinks and, particularly, building materials. Consider the effect of that, combined with the Government's budgetary measures of increasing taxation quite heavily in South Australia, despite what it said before taking office. The only taxation measure that was mentioned before the Government took office was the removal of the winning bets tax, but nothing was to be put on. As a result of the taxation measures the Government has brought in, plus the removal of items from price control, the cost of living has created the gravest situation for most middle-class and working-class families in this State.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: The indices don't show that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The indices do show it. Let me turn to a matter which also concerns consumer protection and protection of the average citizen and which ought to have been dealt with by this Parliament. In 1967 Parliament passed the Builders Licensing Bill, which provided for the establishment of a Builders Licensing Board and an advisory committee representative of the whole of the industry so that the necessary advice could be given to the board in the preparation of the required regulations for the various classes of licence to be issued.

The time required for the preparation of regulations was agreed by the industry to be six months or more. Therefore, the measure was to be proclaimed in June, 1968. However, as honourable members know, it has never been proclaimed. During the two years the Government has been in office, the only action it has taken has been to introduce in the last session some amendments that were not proceeded with. Those amendments would have made the measure fairly useless anyway, but

the Government has not given notice today that it intends to restore that amending Bill to the Notice Paper.

Mr. Jennings: They don't want that back.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, apparently the protection required by the building industry and the consuming public in that area is not of interest to the present Government. The Government has had, for a considerable period, the report of the Adelaide University Law School on the Law Relating to Consumer Credit and Moneylending. There has been ample time to deal with many of the measures recommended in that report and, what is more, it is vital to South Australians that we give additional protections in these areas. I do not know the sort of people who are going to the door of the Attorney-General these days but I know who was coming to my door when I was in that office. The place was besieged by people who were suffering from inadequate and unsatisfactory hire-purchase and credit agreements, and people are still coming to me. Every member of this House gets complaints weekly about these matters.

Mr. Jennings: Daily.

Mr. Broomhill: It wouldn't worry the Attorney-General, though.

Mr. Langley: I can assure you we do get them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not a day passes without people coming to this House complaining about consumer credit and the agreements they have signed, which leave them with no sort of remedy. Many of them are left with a large debt and no assets. This matter should have been dealt with urgently by this Parliament, but the Government has not introduced one Bill on that basis. These are matters that we need to deal with urgently. The Government has at last called Parliament together to deal not with these matters but with one matter that it apparently considers will be an election-winning issue for it. Because of the signs of grave deterioration in the economy in South Australia, the Government would rather have a poll now than at some later time. Well, if the Government wants a poll right now, the Australian Labor Party will be pleased to give it.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I thought you were the one who wanted it.

Mr. Corcoran: No: you give us the opportunity.

Mr. Langley: Who laid it on the line?

Mr. Corcoran: He laid it on the line after he told us he was not game to sit, but then "Muscles" came out and broke the news.

The SPEAKER: Order! Have honourable members finished their second reading speeches? There should be only one second reading speech at a time. The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Sir. I am grateful for the assistance of my colleagues and I know I always have their support.

Mr. McAnaney: That's a funny one.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There have not been any public differences in our Party. It is clear that members opposite are prepared to go to the poll at this time because they think there are storms ahead and that the situation will deteriorate for them. We are always happy to give an election to members opposite, because we have been pointing out since the last State election that most people in this State have clearly wanted another election as soon as possible in order to be able to elect the Government they want and reject the Government they do not want. If the Government is prepared to give them the opportunity this time, I am sure the people of the State will take it.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I should like to raise several matters, the first of which relates to the Governor's Speech. Members opposite are not satisfied with having the newspapers, particularly the *News* at present, in their pocket. They also want to invoke the aid of the Crown and reject the standard constitutional practice that the Governor in South Australia, the Governor-General in Canberra, or the Queen in England is completely independent of the Party battle. The Speech that was put into the mouth of the Governor of South Australia early this afternoon was designed to give the people of this State the impression that the Governor was on the side of this Government, and the *News* played along with this plan.

I have no doubt that this whole approach was considered beforehand by the person or persons who wrote the Speech, as whenever a controversial or partially controversial matter was raised in the Speech, instead of the usual practice of having the Governor say, "My Ministers advise me", unequivocal Party-political statements were put into the mouth of the Governor. The Governor, therefore, has been used to take sides in political controversy. This is unfortunate and a complete

departure from the constitutional practice that should operate. The independence and impartiality of the Governor of South Australia, the Governor-General in Canberra, or the Queen in England should never be placed in jeopardy by political references. I shall give chapter and verse on this: first, we had the Governor of South Australia saying—

The SPEAKER: Order! Before the honourable member proceeds, I think I should draw the attention of the House to the time box on the Clerk's table that is now operating. This is now working for the member for Glenelg. As soon as the honourable member has one minute to go a light under the clock and one above the Speaker will show.

Mr. HUDSON: How much longer have I got?

The SPEAKER: I do not know when the honourable member started.

Mr. HUDSON: In dealing with the State's finances, the Attorney-General (who, I presume, wrote the Speech, because he has been telling everyone what a marvellous speech it was) wrote, as appears on page 4 of the Governor's Speech:

Accordingly, with continued firm control of expenditure, there are now good prospects of a balanced Budget in 1969-70, with some possibility of a modest surplus which may partially offset earlier deficits accumulated during the three years to June, 1968.

The Attorney-General, in writing this for the Governor, managed to avoid saying "accumulated during the three years of the previous Labor Government". However, the remark was completely pointed and, in fact, was untrue. The main deficit on Consolidated Revenue Account occurred in 1965-66. In 1966-67 there was a surplus.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Oh!

Mr. HUDSON: The Premier can sneer at that, but it happens to be the truth, and it is a pity the truth was not put into the mouth of the Governor this afternoon. The deficit was not accumulated during those three years. The bulk of the deficit occurred in 1965-66, and it was a continuation of the run-down in finances which started in 1964-65 and which was not halted until 1966-67. Furthermore, the present Government would have had substantial deficits in each of the last two financial years but for special grants made available by the Commonwealth Government for the first time in 1968-69 and continued in 1969-70. But for them, as is admitted in the financial documents produced, this Government would have had a further accumulation of deficits.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: We got them from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. HUDSON: No: As a result of pressure from all States because of the hopeless position of the Commonwealth-State financial relations that has existed for many years, the Commonwealth partially recognized the problem in 1968-69, and it now looks as though it will recognize it still further.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It is hard for you to make your point without admitting too much.

Mr. HUDSON: It is not a question of admitting: I want to be honest about the matter, which is more than the Attorney-General is prepared to be when he writes a speech for somebody. The Attorney-General and all Ministers opposite, as far as one can judge from their attitude, are quite happy to go along with a situation in which the Governor is used for political purposes. Let us now turn to the first page of the Governor's Speech, where paragraph 5 states:

If these agreements are not ratified there is no prospect of any increase in the entitlement of this State to water from the Murray River nor for the building of any additional storages. Indeed, it will not be possible to provide sufficient water even for our presently foreseeable needs. Restrictions will be inevitable.

I have little doubt that Government members informed the *News* of these statements before they were even given by the Governor in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Do you dispute them?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, I dispute them on the basis that the Dartmouth dam, on the admission of both the Attorney-General and the Premier, cannot begin to store water until 1975. Both the Attorney-General and the Premier have said this. Unless there is an extraordinarily bountiful year, the Dartmouth dam will not be declared effective until close to the end of this decade. I have good reasons for saying that. As every honourable member knows, whatever dam is constructed, if no additional storage can be declared effective until towards the end of this decade, then whether or not we get Dartmouth or whether or not we get Chowilla there is a serious chance of restrictions occurring over the next few years, and every Minister knows that statement to be true.

The Minister of Works gave an answer to a question this afternoon about the rise in water usage over the last year, and the point

of that answer was that if water usage continued to rise at the same rate we could be in a very difficult position in a dry year.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: We have to get water quickly.

Mr. HUDSON: Members of the Government know full well that it is not possible to get water even beginning to be stored in Dartmouth before 1975. The Minister of Education knows that. He would also know that it would be possible to get water stored in Chowilla, if that were constructed now, probably at an earlier date. However, be that as it may, the point I wish to make is a perfectly obvious one, and that is that whatever is done this State faces the possibility of water restrictions in the metropolitan area of Adelaide over the next seven or eight years. Yet words are put into the Governor's mouth today, and the headline "Water Cuts If No Dam, Warns Governor" is used in the press today. These words were put into his mouth by the Attorney-General and his Cabinet colleagues. I think enough has been said to enable people to recognize that a very shabby episode in our constitutional history occurred today. It was a very shabby incident indeed, and I hope it is not repeated.

I turn now to a matter relating to the administration of the Education Department. It was admitted by the Minister of Education, in answer to questions this afternoon, that a magnificent brochure, the biggest for 10 years, with 48 pages and glossy photographs, was being produced. It is said that this brochure gives us all the facts on education and sets out what is being done in South Australia. Its title is *What our Schools are Doing*, and its aim is to paint the rosy side of the education system in South Australia. Again, according to the Minister, it is to be distributed through the schools, with headmasters instructed to give it to all the children to take home to their parents. The children are to be used as postmen. On further instruction from the Minister, this has to be done before the end of term. And, of course, it is to be done at the taxpayers' expense. As far as I can see, the probable cost is about \$40,000.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I will tell you the cost tomorrow.

Mr. HUDSON: I am only guessing, but it is a massive project, with photographs galore and 48 pages, and there will be a copy for every child in the State. A considerable expenditure of public money is involved. If

there is to be an election, the timing of this brochure is well planned.

Mr. Virgo: The L.C.L. candidate in the district will distribute it.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know whether they will go as far as that. After all, one must not be prejudiced in these matters.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You have a pretty good imagination.

Mr. HUDSON: I have not yet said anything that the Minister has been able to suggest is incorrect: all he has done is to confirm everything I have been told about this matter. In the questions I asked this afternoon I said that the information had been given to me and I wanted to ascertain whether it was accurate. The Minister confirmed my information.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I gave the honourable member all the information I had.

Mr. HUDSON: On the front of this document is a message from the Minister patting on the back his predecessors and making special mention of whom? The member for Whyalla? Not on your sweet bippy! The Hon. Mrs. Steele gets a special pat on the back.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The Premier said this afternoon that it was in reply to the teachers' campaign.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes; that is the true story. The teachers will be used to distribute it to the children so that they can take it home to their parents.

Mr. Clark: The Premier said something about higher salaries.

Mr. HUDSON: The Premier prefers to have a rather muddled memory of last year's events. The fact of the matter is that this Government is ensuring that, if there is an election, the most expensive Party-political pamphlet, in effect, ever produced in South Australia—and produced at the taxpayers' cost, not at the Party's cost—will be distributed to every schoolchild throughout the State through Government schools. This is most unfortunate, and I have no doubt that the South Australian Institute of Teachers will have much to say about the Government's attempt to hide the conditions in our education system that need improving. After all, we cannot get the community, let alone the Commonwealth Government, to face up to the basic problems of our education system unless we are prepared to face up to the truth ourselves. This glossy,

white-washed document is designed to mislead people and to stop them from facing up to the facts of our education system.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: What does it tell them of the Labor Government's attitude to Commonwealth assistance?

Mr. HUDSON: Quite. I have no doubt that many teachers and headmasters will object to this pamphlet on the ground that it does not properly face up to the difficulties within the system. Therefore, it is not just an ordinary, non-controversial publication. It is controversial. I point again to the memorandum sent to headmasters last year by the then Minister of Education (Hon. Joyce Steele) relating to the distribution of information in schools. The memorandum is as follows:

Nevertheless, schoolchildren should not be used to act as postmen for conveying controversial information, whether political or not, to their homes. This must apply from whatever source the material comes. I know that you agree with me on this matter and will act accordingly.

In answer to questions, the Minister insisted that headmasters had discretion and were expected to use that discretion. If the Minister says, as he said this afternoon, that this brochure is to give the true picture of what is going on in our education system, and if a headmaster says that it does not give a true picture because it does not point up the deficiencies that we need to remove, and he says this document is therefore controversial, will he have the right to refuse to distribute it to the children in line with the memorandum circulated by the previous Minister last year? I want an answer to that question.

Will the headmasters of South Australian Education Department schools be able to exercise the discretion that the previous Minister of Education told them last year they were to exercise, or is the current Minister going to depart from the memorandum that was issued last year? I give fair warning to the Minister that I will be demanding an answer to that particular question before this brochure is distributed at all. Let us face up to the real issues within education. I know the current Minister admits that class sizes must be reduced. I know that the current Minister will admit that just about every school throughout the State is disfigured by a rash of temporary classrooms and that these temporary classrooms are unsatisfactory. I know the current Minister will admit that there are not sufficient teachers within our schools, because he was pressed on these very matters last week by Andy Thorpe on 5AD.

Being an honest man, he cannot deny that there are these serious problems within our schools, problems relating to excessive class size, problems of class size which mean that the individual student does not get proper attention from the teacher in charge, problems of discipline that come from excessive class size, and problems of unsatisfactory teaching and studying conditions that exist in school after school throughout the State because of antiquated buildings and temporary classrooms that have long since become permanent. Every honourable member knows that the kind of expenditure that will be necessary to get on top of these problems is beyond the financial resources of this State. We believe that the State could do much better within its own financial resources than it is doing. We believe that there was no necessity, as this Government did last year, to cut back the school-building programme by \$1,000,000.

The State can do much more in the field of education than it has been doing but nevertheless it is also true that, to get a proper solution of the problems of obtaining an adequate supply of teachers within the foreseeable future, of getting the necessary reduction in class size and of getting rid of the unsatisfactory classrooms, this will require an increase in expenditure that is not within the State's financial capacity. Therefore, it is necessary to get Commonwealth aid directly into Government primary and secondary schools, and until that Commonwealth aid is forthcoming we will not get on top of this problem. Let us be clear on this matter. I do not think that this is a matter of competition between Government schools on the one hand and independent schools on the other hand; I think there is a ratchet effect. Whatever the part of the system in which standards are improved, this could create pressure to bring up the standards in the other part of the whole system. Can anyone tell me that the way to go about getting Commonwealth aid is to present a 48-page brochure saying, "Everything in the garden is lovely; look at what we are doing"?

Mr. Broomhill: That doesn't seem logical to me.

Mr. HUDSON: Certainly good things are being done within the department. One of the problems of crisis for the teachers is that within the department there is a tremendous potential which has existed for many years but which is not being realized and is leading instead to frustration. What we had last year and still have is a crisis of morale within the

teaching profession. It is vital at any point of time that we get over this problem.

Can anyone really suggest that we can convince those hard-headed moguls in Canberra of the necessity of granting aid to Government schools as well as it grants aid to independent schools, if, encouraged by the Minister, we go about saying, "Look at what we have. Isn't it marvellous? Look at these beautiful photographs." In order to get the message across to the Commonwealth Government at all times we have to be realistic and honest about the deficiencies in the system. It is important for the Minister and for departmental officers to be realistic and honest about those deficiencies. We have to mobilize public opinion behind the department in a drive for Commonwealth aid. If we do that we can get aid. However, the present Government's technique is completely misdirected, representing a refusal to wake up and face up to what are the basic problems.

I now turn to the question of the cost of living and to economic prospects. If I may correct what my Leader said, it is Mr. Gorton who says that the economy is potentially menacing and Mr. Bury who says, "Don't worry about potential: it is menacing." Those members who have approached any bank in the community over the last few weeks know that the credit squeeze has already been applied. Interest rates have already been increased and many businesses and individuals throughout the community are being asked to cut back on their overdraft commitments.

Mr. Casey: Properties in the South-East, including Bordertown, are being sold for that reason.

Mr. HUDSON: I should not be surprised if what is happening is affecting other places in the State as well. The banks are putting pressure on borrowers to cut back on their borrowing. Of course, the sudden drying up of credit is one of the basic reasons for the shake-out on the Stock Exchange. Brokers had been allowing customers credit, and the banks tightened up on the brokers and on others who were using bank credit to speculate on the Stock Exchange, so that the shake-out on the exchange has been of no mean size. I have no doubt that members of this place have had their fingers burnt, although I do not want to name any member in this connection.

Mr. Edwards: Are you speaking from experience?

Mr. HUDSON: No. I hope that, next time the member for Eyre asks his bank manager for credit to play the stocks and shares, the honourable member has a little more success. However, we already have the signs of the kind of credit squeeze that was introduced in 1961 and, if members care to think back to that time, they will remember that the stock exchange crisis occurred about two months before the announcement of the Commonwealth Government's restrictions: the crisis occurred towards the end of September, and Holt's famous or infamous measures were not introduced until towards the end of November. However, the occasion for that was an extremely drastic rise in imports in October, 1961.

Mr. Clark: Is that why the South Australian Government wants to "give it away"?

Mr. HUDSON: Well, that may be the case: that the Government says, "Whatever chance we have now of winning an election, we will have no hope in March next year, so we had better take the plunge now and see what we can save from the wreckage". I should not be surprised if that argument has been used among honourable members opposite. However, my point is that this Government will be able to do precious little about the situation in the way of immediate action. Again we will be the victims of the stop-go economic policies of the Premier's colleagues in Canberra. Mr. Bury is saying, in effect, "Mr. McMahon, when he was Treasurer, let the economy go too far. I have to apply the brakes, and, because he let it go too far, I have to apply the brakes harder than otherwise would have been the case".

In my opinion, it is most unfortunate that we are faced with incompetent economic management in Canberra, because that incompetent management, by restricting credit, will have a bigger effect on the South Australian economy than on the economy of any other State, simply because South Australia's production is so heavily concentrated in those areas that rely on hire-purchase or other credit finance. I am referring to the areas of motor cars and consumer durables. The motor car companies already are watching the market situation carefully, according to information I have been given, and already there are signs that stocks may be building up.

Mr. Clark: Did you say "socks"?

Mr. HUDSON: I am referring to stocks of unsold motor cars.

Mr. Virgo: Not "Stott"?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know: I think he may have to get a knighthood yet to save the Government. All these matters to which I have referred are important. I consider that this Government has shown inefficiency in its general administration, a willingness to indulge in propaganda of a phoney kind, which is again shown by the proposal that the Minister of Education has. This is not the kind of brochure produced by the Education Department relating to information about courses or relating to information for trainee teachers. It is not the kind of document that is informative. It is a deliberate public relations stunt and, to the extent that there is any benefit in it for the public relations of the Education Department, the Government obviously hopes that something to the credit of the L.C.L. Government is to be gained as well. However, let everyone realize that the Government has decided that it is better to spend \$40,000, if that is the figure, on producing this book than to employ 10 additional teachers. I and, I am sure, most other thinking people in the community deplore the Government's decision.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): As my name was bandied about, particularly by the last speaker (the member for Glenelg), there are several points I should like to make in reply to what he said and in reply to what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not intend to canvass all the matters that both gentlemen have raised, particularly those raised at somewhat tedious length by the member for Glenelg concerning education, because the Minister of Education can deal with those if he wishes. I mention three matters: first, the question of the cost of living in this State and the general economic outlook; secondly, the remarks made by the Leader concerning the Adelaide University Law School Report on the Law relating to Consumer Credit and Money-lending; and thirdly, the point first made by the member for Glenelg concerning the Governor's Speech at the opening of Parliament.

Dealing with the matters in that order I start with the question of the cost of living in this State. The Leader said again tonight what I understood he said on a radio programme for the Labor Party last week, that the cost of living in this State was rising extremely fast. I think he used the phrase "at a crazy rate" last week. Undoubtedly, there is a rise in the cost of living going on all over Australia, and there is indeed a general inflation in nearly

every country in the world. What are the facts relating to South Australia compared to those in other States? Regrettably, I do not have the exact figures with me and I am now speaking from memory, but I used the figures last Friday on a radio programme when replying to the remarks made by the Leader. The consumer price index figures show that during the 21-month period from the June quarter of 1968 to the March quarter of 1970, that is, to the end of the month just passed —

Mr. Hudson: That is a phoney comparison, isn't it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have not made any comparison yet.

Mr. Hudson: For most of that period the economy was depressed.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Perhaps the honourable member would allow me to make the point: he can get one of his friends to reply to me later if he wishes. I took that 21-month period of our time in office so far, and if one considers the cost-of-living rise in the various States one finds that the rise in South Australia is 4 per cent, I think, from memory. That is only .1 of a per cent more than Victoria at 3.9 per cent, which is the lowest in the Commonwealth. That is a fact, and I think it is 1.4 per cent below the average for the six capital cities. I am comparing the cost of living rises in capital cities, because that is a valid comparison. Until the quarter ended December 31, 1969, the Adelaide rise was the least of any.

Mr. Corcoran: What about the March quarter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The rise here was slightly greater than it was in Melbourne, and it means that South Australia now is .1 of a per cent above the lowest of the six capital city rises during that 21-month period. Yet the Leader can say on the radio and here, and his followers can echo this, that the cost of living is rising at a crazy rate in South Australia. This is an inexact term and it can mean anything you like. However, when we compare what is happening here with what is happening in the rest of Australia our record is a good one, and I hope members opposite will remember that. I cannot help feeling that what was said by the Leader recently, since he scented the possibility of an election in South Australia, about the likely future of the economy here in the next few months was merely an excuse for what he knew would happen if Labor came into office in this State. Whenever the Labor Party is in office—

Mr. Hudson: You are being dishonest.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The truth is that the Labor Party is fundamentally a Socialist Party. It is antagonistic to private enterprise and commerce, which are the backbone of the economy of this State, and indeed of all the States. Whenever Labor comes to office, there is a loss of confidence in the community, and the Leader knows that if he comes to office the same thing will happen again as happened in 1965 and went on until 1968. That is all I want to say on that point.

Let us come now to the second point I desire to canvass—the disparaging remarks made by the Leader about our attitude to what is commonly known as the Rogerson report but what should be known properly as the Adelaide University Law School Report. He has blamed us this evening, as he has on other occasions in the last few weeks since he started his electioneering, with not doing anything to implement the various proposals in the report itself. What is the position here? The position is that that report was released about the middle of last year by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General during the meeting in Brisbane at the beginning of July. It is a most comprehensive document containing many suggested amendments to the law; it needs much study, because it is of such a novel and indeed revolutionary nature, before any of it can be put into legislative form. I think that is fair general comment.

There are several subsidiary matters in the report with which it would be possible for one State to go ahead: indeed, some States already have legislation on those topics, but it was much too late when we got the report to include any of those matters in legislation for the last session of Parliament. As it was, this Parliament dealt with 109 Bills last session. Only two or three of them were left but obviously there was no opportunity, unless we were prepared to go on until Christmas time or later, to deal with anything else. That is why we have not touched those subsidiary matters.

It has been publicly announced that the Standing Committee still has under review the main fundamentals in the Rogerson report. The Victorian Government has set up a committee to study them and to see how they can practically be put into legislative form, and it would be wrong and a waste of time for South Australia to go ahead with those matters on its own, because they are matters which, of necessity, if they are to benefit the people

of this State and of Australia must be proceeded with on a uniform basis. I ask the Leader to contain his vessel with a little patience. He may have some surprises when we come to the general legislative programme that the Government intends to put before Parliament later in the year.

Mr. Lawn: Are you going to the people next month?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I hope that that will put the Leader on the right track so far as this report is concerned. Now let us come to the matter raised more particularly during this debate by the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Lawn: Why don't you answer my question?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Attorney-General is making the speech.

Mr. Lawn: I'm only asking a question.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have not the faintest idea what the question was; I did not hear it.

Mr. Lawn: Are you going to the people next month?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall go on to the third point raised in this debate by the member for Glenelg. This concerned the Governor's Speech, although the Leader was flapping about it this afternoon in the House and I understand he has done a little piece on television about it. Sir, I have never heard such a pettifogging objection in my life as this one regarding the Governor's Speech, and if Opposition members cannot find anything better to complain about than the style in which His Excellency's Speech was written they are hard up indeed for matters to bring before this Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: For centuries the Governor's Speech has been acknowledged to be a political document containing the legislative proposals and programme of the Government of the day, and there is no convention whatever regarding the style in which that Speech is written. I am not apologizing for this Speech; in fact, I thought it was a jolly good one.

Mr. Virgo: A jolly fine swan song.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It was pungent and hard-hitting and every statement in it was accurate, as the Opposition well

knows. I have no apology to make whatever about this. I just want to make one last point, particularly for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, regarding the Governor's Speech or the Speech from the Throne and to give the example of a previous speech that may well appeal to the Leader. I am sorry the member for Brighton is no longer here.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member to whom the Attorney-General refers is the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Lawn: That's an admission.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am sorry he is not here because it would appeal to him, too. This suggestion of the Leader that there is some constitutional convention regarding the form in which the Governor's Speech should be put to Parliament is absolute nonsense. Let me remind the Leader, because I know he still retains a little history, of the famous or infamous John Wilkes, the publisher of *The North Briton* in the 18th century. The Leader will recall that John Wilkes was prosecuted, I think for criminal libel, in the reign of George III because of statements contained in No. 45 of *The North Briton* in 1762, more than two centuries ago. Let me quote just one sentence from the offending article.

Mr. Clark: What's this got to do with it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I want to show how the King's Speech was regarded in the 18th century, and I wish to quote this to refute the suggestion of the Leader that there is some constitutional convention about this. The relevant sentence is as follows:

The King's Speech has always been considered by the Legislature and by the public at large as the speech of the Ministers.

That is exactly what it is and what it always has been. It has always been acknowledged to be a political document written by the Government of the day and setting forth for the members of the Legislature and the people of the community for which that Legislature is responsible its programme and the reasons for that programme. It does precisely what the Speech we heard delivered this afternoon by His Excellency does, and we make no apology for it whatsoever.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have heard the Attorney-General in the House on numerous occasions, and I do not think we have heard him worse than he

was tonight. He talked so much twaddle it was almost unbelievable. I think he must be suffering from pre-election jitters. I challenge the Attorney to go out and say to the workers, the pensioners and those on fixed incomes in this State that South Australia is having less rise in the cost of living than any other State and see whether he comes out of it with his glasses still on. He would not have the courage to go to a pensioners meeting and make a statement like that. About three weeks ago the Prime Minister told the pensioners in Canberra that they were being treated very well by Liberal Governments. The pensioners did not agree with him, and I do not think many other people would agree with him, either. To use the old ruse that the increase in South Australia's cost of living is the second to lowest in the Commonwealth is just pure childish argument, and I would have thought that a man with the legal qualifications of the Attorney-General would use something a little more to the point—not that juvenile drivel. It is just like saying to a person, "We will increase a charge by \$10 a week," and then saying, "We have had second thoughts; because we feel very sorry for you we will increase the charge by only \$5 a week." It is the old pea-and-thimble trick.

This is the sort of guff that the Attorney is trying to put over. I should like him to get out amongst the people and try to tell them that the cost of living is not increasing. One has only to look at what the Government has done: it has increased charges wherever possible and it has relaxed price control so that even the prices of the ice-cream and cool drinks that children buy have been increased. To make the wild statement that whenever a Labor Government is in office industry loses confidence suggests that the Attorney thinks that a Labor Government has been in office about every other term for the last 20 or 30 years. He had better read a 20th century history book: never mind this 18th century rubbish that he is reading! He should realize that it was the rotten gerrymander that Liberal Governments sponsored and maintained that kept the Labor Party out of office and denied South Australia the industrial development to which it was entitled.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Which Government achieved redistribution?

Mr. VIRGO: I am very happy that the Attorney has been stupid enough to make such a statement. In 1965 and 1968 which Party threw out electoral reform that was based on democratic principles? Was it the Labor Party?

No! It was those rotten Liberals in the Upper House, and the Attorney knows it. They prevented democracy from coming to South Australia. The redistribution that the Premier got through this House was achieved for one reason and one reason only: because members on this side said that it was better than the rotten system then applying. We can see how far the system is from democracy when we realize that the Attorney's new district will have about 16,000 electors whilst the district of the member sitting behind him will have about 9,000 electors.

Mr. McAnaney: You are a thousand or so out, but that is pretty close for you.

Mr. VIRGO: I am giving approximate figures, and the honourable member knows that they are fairly accurate.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Would you change the system if you had the opportunity?

Mr. VIRGO: I do not know whether the Attorney-General would like me, if I was wearing climbing spikes, to climb up one of the pillars in this Chamber: the question he has asked is just as stupid. He knows that, after five months of gathering dust, this House has been called together to deal with one matter only—the Premier's hobby horse, the Dartmouth dam (1,000 river miles and six weeks away). Although I do not wish to prolong this debate, I want to say two or three things, particularly in view of what the Attorney has said. He has said that the report of the Adelaide Law School on consumer credit was received too late to be dealt with last session, and he told us that we dealt with 109 Bills, or something. The report may have been too late for last session, but what has the Government done since last December 4 or 5, when in a terrific hurry it closed down the House and did not even give sufficient time to debate some of the Bills before us?

The Attorney threatened to put an important Bill up in Annie's room if the Opposition exercised its democratic right as representatives of the people and properly debated the measure. So do not talk this twaddle about not having time! What has happened in this five months, apart from showing a few school-children around the building? The House has been empty and gathering dust when it ought to have been open for the conduct of the business of the State, so that we would not have had that business conducted by those six august gentlemen who should be sitting on the front bench (two of them are missing) and their three comrades-in-arms up in the Legislative

Council. Let us look at some of those things that I am saying ought to be done. The Attorney will recall that on January 20 I wrote to him drawing attention to the fact that workers of this State were being robbed by insurance companies, because those insurance companies were not paying the proper amounts of workmen's compensation.

The Attorney can sit there with that supercilious grin on his face; he has never known what it is like to live on workmen's compensation. Let him try to live on \$40 a week and keep his wife and kids. Indeed, that is what his Government is forcing many injured workmen to do. If he thinks that it is a joke, then let him try it. Very few people involved would think it humorous. The matter is made worse by the fact that insurance companies cheat. In fact, looking over the various dockets that I have on this matter I notice that when I spoke to the officer of one insurance company he told me that the company had consulted its legal representative, who had said that it did not have to make the payments. There is a legal representative who does not even read the Act!

Mr. Lawn: It wasn't Mr. Millhouse, was it?

Mr. VIRGO: I am not saying who it was. I asked the Attorney immediately to have a check made of the various insurance companies involved in workmen's compensation in order to ensure that they were paying the proper amounts. He rang me a day or so afterwards and said, "Look, you're asking me an impossible question; there are something like 60 or 70 insurance companies. How could we go to all these?" I am blown if I know how the Attorney could go to them all, but surely there are a few people who work in the Public Service and who would place the welfare of an injured workman above all else for a short period. Finally, I received a reply, after the Attorney had pushed the matter on to the Treasurer, and the Treasurer had pushed it back to the Attorney (going around in circles), on March 18, after two or three other letters had gone backwards and forwards, stating:

In replying to the Treasurer on February 12, 1970, the Chairman (of the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association) advised that he had circularized all members and sent copies of the circular gratuitously to the major insurers who are not members of the association.

Isn't that delightful! This is from a man who had only a few days beforehand severely criticized me in the press for saying that insurance companies were under-paying. He said I was mad. I may be, but I have some damn

good proof to show how mad I have been at insurance companies that have been under-paying.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I don't think I used that description of you.

Mr. VIRGO: I am talking about the Chairman of this Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association. It is futile to ask him to do this when they have already refuted the charge. This was a clear admission by the Attorney that they would do nothing at all. To add insult to injury I received the following letter from the Premier (and I am pleased he is back in the House to hear it):

I acknowledge your letter of March 18, 1970, regarding the delay you experienced in obtaining a reply to correspondence regarding the Workmen's Compensation Act.

I had written because I was just not receiving a reply. The letter continues:

I have noted that the Attorney-General wrote to you on the same day—

that is true, and this is the winner—

and I hope there will be no further reason for complaint regarding claims under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

I can assure the House that there is much room for further complaint. Sooner or later this Government has to get rid of its complacency in relation to these matters and stop covering up for crooked insurance companies in the way the Attorney tried to do this afternoon—and I want to deal with that matter, too, although it is not concerned with workmen's compensation.

I do not think the Attorney realizes the racket which is being worked throughout Australia by insurance companies and which has been referred to by the member for Enfield this afternoon. I intend to go further than the member for Enfield went. I ask the Attorney to say whether he is prepared to appoint a Royal Commission immediately to investigate the affairs of this company and to determine how many people are being chiselled out of their rights. I ask the Attorney to consider this request seriously, and I hope I will receive a reply before Parliament rises. The Attorney can laugh it off if he wishes. I shall give one instance. We were able to bluff them through on one occasion. Its racket is that it offers insurance at lower premium rates than any other company offers.

Mr. Clark: It can afford to.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, because it does not pay its claims. When a vehicle is in an accident, the company inspects it and says, "That is not

a brand new tyre; that car is unroadworthy because that tyre is not in perfect condition." The company even looks in the boot and, if there is a bald tyre there, it pronounces the car unroadworthy. This is true: there is no point in laughing about such things. I can give details of a young fellow who turned over his car in the district of the member for Gumeracha in, I think, either December or January, and he has not been paid a penny, because this company said that the two front tyres of his car were bald.

Mr. McKee: It accepted his premium all right, through.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, but it said that two front tyres were bald and that it would not pay. The last case I wish to instance, perhaps the daddy of them all, concerns a chap in my district. A few weeks ago, during the night, his car, which was parked in his drive, was stolen. Apparently, the person who stole the car found the ignition keys on the front seat. He drove the car to Marino Rocks and pushed it over the cliff. The insurance company refuses to pay the claim, stating that it is not liable because this person did not take sufficient care to safeguard his property.

Mr. Clark: And it was in his own drive?

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. Thinking that the company might have a point here, I contacted several reputable insurance companies, but each one laughed at me when I mentioned the case. Those companies said, "There has to be more than that in it. No company could treat people like that and exist." One of the Attorney's professional colleagues has advised this insurance company that it does not have to pay. Surely we have reached the stage where the Attorney can no longer sit complacently by, seeing the people of South Australia being chiselled out of their rights, without doing something about it. I consider that this is an extremely serious matter and I hope that, whatever advertising Motor Marine and General Insurance Company Limited gets out of this, the company loses many customers, because the sooner it does, the better.

When I was in New South Wales a couple of weeks ago, the manager there gave me details and, on checking, I found that, when a person there who had been in an accident and had his car repaired was driving along the street, the whole thing collapsed. These things are going on and I hope the Attorney considers them seriously and I also hope that the affairs of this insurance company will be fully and immediately investigated.

I now conclude by referring to something that speaks for itself. It is in reply to the oft-stated claim of Government members (it is repeated in the Governor's Opening Speech, at the behest of the Attorney) to try to project into the mind of the people the view that the Labor Party went on to the Treasury benches with a buoyant Budget and came out with a tremendous deficit, and that the present Government has rectified the position. Let me read the words of a person for whom I think most of the Government have a very high regard, although I know that the Premier is not in this category, for he has rejected completely the view of Sir Thomas Playford because Sir Thomas has the same view as we have regarding Chowilla. On September 1, 1964, the former Premier and Treasurer stated:

After mature consideration of revenue expectations for 1964-65—

that was the last financial year of the Playford Government's term—

and a close review to determine the extent of the necessary expenditure commitments which could not be reasonably delayed or eliminated, I found that the indications were for a shortage of revenues as against expenditures of about £4,500,000. This shortage would have been even higher if the seasonal outlook had not been generally favourable, and it is particularly fortunate that the metropolitan water storage position indicates that water pumping costs will again be low in 1964-65.

In quoting another portion I am not attempting to pick out any points for my benefit but rather selecting pertinent points. When speaking about surpluses from previous years and from the uranium project, Sir Thomas said:

Those surpluses will naturally not be available next year and, unless a substantially more favourable approach is then made by the Commonwealth, the 1965-66 State Budget will be very difficult.

The former Treasurer of the Liberal Government foreshadowed the difficulties he was handing on. He knew that he could not survive another election and that he did not have the constitutional majority to further gerrymander the electoral districts so he made the financial position as difficult as he could. However, he was honest enough to foreshadow what was going to happen. This is the situation that the Labor Party inherited. If that was not bad enough, the seasons made it even worse. So let us get out of the air all of this piffle that the Liberal Party loves to speak about. The record of the Liberal Government since it came to office in 1968 leaves much to be desired. If Government members are so confident of themselves that they think

they have the people believing them and that they have fooled the people, let them go to the people and try it out. Whenever they are ready, we are.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE (Minister of Education): Originally, I intended to speak on education. Many of us who have been in this House for the last couple of years have become used to the usual tirade from the member for Edwardstown. I shall not speak on the points he raised on insurance, because that is a matter in the field of the Attorney-General. The member for Edwardstown in his inimitable style, which we can always foresee the moment he rises to speak, started with his usual tirade. I listened intently to what he said, but I was more interested in what he deliberately omitted to say about the cost of living and working conditions in South Australia. What he has carefully omitted to say in his tirade is that there is now far less unemployment in South Australia than there was when the Labor Party went out of office in 1968.

Mr. Clark: Or anywhere else.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: This is borne out not only by my figures and the information I had when I had the privilege of being Minister of Labour and Industry but also by details from the Bureau of Census and Statistics. Knowing the member for Edwardstown's industrial background I am sure that he would agree with me that the bureau provides much detail, especially on employment and unemployment matters. Compared with the period during which the Labor Administration was in office, there are now more job opportunities, increased overtime, and more jobs available in many categories than there are tradesmen to fill them. In fact, there is a severe shortage of tradesmen in some trades, provided that they can get cement, and there are some serious areas of over-employment. I say this deliberately (and the figures are borne out by the Bureau of Census and Statistics) to emphasize the facts that the member for Edwardstown deliberately avoided mentioning. I go further and say that today we are trying desperately to get back to this State many of the tradesmen who were forced to go to other States towards the end of the Labor regime.

Mr. Virgo: We are the low wage State, the depressed State.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The honourable member has had his say; now I want mine.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Education is making the speech.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I turn now to education, which was touched on by the member for Glenelg. Perhaps I may take first the last point he made because the first part of his discussion was a recapitulation of two questions he put to me this afternoon on which I endeavoured to give him as much information as possible. I am the first to admit (I think everybody in this House admits) that there are problems in education today, as there have been for many years in South Australia, in the rest of Australia, and indeed throughout the world. Many countries are going through the process of finding out that there are greater and greater needs for education. Everybody admits it and I am the first to admit that there is in some areas need for improvement. But, having admitted that, I am trying already to solve some of these problems. This cannot be effected overnight. Compared with the problems that exist in some other States, South Australia can be proud of some of its achievements. There is a long way to go but with some of our achievements here, made not overnight but in the course of years, we have a system of which compared with some other States we can be justly proud; but that does not mean for a moment there is not room for improvement. The member for Glenelg said that the Government was trying deliberately to gloss over deficiencies. I have already admitted there are deficiencies in the education service generally, and we are trying to overcome them.

Just two weeks ago I convened a meeting of all major interested parties in education in South Australia; it was a round table conference, the object being to get going a special education week—not the type of formal education week we have known in the past (about which I have some doubts; I do not want that type of thing to happen again) but a week to be called International Education Week. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization has designated 1970 as International Education Year; it is to be held throughout the world. In Australia it is to be held in the various States. At the meeting to which I have referred were representatives from the Education Department, from the South Australian Institute of Teachers, from the universities, from the Institute of Technology, from independent schools, Catholic schools and various

other bodies—everbody we could think of who was interested in education. (I am sorry I forgot to invite the member for Glenelg; that was an oversight!).

The object as set down by U.N.E.S.C.O. and as agreed upon at this convention was to show what has been done or should be done in one's own country, and to show the need in backward countries of fostering assistance in education. These are admirable precepts and in South Australia part of this programme, which I hope will be decentralized as far as possible—we have set up a working party to run it—will show not only what we are doing and what has been achieved but some deficiencies and what we hope to achieve in the future, making comparisons with other countries and finding out where we can help them. I say immediately that the suggestion that this brochure is designed to gloss over any deficiencies is a complete fabrication by the honourable member.

The honourable member then went on to talk about Commonwealth finance for education, and I agree entirely with him that this State's resources for education are strained to the utmost. We need considerable financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government. True, of recent years increased finance has been made available to the States for this purpose. I have spoken recently to Mr. Bowen, the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science, on this question. I am meeting him next week, and as the Minister of Education I am meeting him again in Canberra, in association with all other State Ministers of Education, on May 25. We already have a working party, which has prepared a vigorous case to be presented to the Commonwealth Minister for a special grant for education for each State. South Australia has prepared a special case for an immediate line to go on the next Commonwealth Budget for moneys to be spent in South Australia.

Mr. Hudson: Do you think you will get it?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I have said that I have spoken to Mr. Bowen on this subject, and I am seeing him next week in Adelaide and on May 25 in Canberra. I have already spoken in my office with Sir Hugh Ennor, the head of the Commonwealth department, and the idea is to get from the Commonwealth Budget this year an immediate grant over and above our normal allocations. This grant is to go to primary, secondary and teachers college education, principally in the form of capital grants for building. We have

already made out a vigorous case for extra money for this State, and I know that I would have the support of every member in saying that we need more and more finance from the Commonwealth Government in this connection.

Mr. Hudson: It is a pity some of your colleagues didn't say that before the last Commonwealth election.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I think everybody would agree today that we must have more money from the Commonwealth Government for education. We know what the Commonwealth does for the universities and for colleges of advanced education. Recently it was announced that a grant had been made to the Kindergarten Union for its new college in North Adelaide. This is breaking new ground in that it is entirely for primary, secondary and teachers college education. In addition, the Premier announced recently, I think about three or four weeks ago, that additional moneys were being made available for the school-building programme in South Australia. The member for Glenelg referred to this a few minutes ago. It is likely (and it was hinted at today in His Excellency's Speech) that there will be some overspending, and it is likely that in the school-building programme for 1969-70 there will be overspending. I have had discussions with the Minister of Works, who has the responsibility for building schools and finding the money for them, and I know that we are likely to overspend this financial year. I suggest that no-one in this House would complain if we did. This is quite separate from the other moves that have been announced recently about improvements in building.

I return now to the hobby horse of the member for Glenelg, who addressed two questions to me this afternoon about a brochure and got on to the subject again in his speech tonight. I thought I had given him as much information as I could, because I remember that last year in another debate (I know that you, Mr. Speaker, would rightly call me to order if I referred to it) I gave the honourable member on every occasion he asked every possible bit of information I could get. This afternoon I told him that I did not have details of the cost with me but I would get them for him tomorrow. What the honourable member has said is that this brochure, which certainly is not the first brochure ever to be issued—

Mr. Hudson: How many have been distributed to every child?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: This brochure is the first of its type for 10 years; in the interim various Ministers of Education have issued smaller pamphlets dealing with special courses, and other departments have issued brochures of various types and on various topics. The honourable member alleged that the Government was issuing the brochure for two reasons: first, for political purposes; and, secondly, to try to win an election. I give the lie direct to his statement. If the honourable member persists in saying this, I will charge him with doing a grave disservice to the education system of this State, which includes teachers, parents and school-children. If he persists in his statements, the charge will be on his head. I categorically deny that this is a political pamphlet.

Mr. Hudson: I challenge you to delay it until the middle of June.

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

Mr. Hudson: Answer that!

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has made his speech, and he cannot have two or three goes.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member is one of those who, having made their speech, insist on having two or three goes whenever anyone tries to reply.

Mr. Broomhill: Why don't you leave it until the end of June? What difference would it make to you if it is not political?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I am interested in education. The preparation of this brochure was commenced before I took office, and I had the privilege of completing it. The schedule for printing and issuing it provides that it should reach the children by the May vacation, and that schedule has been adhered to since I took office. What the honourable member has now done, for some very apparent sinister reason, has been to link this timing with his desire for an election. That is the essence of the honourable member's argument tonight, and we must see it in the context of the recent announcement that the honourable member has been selected as the shadow Minister of Education. Surely a Minister of Education, above all other members of Cabinet, should have at heart the interests of the children, the parents and the teachers of this State.

Mr. Langley: So he has.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: He is making this allegation, and if he had his way he

would be Minister of Education in a month or two. He is turning into a political football my efforts to improve our education system and to tell the people what is available.

Mr. Virgo: You will have a heart attack.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I had a heart attack as a result of hard work, but this is enjoyable. I hesitate to call the member for Glenelg a political shyster, but I regret very much his attitude on this matter.

Mr. Hudson: Are you saying that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: If the honourable member objects to that term, I will say that he is a political opportunist.

Mr. Broomhill: You could prove your honesty in this matter by leaving this publication until June.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not the time for the member for West Torrens to make a speech.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: Let us have a look at that. What is significant is that —

Mr. Broomhill: It would prove your honesty.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: If this brochure is political, as is suggested by the member for Glenelg, what is the reason for leaving it until June?

Mr. Broomhill: It would prove your honesty in saying that it is not political.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: Are you querying my honesty in this matter?

Mr. Broomhill: You're the one who is saying it.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: No; the member for Glenelg made an allegation in his speech earlier this evening. He is the one who made the imputations.

Mr. Hudson: You are spending the taxpayers' money on the brochure.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I know that the member for Whyalla, who is a former Minister of Education well versed in education affairs, will appreciate the merit in putting out to people, including students and teachers of this State, information on the latest developments occurring in education. Apparently, the member for Glenelg, who was most vociferous last year in getting stuck into the Government (if I may use that unparliamentary phrase), is objecting now that something is being done.

I make the categorical statement that everything in this brochure is factual. It contains a foreword by the Minister of Education, as been put out by various Ministers and by have other publications in the past which have successive Premiers, and it contains a foreword by the new Director-General. As soon as this document is available, I will send a copy not only to the member for Glenelg (I will see that he gets the first one) but also to every member of both Houses of this Parliament. If at that time, having received that booklet, the honourable member can then get up and justify his statement that it is put out for a political purpose, I shall be pleased to hear him.

Mr. Hudson: Then, will you delay it until mid-June?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I am not going to delay it. Why should I delay putting it out just because the honourable member gets up on his feet and has a lot of hoo-ha to say? Why should I delay implementing a decision which was made some months ago and which I confirmed when I came into office? The member for Glenelg is trying to run the Education Department from the back bench on the Opposition side. I had looked forward to receiving co-operation from every member of both Houses of this Parliament in presenting this booklet in the interests of education. If that is not to be the case, I personally am greatly disappointed, because in all honesty I had hoped that the booklet would be accepted for the very reason that it was being put out, that is, in the interests of education. I categorically deny that there is anything politically obnoxious at all in it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer): It is obvious that the Opposition is disturbed and that it is frightened of one particular thing, namely, the obvious success of the Government in the management of South Australia's affairs. The Opposition is scared of the electoral consequences that are now becoming apparent in all directions in this community. So much is it running before the wind of its own fear that it has brought the Governor into the argument and said the Government has used him to make political statements. Opposition members have referred to the *News*, which the member for Glenelg said was in the pocket of the Government, and criticized it for printing a speech which they said was wrongly written by the Government for the Governor to read. So we are all in it: the newspaper and the Government. I turned back to the

News of June 21, 1966, and looked for the announcement about the opening of Parliament. I saw that it vied for attention with a far more interesting news story about a strip girl in court. Turning from right to left to the less interesting story I found an announcement of the Government's programme at that time. The newspaper refers to a surprise announcement that the State Government would introduce a Bill to set up a State insurance office being made by the Lieutenant-Governor (Sir Mellis Napier). So, Sir Mellis Napier, reading a speech prepared by the Government, announced there would be a State insurance office.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: In today's *News* there is again on the left of the front page an interesting photograph. Turning to the right there is an even more interesting announcement of the Government's plans on the specific question about which Parliament has met. An important part of the reporting on this page states, "In the speech, drafted by Cabinet—"

Mr. Hudson: That's in small letters.

Mr. Langley: What about the headline?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: So the intention of the shadowy Ministers opposite is to direct attention to the size of the print used to report the Government's announcements. What a marvellous thing to occupy the great minds of those members! It is obvious that they are using any trick in the trade to distract the people of South Australia from the specific reason for the meeting of this House. This will become more and more obvious as the debate on the Bill to ratify the agreement relating to Dartmouth dam takes place. It will then be clearly seen that Opposition members have no valid argument that means anything in relation to the water question in South Australia. They can bring no logic to bear on their argument; all they can do is distract people as they have done in measuring the size of the print used in newspaper reports of the Governor's Speech drafted by the Government. That is the type of thing we are getting from the Opposition.

However, members opposite have made far more serious miscalculations than their rather infantile deliberations as to print size. The member for Glenelg said that the Government had reduced expenditure on Education Department buildings by \$1,000,000 a year. Let me

refresh the honourable member's memory as to the actual expenditure, as this interests him as well as me.

Mr. Hudson: I referred to school buildings.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I sat tight while the member for Glenelg made his assertion, and I wish he would listen to the facts I will refer to.

Mr. Clark: That's unusual.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I know it is not very pleasant for Opposition members to have to listen to this, but I intend to pursue this course. In 1967-68 the net expenditure by the previous Government was \$8,700,000 on school buildings.

Mr. Hudson: You know there was a carry-over in the following year.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I know that the expenditure was \$8,700,000.

Mr. Hudson: But you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is too insistent with his interjections. He has already made one speech and that is sufficient for any member.

Mr. HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. What do we do in relation to continual misstatements by the Premier?

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: And what I have said is not a misstatement; I am quoting from the Parliamentary Papers, and they are accurate. The member for Glenelg had better sit tight and take his medicine, because I repeat that in the last year of office of the Labor Government \$8,700,000 was spent on school buildings: in the first year of office of our Government, this increased to net expenditure from State funds of \$11,700,000. This year the estimated final net expenditure expected from State Loan funds is \$12,100,000, so is it not evident that it would not be favourable for the Opposition to have the facts on improvements in education put into a brochure?

One does not have to be political at all in depicting the recent growth in education to show effectively where it has come from, and this is what annoys the member for Glenelg and makes him charge "Politics" on a factual statement that is directed at building the morale of all those involved in education in South Australia, whether teaching staff, student teachers, schoolchildren, or the women who work in the school canteens. We intend to continue to build the morale of the teaching

profession of this State, and we do not join forces with a member who feeds on the dissension and disruption of the morale of the community. That is the basic difference between us.

Other things have been said but I take it that we do not have to deal with them all because in the main they were distractions, many inaccurate and none more inaccurate than those in the speech made by the Leader, who would imply that industry has declined, not only in total but in diversification, under the present Government. Quite the opposite is the fact, and it can be shown to be so in detail. What the Leader has said is the position is simply not so. We could return again to the Leader's involvement in industry when he was Premier. When I came to office I had to assess whether to continue with a survey that the Leader had commenced. An interim report given to me contained nothing but fancy words, and half the money allocated for that purpose had gone. From memory, it was from \$60,000 to \$80,000. Let us take the lower figure and be charitable. That money had been spent for a few pages of puffy, fancy words. I told these people that we needed more than this if we were to justify the expenditure of the remaining money and we directed them to look at various important aspects of development and growth in South Australian industry. We defined these and these people came along with a programme. I said, "If you can bring the answers up, at least the remainder of the contract money that the former Premier has incurred will have been worth while." I told them to try it and we spent at least another \$60,000, making a total expenditure of at least \$120,000. I will get those figures checked if members want them to be accurate. I do not want to mislead the House about the cost, but it was substantial.

Of course, these people came back with many investigations. One of them is a real prize, of course. It said that the electronics industry in South Australia was not one to be pursued, that we were not suited to it, that we did not have the right techniques or the right environment. We went out and got a \$1,000,000 electronics industry! That is the sort of direction in which the former Premier, the present Leader of the Opposition, spent South Australia's money, yet today he accuses the Government of some sort of failure in industrial development. We have now filled the factories that he, by his administration, emptied. In the first few months when we were in office we hawked those factories around trying to

fill them, because they were a drag on South Australia's reputation, while they were empty, and to have empty a huge factory like the one that was occupied by Diecasters Limited was one of the biggest drags that South Australia could have. It was our objective to fill these factories, and we filled them with successful, viable and diversified industries.

Mr. Lawn: Rubbish!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is no good the member for Adelaide saying "Rubbish" about the Iplex factory at Elizabeth. Let him go out and tell that to the community. The company employs 100 more people than it did before, and now contemplates doubling its production in the near future. The Labor Government emptied that factory, and put 7,000 people out of South Australia each year.

Mr. Lawn: What about Shearers and Freighters?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Leader's recipe tonight seemed to be to abolish competition and institute price control. That seemed to be the tenor of what he said. He did not like the competition that Freighter Industries Limited endured and wanted more price control. One does not have to be an expert in industrial promotion to realize that that is what sent South Australia plummeting to the bottom of industrial development among the States of Australia. Does the Leader think that competition is not needed to keep industry viable and the cost structure down in this community? Concerning Freighters, tenders were called for 140 buses and a second tender was for 260 buses. The successful tenderer for the last tender was also the lowest for the first tender: in both instances the successful tenderer was the lowest. The contract involved more than \$2,500,000 and the saving is 10 per cent. Does the Leader suggest that one industry is in South Australia and one in Queensland? The successful tenderer, as part of the condition of his receiving the contract, had to manufacture here. We are not differentiating between a South Australian and a Queensland industry. The company will employ South Australians to make bodies in South Australia. Because the Leader has a liking for one industry more than another he is suggesting that we shall go to the people using these buses and say that we will charge them another \$250,000 in fares because he likes one firm better. That is the effect of what he is saying. The Leader spoke about not diversifying South Australian industry, and I think he referred to a cottage industry. He knows the term best.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Didn't he speak about a milk-bar economy?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, and perhaps that is why people like Caterpillar of Australia Limited decided not to come to South Australia. It made that decision under a Labor Government but subsequently the Labor Party tried to blame us.

Mr. Virgo: What about Fiat and the one you went around the world to get?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The member for Edwardstown would be interested in diversifying industry in South Australia, and that is what we have been careful to foster, with much success. Let me illustrate some of the milk-bar economy industries to which the Leader referred. Solar International Proprietary Limited in South Australia is producing—

Mr. Broomhill: They have been here for 20 years.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: —in a new factory that will be built under lease-purchase arrangements by this Government in the only optical industry in Australia. It will develop important export markets both internationally and in other States.

Mr. Broomhill: Is this a new industry?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: With the help and promotion of this Government it will be a large industry, and the management of this industry is acutely aware of this Government's support. It has expressed its appreciation of our support. We got the Texas Instruments industry, despite the recommendations that the Leader had started which told us that we should forget electronics. Heaven knows why! We took on the Texas promotion. I visited Dallas and there were exchange visits here. Of course, we were involved then with building the lease-purchase factory that has just been finished at Elizabeth.

Mr. Virgo interjecting:

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The member for Edwardstown cannot get off his one track; we just cannot deal with a mentality like that.

Mr. Clark: You can't get on to the track.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Sir Thomas Playford's Government and, I think, the previous Labor Government dealt with the Krommenie people to entice them to South Australia to make floor coverings. We were successful in finalizing that arrangement. I remember visiting Krommenie in Holland and discussing with the board of that company the activities that

it might engage in here. We now see a successful industry, the first of its type in South Australia and, what is more important, it is using a tremendous quantity of locally processed materials in its manufacturing—a most gratifying move much appreciated by its suppliers. Perhaps it is not important to members opposite, but we have the Nylex Corporation, quite a large industry, coming to this State. It will involve a total expenditure of about \$5,000,000. Obviously, the member for Edwardstown has not watched my television show on channel 9 at 6.25 p.m. on Mondays. I advise him not to miss it, because obviously there is a gap in his knowledge. In fact, I might let him know when the next interesting programme is to come on.

Mr. Virgo: That would be the first one.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Then we have the expansion of the Onkaparinga Woollen Mills, which are successfully selling some of the highest quality production of woollen goods, blankets and rugs on the west coast of the United States of America. It has a wonderfully high reputation for the quality of its goods.

Mr. Hudson: What precisely did your department do in that matter?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The member for Glenelg talks more than he listens and it is difficult to tell him anything, but if he will listen for a moment he may be able to ponder the diversification (if that is what he is looking for) in the establishment of International Computers Limited in conjunction with the new Institute of Technology structure at The Levels. I took a particularly personal interest in this. I again visited this group overseas and had to take a series of actions in relation to its organization in meshing in with the Institute of Technology. This is a most satisfactory result, and it is expected that within three or four years the company will almost outgrow its present premises and be employing about 80 of some of the most highly skilled people in Australia in this field. It is in fact the first software factory in Australia and not only making for South Australian a demand but working out systems for computers for South-East Asia and adjacent areas. So I could go on. There is the expansion of many other existing industries. Perhaps the greatest diversification of all would be the establishment of a mineral science centre, which I believe is close to fruition. That concept

will place South Australia in the forefront of post-graduate mining and mineral development. In addition, it will draw around it mining interests and thereby create a mining complex of learning and development the like of which Australia does not have at present. This brain-power industry is available to South Australia because of the Government's intense interest in encouraging the people concerned and in promoting and assisting the industry at every turn.

During the Labor Government's term of office migration from the United Kingdom practically halted, but the present Government's positive, forward planning resulted in its calling for more migrants within the first few months of its term of office. The Government's planning revitalized and reorganized South Australian industry. This State's economy is so buoyant today because of the confidence that my Government has created in the community. Opposition members know that confidence declines when there is a possibility that there will be a Labor Government. Already Opposition members are making excuses in case they win an election. It is obvious that a lack of confidence follows Socialism in Government, and Opposition members are trying to conjure up a feeling of depression so that they can establish excuses in case they win an election.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I could deal further with this ineffectual and futile argument that the Opposition has thrown up today and with the half-hearted manner in which the Leader pressed his attack. I could deal, too, with the misquotations of the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) and with his incorrect reference to spending on education. His statements need correcting, and they should not be presented to the public as facts. In 1967-68, the last year of the Labor Government, net spending on education was \$8,700,000; in 1968-69, the first year of the Liberal Government, it was \$11,700,000; and in 1969-70 we will see even greater heights—

Mr. Clark: Of extravagance.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That would be about the most inane remark the honourable member has ever made. He often cries to the Government that more educational facilities should be provided in his district; yet when I point out the advances we are making, he says we are being extravagant! The Opposition's whole purpose is so clear: it is to run

from television and to get away at all costs from the question of water for South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There is not one ounce of logic in the Opposition's argument. Its members are trying to obtain an election at any cost: they are frightened of the Government's accumulated reputation and the cumulative effect of success after success. They do not want to see an election in March or April next year: they want an election now, before the Government's reputation rises even higher. I refute the nonsense and the small mindedness of people who attack the Government on this vital issue. How small minded it is to measure the print with which the Speech is made.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

First line (Chief Secretary and Minister of Health, Hospitals Department, \$300,000)—passed.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION

Miscellaneous, \$770,000.

Mr. HUDSON: Can the Treasurer say why the Government has failed to implement the Sweeney Report in relation to salaries at the Institute of Technology?

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer): This subject is still under vigorous discussion in Government and is a matter of some negotiation between Governments. That is all I can say at the present time.

Mr. HUDSON: This is an absolutely extraordinary statement. After all, the Queensland Government, I think, has decided to implement it, and this Government has already announced that it does not intend to go on with the matter. Has there been a change of mind by the Government, or does its previous decision stand? I am not going to be fobbed off by the Alice-in-Wonderland type replies of the Treasurer, so I will direct the question to the Minister of Education, who may know something of a partially factual nature at least (I hope it is better than in the case of the brochure).

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE (Minister of Education): Discussions have been going on, as the Treasurer has said, and the fact is that, as the honourable member should know, an investigation is going on into university salaries at this moment. The Eggleston inquiry is proceeding at present, and we have said that when

the Eggleston Report comes out (we expect it will be in about May or June) then, as we expect that university salaries will increase, so the Institute of Technology salaries will increase in the same ratio. The question then arises of the disparity that exists at the moment between the Institute of Technology and the universities in this State where the same types of course are being taught, with the same content and with the same type of lecturer. This is being investigated, and it is one of the very matters on which I am having discussions with other Ministers of Education in the other States, on which I have had some talks with Sir Hugh Ennor and Mr. Nigel Bowen, and which I intend to discuss in more detail when I see them next week and certainly in May.

In some States there have been partial moves to parity and in other States there have been no moves to parity. An announcement was made about four or five weeks ago that the Ministers would get together, that this matter would be discussed and finalized and that the move would be made conjointly, retrospectivity also being considered. That is our intention at the moment. We are discussing this matter at present with a view to seeing how we can get over the point that was referred to in the Sweeney Report. I must say that there was some ambiguity in the report, but we are discussing the matter. We are currently working also on the Wiltshire Committee Report, which came out about the same time.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF ROADS AND TRANSPORT AND
MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Miscellaneous, \$250,000.

Mr. VIRGO: I rise mainly because of the statements contained in the Treasurer's explanation which disturbed me considerably. I point out to him (and it is merely a minor factor) that his comment was that members would recall from the debate in August, 1969, that the Government, in accepting most of the proposals, stated specifically that it did not accept the Hills Freeway and Foothills Expressway proposals. Of course, that date is not correct. The present Treasurer made his Ministerial statement on February 19. What he is saying now is that he and his Minister have deceived not only this Chamber but also the people of South Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable member's language is rather strong.

Mr. VIRGO: What the Government has done is stronger, because in a Ministerial statement, which appears on page 3692 of *Hansard* of February 19, 1969, the present Treasurer said that the Hills Freeway and Foothills Expressway had been deferred. Yet we find that we are now being asked to agree to the provision of \$250,000 to make reimbursement (I have no quarrel with reimbursement payments) for the Government's purchase of land for a project that has been deferred.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: It is for hardship cases.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, but no hardship cases can be involved when a freeway is deferred: the only hardship cases occur when a freeway is proceeded with. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, if my words were strong, but I believe the public should have a full explanation of what the Government is doing. I am sure the Attorney-General and Mr. Hill used their influence in Cabinet to make sure that the desires of the Mitcham council were acceded to by the Government, and the Mitcham council was told that there would be no continuation of the Hills Freeway and Foothills Expressway. I believe members of this place, the Mitcham council and the public have a right to know why the Government has spent or intends to spend \$250,000 for land for a freeway that it says will not be built.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The simple answer is that the route was proposed and studied and has now been deferred and not accepted. Nevertheless, a number of people whose houses are within the lines for this freeway drawn on the map have obviously suffered some problem in quitting their houses. We do not want people in the community to suffer because of Government planning. The money is being made available for this simple reason. I am sure the honourable member would not want to see hardship created in this way and not ameliorated by providing money with which to purchase these houses. I remind the honourable member that this money will not be wasted. It is obviously out of circulation for road-building programmes while it is tied up in properties, but it will return to the Government either by way of future road-building programmes in that area or through the sale of the properties.

Mr. Virgo: You're saying that a road will be built there.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member can draw his own conclusions. If he cares to listen he will find out the position; if he does not listen he can read my remarks later.

What I have explained should be obvious to the honourable member. In the meantime, the Government does not intend to see people suffer hardships by being unable to sell their properties because of planning still taking place, whatever that planning may be.

Mr. HUDSON: It seems that the Government has adopted an attitude that makes deferment the same as adoption. What the Government is doing in relation to the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway is the same as it would do if it had adopted the routes.

Mr. Virgo: That's right. They're too dishonest to say it.

Mr. HUDSON: If they had adopted the routes, they would have acted on hardship cases. The present situation puts a complete cloud over anyone living along those routes. The position is as if the Government had announced adoption. We ask the Government how long we have to put up with this situation. It has already been deferred for 14 months. Is the Government unable to make up its mind on these two routes because of the quality of the people who live along them, or something like that? The Minister's whole purpose is to get people fighting amongst themselves so that he, like Sir Galahad, can announce a route and be the saviour of all those people who live on the other routes. The people living along these routes are entitled to a reasonably quick decision, but we are getting the absolute reverse. People living on the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway have a legitimate complaint.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: First, I suggest that the people in these areas should get better spokesmen than the two members who have addressed themselves to the matter. I resent any implication by the member for Edwardstown that the Government is being dishonest.

Mr. Virgo: I'm not implying it: it's a statement of fact.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Members opposite are in a cleft stick. When we opened our plan for public inspection, we were told that we should not have done that because it created uncertainty, but members opposite also did not want us to come out one day and say to people, "Bang, you are gone." All that members opposite want is political disturbance and the member for Edwardstown has followed this matter from its inception for political disturbance. I can make that charge in the same way as he can make the charge that we are dishonest, and I think I am correct. The

plan has been announced and, if we think there is a hardship case, we cannot have these people hurt.

Mr. HUDSON: When we ask how long the people along these routes will have to wait, the Premier goes on with his usual garbage. As he has been told many times by the Opposition members, when any freeway route is adopted it should be incorporated in the Act and a period of six months should be allowed. I repeat my question: how long do the people on these routes have to wait before this Government gives a definite decision whether the routes are deferred or not?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member knows that it is not possible to plan in detail at the same time the routes in every direction. It will take time before a decision is made as to where the route will be in the area with which we are dealing. It would be useless to put a time table on when that will be decided: the decision will be made as soon as possible, bearing in mind the number of planners available to Government and the speed with which other controversial areas are cleared up and a decision made.

Mr. VIRGO: Obviously, from the Premier's replies we are not going to get anywhere with him, because he has adopted his usual evasive attitude and tactics. In rebutting my charge that the Government had acted dishonestly he attempted to justify its action by saying that it had not acted dishonestly because the matter had been brought before Parliament. When reading his explanation this evening he did not realize what the words meant. The only reason he has brought the matter to Parliament is that he is forced to do so because there is no provision in the Highways Act to deal with it, and the Government wants to be reimbursed for the money paid out of Revenue Account.

The Premier also said that I pursued the matter for political purposes. Because of this statement by the Premier I intend to make a statement now that I would not otherwise have made: the Premier can accept the responsibility for my making it. I was told last week, on extremely good authority, one of the recommendations before the Metropolitan Transportation Committee to reroute the Noarlunga Freeway through the Sturt Gorge would be followed in order to get the Minister of Roads and Transport out of the political dilemma he was in, because in his private capacity as a land agent he had sold houses to people in Ridgehaven Drive only a short time before the

Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study was released. So the Premier should not talk to me about bringing politics into this matter. The responsibility for my having to make that statement lies fairly and squarely on the Premier because of the tactics he has adopted.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That is the standard of debate I expect from the honourable member

Mr. Virgo: You started it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is a completely unsubstantiated charge, which the member for Edwardstown has plucked out of the air, against the personal integrity of the Minister. He has been known to do this before, so let him be known by it.

Line passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Supplementary Estimates were adopted by the House and an Appropriation Bill for \$1,320,000 was founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. R. S. Hall, and read a first time.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is based upon the Supplementary Estimates which have been dealt with by the House. Clause 2 authorizes the issue of a further \$1,320,000 from the general revenue. Clause 3 appropriates that sum and sets out the amount to be provided under each department or activity. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall have available to spend only such amounts as are authorized by a warrant from His Excellency the Governor, and that the receipts of the payees shall be accepted as evidence that the payments have been duly made.

Clause 5 gives power to issue money out of Loan funds, other public funds or bank overdraft, if the moneys received from the Commonwealth Government and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to meet the payments authorized by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to the first day of July, 1969. Clause 7 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated. Except for the amount

of appropriation sought and the period covered, this Bill is the same in all respects as the supplementary Appropriation Bills passed by the House in recent years. I commend the Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1971.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That towards defraying the expenses of the establishments and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1971, a sum of \$40,000,000 be granted: provided that no payments for any establishments or services shall be made out of the said sum in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments or services on the Estimates for the financial year ending June 30, 1970, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the Public Service or by any regulation or by any award, order or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Motion carried.

Resolution adopted by the House. Bill founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. R. S. Hall, and read a first time.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides for the appropriation of \$40,000,000 so that the Public Service of the State may be carried on in the early part of next financial year. As members know, the annual Appropriation Bill does not normally receive assent until the latter part of October and, as the financial year begins on July 1, some special provision for appropriation is required to cover the first four months of the new year. That special provision takes the form of Supply Bills, normally two such Bills each year, and without this Bill now before the House there would be no Parliamentary authority available for normal revenue expenditure from July 1, 1970. The amount proposed in this Bill, \$40,000,000, is the same as in the first Supply Bill introduced last year,

and it should suffice to cover requirements through July and August. Accordingly, it will be necessary for a second Supply Bill to be submitted to the House in the latter part of August to provide for requirements while the Estimates and the main Appropriation Bill are being considered during September and October.

A short Bill for \$40,000,000 without any details of the purposes for which it is available does not mean that the Government or individual departments have a free hand to spend, as they are limited by the provisions of clause 3. In the early months of 1970-71, until the new Appropriation Bill becomes law, the Government must use the amounts made available by Supply Bills within the limits of the individual lines set out in the original Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates approved by Parliament for 1969-70. In accordance with normal procedures, members will have a full opportunity to debate the detailed 1970-71 expenditure proposals when the Budget is presented.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): As the Bill is a purely formal measure granting the necessary supply to continue payments to the Public Service, I see no objection to it. It is in the normal form and, in consequence, the Opposition supports it.

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

PETITION: MATRIMONIAL AND MAINTENANCE PROCEEDINGS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN presented a petition signed by 63 persons stating that judges, magistrates and other public servants of the State were discriminating against men in matrimonial and maintenance proceedings, thereby encouraging the breakdown of families and violating natural justice and the provisions of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It prayed that the House would—abide by the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and legislate that both men and women have equal rights and equal standing before judges, magistrates and other public servants appointed by the Parliament or the Government of South Australia; replace any judges, magistrates and other public servants continuing to refuse equal rights and equal standing to men and women; order the Social Welfare Department to police and enforce all child access orders; direct South Australian judges, magistrates and other public servants not to enforce any orders relating to

the payment of maintenance to women able to support themselves; and provide better amenities (kindergartens and creches) for working mothers.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My question is addressed to you, Mr. Speaker. It has been the constitutional position in this State that Ministers prepare for the Governor to deliver on the opening of Parliament a Speech in which the Governor sets forth the reasons for which Parliament has been called together. It has not been the custom constitutionally for Ministers to put into the mouth of the Governor contentious political statements. Where Ministers have had some contention that is obviously disputed, it has been normal for the Governor's Speech to contain the phrase "my Ministers advise me". However, on this occasion we have had presented to us a Speech in which a contentious statement that unless the political programme of the Government is agreed to certain results regarding water restrictions will occur has been put into the mouth of the viceregal representative as though it were his own statement, which quite clearly it is not. Will you, Mr. Speaker, say whether this sort of thing is in accordance with the constitutional traditions of Parliamentary Government in this State?

The SPEAKER: It has been the practice in the 37 years I have been a member of this House for the Government of the day to prepare the Governor's Speech and to avoid reference to highly controversial subjects in it. I noticed the statement referred to when I read the Speech, and I thought it was a little beyond the traditional custom to which I have been accustomed. The Leader having brought up this matter, I think it goes back to our first Standing Order, which states that, if there is no Standing Order regarding the matter in question, we revert to the House of Commons rule. I have not read all Her Majesty's Speeches in opening various sessions of the British Parliament, but those that I have read certainly follow the general tradition of not bringing in any highly controversial subjects.

WATER RATES

Mr. CORCORAN: In asking a question of the new Minister of Works, I take this the first opportunity I have had in the House to congratulate him on his appointment. I do not

know whether he wants me to say that I hope he will have a happy time in that position—

Mr. Clark: Or a long one!

Mr. CORCORAN: —but nevertheless I wish him well. My question relates to the assessment that either has just been completed or is about to be completed in relation to annual rental values as they affect water rating throughout the State, particularly in the metropolitan area. Several members have recently been besieged with inquiries about what exactly is involved in this increase. I am certain the Minister is aware that his department, too, has been inundated with inquiries. In view of all the inquiries that have been made, I am surprised that the Minister has made no public statement to clarify the position. Will he say now why this increase has been made and describe the effect it will have on the sums to be paid for water rates and for the rebate water used by metropolitan consumers?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: First, I thank the honourable member for his kind words on my appointment; I know he meant what he said. In view of the times in which we live, I can also appreciate what was meant by the asides. As the honourable member has asked a long question about an important matter in which there is much interest, I know he will not expect me to give a reply off the cuff. I shall be pleased to discuss the matter with my officers, and to bring down a considered reply.

MURRAY PLAINS WATER

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I, too, congratulate the Minister of Works on his appointment. From time to time, particularly during the last three or four years, I have pressed for a reticulated water supply for certain Murray Plains areas, particularly for the Cambrai district, and I have been told that, although this area was considered by the Public Works Committee when it investigated the Swan Reach to Stockwell main, a reticulated service was considered impossible to provide until this main was completed. As I understand that that main is now virtually complete, will the Minister further consider having provided to Cambrai and other Murray Plains areas a reticulated water supply from the Swan Reach to Stockwell main, with provision for financing such a supply being made in the next financial year's Loan Estimates?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I acknowledge the kind sentiments of the honourable member on my appointment. Although I have not been a member of this House for a very long

time, I know that this matter has greatly interested the honourable member. As he has informed me that he would ask a question about the Swan Reach to Stockwell main, I am able to report that, although the pumps were due to be installed in October, owing to the world shortage of nickel they will not now be ready for testing at the manufacturer's works until November. Installation of the permanent pumps will therefore be carried out in late summer. Temporary pumps capable of pumping 900,000,000 gall. a year will be adequate for next summer's demand. These facts indicate the progress being made on the main. I shall be only too pleased to ask the Engineer-in-Chief whether something along the lines suggested by the honourable member can be done.

EDUCATION BROCHURE

Mr. HUDSON: It has been reported to me that, on the instruction of the Minister of Education, a 48-page brochure is being produced by the Education Department, and that 220,000 copies will be produced to be distributed by headmasters, who will use children as messengers, to parents with children in Government schools throughout the State.

Mr. Broomhill: That can't be right.

Mr. HUDSON: That is what has been reported to me. I understand that the brochure, which contains glossy coloured photographs and which is entitled *What Our Schools Are Doing*, is aimed generally at whitewashing the current deficiencies existing in our education system. Further, I understand that instructions have been given that the brochure must be produced on time so that it can be distributed before the end of term, or certainly before any election that may take place. If the facts I have given are correct and if we assume that the cost of producing one of these pamphlets or brochures is about 20c, the total cost of 220,000 will be about \$44,000, to be met from the revenue of the Education Department. I guess that would make it the most expensive Party-political pamphlet to be paid for by the taxpayer in the history of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the question.

Mr. HUDSON: Can the Minister say whether the facts I have related are correct, whether this brochure is being produced, what its cost will be, and how it will be distributed? Will he also say on what basis he justifies the distribution of such a brochure, with a message on the front, in view of a likely election?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I am most happy to answer this question. I am not surprised by the tone used by the honourable member in directing this question to me or by its implications. On the other hand, knowing the honourable member's interest in education in the past, if not in the future, I should have expected that he and his colleagues would co-operate in every possible way in the work that the Education Department and I intend to undertake in this direction and in the distribution of this pamphlet. Regarding the specific questions asked by the honourable member, I give the lie direct here and now to his implications. The brochure has been in preparation for some time, the work having been commenced during the term of office of my predecessor (Hon. Joyce Steele) to whom I now publicly give much credit for the preparation and publication of this material. The publication, which will be entitled *What Our Schools Are Doing*, will be distributed to families with children at Education Department schools.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: It's high time the story was told away from political interference.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Education is replying to the question.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: To answer the honourable member's implication regarding the purpose of the pamphlet, I point out that it is aimed to show a cross-section of the work of the department and, through the glossy photographs to which the honourable member referred and other descriptions in this high-class production (and I may say that this is not the first time such a brochure has been produced), it is designed to show the people of this State, particularly parents of the children in our schools, what is being done here in education. I think that is of vital importance. I am the first to admit that such a brochure could not possibly describe everything that is being done, but its object is to give a broad picture of what facilities are available to children in this State and to show what is being done. It is designed specifically to show the variety and the fact that, particularly in recent years, new methods of education, new teaching aids, and new varieties of equipment which were not available a few years ago are now available. I have to watch where the member for Glenelg has moved to.

Mr. Clark: He has a right to move. The whole State will be watching soon.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: For a moment I thought I was addressing an empty seat.

Mr. Virgo: You should address the Chair.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: One of the honourable member's questions referred to the timing of distribution of the brochure. This was decided some time ago, the printing was put into operation accordingly, and it was arranged that copies would be distributed at the schools so that the children could take them home to their parents before leaving for their May holidays. That is a factual statement, and whatever the honourable member may wish to imply is his own choice. It is about time that such a brochure was produced to show the people of this State what is being achieved for the benefit of our schoolchildren.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Can the Premier say whether he approved of the issue of these pamphlets, whether he approved of the cost, and what was the cost?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I was an enthusiastic supporter of the issue of these pamphlets, the preparation of which began some months ago. I believe that there is a great need in this State to publicize its extremely good education system, and that this effort should not be masked by the deficiencies that can occur in any organization. I believe that the reputation of this State suffered last year in the campaign that was waged at that time around the application for increases in teachers' salaries. As members know, a campaign was waged throughout Australia, and I believe—

Mr. Clark: It had nothing to do with teachers' salaries.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: —that the reputation of our education organization suffered. I was keen to promote throughout the State publicity about the activities of the organization and good aspects of our teaching. The pamphlet will be based on fact, and nothing else. The honourable member will know that since he was in office there has been a significant increase in expenditure to provide facilities in schools throughout this State. I cannot quote the exact figure, but I understand it is about 26 per cent more annually than when the honourable member was Minister of Education. The facts concerning this progress need to be told to the people of South Australia so that they may have in the education system the confidence it deserves.

Mr. Hudson: What was the cost?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the honourable member will not be so rude, I shall obtain for the member for Whyalla a reply that may also include the information requested by the member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUDSON: My question is supplementary to my previous question about the distribution of a political pamphlet to all schoolchildren in South Australia. On November 18 last year, at page 3060 of *Hansard*, I quoted a memorandum which was sent around to all headmasters and which contained the following:

Nevertheless schoolchildren should not be used to act as postmen for conveying controversial information, whether political or not, to their homes. This must apply from whatever source the material comes. I know that you agree with me on this matter and will act accordingly.

To a further question that I asked, the Minister of Education replied at the time that headmasters must use their discretion, and to a question on notice the Minister, at page 3454, had this to say in reply:

It is not intended to amend the memorandum to heads of departmental schools. In a matter of this kind the use of the head's discretion is always understood. The responsibility is on him to decide what is a fair thing and what is not. The wording of the last sentence ("I know that you agree with me on this matter and will act accordingly") invites co-operation in the use of his discretion along the lines of departmental policy.

Will the Minister of Education say whether this memorandum is still in force? If it is, will he permit headmasters to use their discretion and, if those headmasters consider the glossy brochure that the department is producing at great cost to the taxpayers of South Australia to be controversial, will he allow them to refuse to use children at schools as postmen to transmit this information back to parents?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The honourable member, whatever his shadow future may be, has never learnt the lesson about tilting at windmills. In the first sentence, he referred to a political pamphlet. I made it clear in my earlier reply to him this afternoon that this was not a political brochure: it was an educational brochure.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There must be only one speaker at a time.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Further, I made it clear that this brochure was being produced solely for the benefit of the children and the teachers of this State. The honour-

able member answered his own question when he quoted the memorandum sent out by my predecessor; he spoke about its being a political brochure. It is not a political brochure. I had hoped and expected that I would have the full co-operation of every member of both Houses of Parliament; I am certainly expecting the complete co-operation of the teachers of this State in the distribution of this brochure, because its whole purpose is to describe to the people what is being done for the benefit of their children and the advantages now available that were perhaps not available a decade or so ago. The brochure deals only with facts. Indeed, in one part (I think it is in the foreword) I refer to the work of my predecessors; I particularly mention the Hon. Joyce Steele, because much of the preparation of this brochure took place during her term as Minister of Education. I include in my remarks, too, the Hon. R. R. Loveday and his predecessors, because some of the work referred to in the brochure was commenced during their terms of office. The brochure certainly was not commenced during my term, because I have been Minister of Education for only six weeks. I regret that in my previous reply I did not tell the honourable member the cost of the brochure; I did not have the details with me, but I will obtain them for him tomorrow.

I repeat that this brochure will be supplied to all members as soon as it is available and I invite their comments on it. I ask for their co-operation in its distribution, because it is a factual statement of what is being done and is very similar to brochures that have been issued previously, though perhaps most of the previous brochures were not as big as the present one; one was issued about 10 years ago. The whole purpose of the current brochure is to provide an uplift to education in this State. Tomorrow I will also deal with the memorandum that has been referred to by the honourable member.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS' FINANCE

Mr. VENNING: The Premier will be well aware that primary producers throughout the State are going through extremely difficult times, with lower returns for their commodities, higher costs, wheat quotas, etc., and many primary producers require finance to enable them to carry on. Will he approach the Commonwealth Treasurer to ensure that all sections of primary industry have sufficient finance to carry on their particular aspects of primary production?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: For some time in this House the honourable member has made known his views and the fact that he is concerned about the costs of primary production in South Australia and their effect. The Government agrees entirely with the honourable member that something needs to be done wherever it can be achieved. To this end, some weeks ago I wrote to the Prime Minister asking whether he would give attention to the subject of having additional finance provided through the banking system to those farmers who needed it to carry on. Afterwards I noted with some satisfaction that the Commonwealth Government took action to ensure that the full impact of increased interest rates was not passed on to primary producers in their day-to-day finance.

Mr. McKee: What about house buyers? They have to pay the higher interest rate.

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

Mr. Jennings: That's one letter you wrote that didn't get out.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have not yet received from the Prime Minister a reply about the point on which I wrote to him, but I expect it soon.

MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The *Advertiser* of February 24 last contained a feature article by John Miles regarding a treatment for mental retardation that includes P.K.U. tests. Mr. Miles referred to the submissions of Dr. Elliott regarding this treatment, and stated:

A simple test, universally applied, could be saving hundreds of new-born babies a year in this State alone from the possibility of growing up mentally retarded. Already about four babies a week are being saved from possible mental damage by the technique at Queen Victoria Hospital and Queen Elizabeth Hospital. But these are the only maternity hospitals in this State, possibly in Australia, where it is being done.

The report also stated—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member has read enough to explain his question.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I can explain the matter, Mr. Speaker. The report stated that the test was simple and that it could be carried out by any nurse. It is a simple blood test, made by putting the infant's blood on to a piece of paper and making the diagnosis. As

this is an extremely important development and saves many lives, I am sure that it has been brought to the notice of the Government, and one would expect that some statement would have been made about the Government's attitude to the development. However, as far as I know, no such statement has been made known. Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered the matter and whether anything has been done regarding this new discovery?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will ask the Minister of Health what is the departmental policy on this matter. From what I know (and this knowledge extends only to the periphery of the matter) I understood that the tests were applied far more widely than the honourable member has mentioned. However, that is only a personal opinion, and tomorrow I will get the information the honourable member requires.

LAMEROO AREA SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education obtain for me a report on the progress being made in the planning of the Lameroc Area School and on whether provision for the work is expected to be included in the Loan Estimates for next year?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I shall be pleased to get a report for the honourable member.

INSURANCE CLAIMS

Mr. JENNINGS: Recently I have received several complaints from constituents and members of the Attorney-General's profession about the activities of an insurance company known as Motor Marine and General Insurance Company Limited.

Mr. Broomhill: They're as crooked—

Mr. Clark: I've had complaints, too.

Mr. JENNINGS: I was going to say that most of my colleagues had had complaints from their constituents about this company. Lawyers complain that the legal representative of this company is instructed not to discuss with them any claim they have on behalf of their clients and, as a consequence, without testing the matter in court, which could of course be very expensive, lawyers are unable to advise their clients whether they have good cases. One complaint made to me recently concerns the following question in the company's proposal form:

Have you or any member of your family or any person who will regularly drive the motor vehicle:

- (a) Had an accident or fire happen to a motor vehicle and/or made a claim against any insurance company? If so, state date and nature of each accident or fire and name of each company claimed upon.

A lady in my district had an accident and, as a consequence, the car was burnt. On approaching this insurance company for insurance compensation, she found that her then husband, long before she ever met him, had had an old bomb burnt out, and she was refused payment by this company because it was said that she had made a dishonest statement in the proposal form. I checked with the managers of some other insurance companies in South Australia, and they told me that no legitimate insurance company would have refused payment in circumstances such as this. I could go on, I know—

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has made his point.

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Speaker, I know that we are good friends at the moment. I merely ask now whether the Attorney-General will investigate this matter publicly. I am sure that if he does so he will find many cases of the kind I have not time to amplify today.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am not sure how one investigates a matter publicly.

Mr. Jennings: Well, do it privately, if you like.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The question was whether it would be investigated publicly. If the honourable member gives me the details of this case, I shall certainly have inquiries made about it.

Mr. Jennings: Everyone in South Australia knows about it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not want to comment on the honourable member's long explanation of his question. Whether it is proper to canvass these matters in the House is a matter for his own judgment, and I do not reflect on that. Complaints have been received about this company. A few weeks ago I said that I personally had not had any complaints while I had been in office. However, I found out later that over the last couple of years some complaints had been investigated by the Prices Commissioner at the request of members of the Government and members of the public.

Mr. Virgo: Did the Government take action?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: In most cases this is not a matter in which the Government can take any action directly.

Mr. Virgo: That's not right: they are breaking the law, that's all!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Edwardstown may sneer at me and say that I am not right but, in fact, as the law stands—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General is replying to the member for Enfield, not to the member for Edwardstown.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am sorry that I got diverted, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that these matters are civil matters, in the main, between those who insure and the insurance company: they are not matters in which the Government can take any action directly. I point out that there are many most reputable companies in Adelaide and throughout this State that offer the same services as this company offers, so no-one is forced to go to it: a wide choice is open to people when insuring, and before people give their business to any company they would be wise to check on its reputation. I will say no more than that, but if the honourable member will give me details I will check—

Mr. Clark: How would you check?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: How does one check on any matter?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General shall take his seat. This is Question Time, not debating time. There is too much discussion during a question and too much debate in the answer. The Attorney-General will please reply to the honourable member for Enfield and ignore other interjections.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Very well. If the honourable member will give me the name and address of the person concerned and a brief outline of the facts of this case, I shall have an investigation made for him.

EYRE PENINSULA SCHOOLS

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: My question to the Minister of Works concerns the progress on two proposed new schools in my district, namely, the high school at Port Lincoln and the area school at Tumby Bay. I ask this question of him rather than of the Minister of Education because it is the departments under the Minister of Works that are responsible for the planning of these schools, which, if my memory is correct, were placed on the list of schools to be planned during the current

financial year. I think a report appeared in the local press to the effect that the Port Lincoln High School project had, of necessity, to be referred to the Public Works Committee for a report. As there is already a current report on the new high school at Port Lincoln, I wonder why it must be referred again. I should like the Minister, if he cannot answer me now (and I have not given him previous notice of this question), to examine the stage of development of the planning of these two schools, and also to see whether or not it is necessary to refer the high school project to the Public Works Committee. If it is necessary, can he say whether it can be done in time for the project to be included in the Loan Estimates for the next financial year? Can he at the same time say what is the current position with regard to the Tumby Bay Area School?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I shall be only too happy to confer with the Minister of Education and to look into the matters raised by the honourable member, and I will note what he has said about the reference of the Port Lincoln High School project to the Public Works Committee. I will bring down a report as soon as possible.

WINGFIELD FIRE

Mr. RYAN: My question concerns the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Health and the Attorney-General. However, I shall ask it of the Attorney-General, and after I explain it to him he can say to whom he thinks it should be directed. During last summer, on a day on which there was a complete fire ban, I had many complaints about burning at a dump in the Wingfield district, the smoke from which blanketed out the city and many suburbs of the metropolitan area. On April 18, again on a day on which there was a complete fire ban, I received numerous calls from people complaining that they were blanketed by the very dense smoke from a fire at the same dump. At about lunchtime on that day, a Saturday, I went down and had a look, and I would say that many suburbs from Wingfield right through to Adelaide, and even beyond, were completely blanketed by dense smoke. Prior to that time, when I asked what would be the position of the company concerned in burning off on a day on which there was a complete fire ban, I was told in a roundabout way that the matter had been referred to the Crown Law authorities for consideration of whether a successful prosecution could take place under existing legislation. Has this case been

referred to the Attorney-General or his officers for a prosecution? If not, why not?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall inquire.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM CAMPAIGN

Mr. GILES: Recently, the Premier declared that Adelaide Cup Day on May 13 would be a holiday, and shortly after the announcement was made the university people said that they opposed this because their classes would be disrupted. It has been announced today that the universities have withdrawn their opposition to this holiday. Also, on the front page of today's *Advertiser* it is stated that 20 members of the academic staff of the Flinders University intend to suspend classes on May 8 as part of the Vietnam Moratorium Campaign. Does the Minister of Education know whether the last day of the moratorium campaign happens to be May 13 and, if it is, would this be the reason why this opposition has been withdrawn by the universities? Also, does the Minister know what action is to be taken against the academic staff who have admitted that they will go on strike on this day?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The brief reply is "No". I have no knowledge of what relationship the Adelaide Cup Day has in this regard. Although I regret that certain actions have been taken, I point out to the honourable member that the Flinders University, like the Adelaide University, works under its own Act of Parliament and is autonomous. These universities make their own rules and are responsible for the conduct of the universities. Although members of both sides are on the Council of the Flinders University, I have no particular knowledge about the holiday because that is entirely a matter for the university authorities who have jurisdiction in this regard. There have been several comments in the newspapers and various views have been expressed, but, as Minister of Education, I remind the honourable member that this is a matter principally for the university authorities.

YORKE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. FERGUSON: As far back as 1964 when I asked questions about the water supply for the southern part of Yorke Peninsula, I was told that test bores were being put down in the Carribee Basin to ascertain whether there was a supply of water there. Since then, when asking questions about this water supply, I have been told that the basin would have to be thoroughly investigated.

Recently, a report I received from the Engineer-in-Chief, through the Minister of Works, stated that further investigation of the basin would be necessary. As the department has been giving me similar replies since I first asked a question about this water supply, will the Minister of Works have the investigation completed in order to determine whether a useful supply of water can be obtained from this source?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I shall be pleased to discuss this matter with the Engineer-in-Chief. I also know that constituents of the honourable member have had considerable problems because of a drop in pressure. This matter is now being investigated, but I will obtain a report from the Engineer-in-Chief and bring it down.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. RICHES: My question concerns the construction of the standard gauge railway line between Adelaide and the Indian-Pacific connection. As the longer this is delayed the more South Australia will miss out; can the Premier say what stage negotiations have reached?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I agree with the honourable member that the longer this matter is delayed the more South Australia will miss out. However, the report of the consultants that was forecast during the previous sitting of the House is now in the hands of the Government and is being studied by the Railways Commissioner. I have had several private conversations with the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport about the report, and I should hope that we can soon come to a satisfactory solution concerning the connection between Adelaide and Port Pirie.

Mr. Jennings: Before the election!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I hope so.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier cannot reply to interjections.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No, Sir, I cannot, but I hope that soon, before there is a possibility of any election, whether it be this month, next month or next year—

Mr. Clark: Aren't you replying to the interjection, not the original question?

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

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The matter is being actively pursued, I believe to finality, in relation to the first stage of the study. The honourable member will recall that the agree-

ment with the Commonwealth Government on this study was that it should proceed in stages. The report on the first stage, basically concerning the connection from Adelaide to Port Pirie, is now in the Government's hands. I hope that one or two final but important details will be resolved so that I can inform the honourable member within the next few weeks, and that a resolution will be adopted to build this railway.

ROYALTIES

Mr. ALLEN: I have been approached by landowners in my district concerning royalty payments that are made by councils and the Highways Department for road-making materials. For many years these bodies have paid royalties to landowners for suitable road-making materials, and during the depression the price of the royalty was about 3c a yard. However, over the last 30 years costs to landowners have risen enormously: for instance, the price of land has risen about 600 per cent, that of farm machinery has risen by about 1,000 per cent, wages have increased by about 800 per cent, and council rates by 800 per cent. Royalty payments have increased during this time in some instances only by 1c or 2c, and in other instances there has been no rise. As it is considered by landowners that, because of the increased costs to them, royalties should be increased, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Local Government to discuss this matter with councils and the Highways Department?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will get an answer to that question.

SCHOOL BUS FARES

Mr. CLARK: I think every member of the House is pleased to see the Minister of Education restored to health. Personally, I wish him a very healthy but brief term of office as Minister of Education.

Mr. McKee: And a long holiday to recuperate.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Port Pirie is out of order. The honourable member for Gawler is asking the question.

Mr. CLARK: Ever since the beginning of the year, I have had continual complaints by telephone and letter about the cost of bus fares to boys and girls attending primary schools, and particularly those attending secondary schools, where the cost is greater, in the Salisbury and Elizabeth district. It has been pointed out to

me that anyone with a fairly large or even a small family in poor circumstances finds the cost of such bus fares more than he can bear. Let me quote from one letter, which is not a particularly harsh example but is an example of a person with a large family who finds these fares a greater hardship. This lady wrote to me as follows:

I now have four children at secondary school (three at Elizabeth High and one at Elizabeth Girls Technical High), four children at primary and infants schools and two pre-schoolers, a total of 10 altogether, and only one wage-earner, my husband.

The Minister of Education will realize that these bus fares have to be paid to travel to school, and if children are over 15 years of age the fare is much dearer. This can be a real hardship. Will the Minister examine this matter to see whether any assistance can be given to people who have a number of children who must travel to school by bus?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: First, I thank the honourable member for his kind sentiments about my recovery and I join with him in his wish that I have a long occupancy of this Ministry! The matter he has raised is very real, and I appreciate his concern, which I am sure is shared by many members of this House. I have looked at this problem, but it is not easy of solution. However, I shall be pleased to look into it further on behalf of the honourable member and others, and I hope to have a reply for him as soon as possible.

MURRAY RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. WARDLE: My question concerns bridges across the Murray River. At present one is being constructed at Kingston-on-Murray, and drillings are now proceeding for a second bridge which it is presumed will be built in the next four years about three or four miles downstream from Murray Bridge. I have also noticed that people from Tailem Bend and the district council area of Meningie have made submissions to the Minister about a proposed bridge lower down the Murray towards the lakes. I guess there are many towns along the river that think they have priority for a bridge. Will the Attorney-General obtain from the Minister of Roads and Transport a report on what the Highways Department's plan is at this stage for another bridge or other bridges across the Murray River following the construction of the Kingston bridge and the proposed new bridge at Murray Bridge?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall inquire about the matter.

AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

Mr. CASEY: Even though my question concerns agriculture, I think it is important that it be directed to the Premier. I was happy to listen to the Premier a few moments ago praising the stand that the Government has taken over the issue of pamphlets on behalf of the Education Department, perhaps trying to justify the enormous cost to the Government. I draw his attention to the fact that this money could probably have been spent on farm managerial services, which are normally provided by the Agriculture Department of South Australia but which are now at a low ebb. The Premier knows that farmers today in South Australia and in other States are relying more and more heavily each year on farm managerial services, particularly in New South Wales where there are, I think, nine centres altogether set up throughout the State, whereas we have not one such centre in South Australia. In South Australia the number of agricultural economists, which until recently was four, has been reduced to one. This is, of course, a ridiculous state of affairs when there are over 20,000 primary producers in this State.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is beginning to debate his question.

Mr. CASEY: These are facts that I want to bring out.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order in citing facts. He must ask his question and not give the answer at the same time.

Mr. CASEY: Will the Premier take up with the Agriculture Department the problems of financing managerial staff for the department, which is absolutely essential in order that farmers can make themselves readily available to contact these people so that they can increase the profitability of their farms, which is a must these days considering the economic state of rural production throughout Australia? I shall be pleased if he will do that.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to please the honourable member and I shall take up this matter with the Acting Minister of Agriculture. The honourable member will understand that the Minister of Agriculture is at present overseas on a comprehensive tour covering points of interest that will be of use to him in administering his portfolio. Upon his return, I expect to learn that he will have many forward-thinking ideas to transmit to his department. I am sure economic management for farmers will be one of these ideas. He has already written to me indicating that he has

indeed been able to pick up many points, and I shall bring the honourable member's question to his notice when he returns. In the meantime, I shall get for the honourable member the figures and facts concerning the appointments he mentions. I point out that it is difficult in the generally existing buoyant economic circumstances, apart from the farming community, to keep experts in Government departments in face of the competition from the private sector of industry. This poses a great problem in the Government services in the staffing of expert facilities. However, I will get what figures I can in the short term for the honourable member.

AGED COTTAGE HOMES

Mr. McANANEY: Recently, I noticed in the newspaper that there was a difference of opinion between the tenants and the management of Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated, and that the Leader of the Opposition together with the candidate for the District of Coles (possibly with a slight hope of being a member of this place in the near future) suggested that the Chief Secretary, under the Public Charitable Purposes Act, could put pressure upon Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated to solve its problems. As this statement puzzled me a little, will the Attorney-General say what action could be taken under this Act?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The name of the Act is the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, and under that Act licences are given to various organizations to collect moneys. Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated does have such a licence. My attention was directed to the meeting which was attended by the Leader of the Opposition and the endorsed A.L.P. candidate for the Coles District and at which both gentlemen expressed perturbation about the dispute and suggested that the Government should take some action. This is a long-standing controversy that I and other members of the Government have examined in detail over a long period. We concluded that there was no appropriate action that the Government could take in the matter. I therefore publicly asked the Leader what action he suggested the Government should take to resolve the dispute between a section of the tenants and the management of Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated. The Leader was good enough to reply, again publicly, with the suggestion that the Chief Secretary, who administers the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, could bring pressure to bear

upon the management by threatening to revoke the licence under which its collections are made and that this would bring the management to heel. I do not comment upon the propriety of the Chief Secretary's undertaking such a course, but I should like it to be known to the Leader and other members that, even if it were a proper course to adopt, I believe it would have no force whatever: it would be an entirely ineffective method of bringing pressure to bear on the management. My inquiries show that the proportion of income derived by Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated from donations is so small as not to be a significant factor in income.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It has been quite a considerable amount in the past.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Perhaps the Leader is not aware of the facts.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General is replying to the member for Stirling.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In any case, I intended to quote the following figures: in 1966-67 the total income of Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated was \$43,069, of which \$537 was collected pursuant to the licence; in 1967-68, its total income was \$53,955, of which \$596 was collected; in 1968-69, its total income was \$64,240, of which \$938 was collected. So, expressed as percentages of total income, collections for the three years were 1.25 per cent, 1.1 per cent and 1.46 per cent. I think all members will realize that the suggested pressure would not be effective, even if it were proper, in settling the dispute between a section of the tenants and the management. I do not want to say anything about the facts of the dispute. The Government has concluded that it cannot properly take any action, and the only suggestion that the Leader has made would obviously be ineffective. I shall be glad to have any further suggestions from the Leader that may lead to a resolution of the unhappy differences that have arisen.

OIL TANKER BERTH

Mr. McKEE: First, I congratulate the Minister of Marine on his appointment to the Ministry. He could set a new record for having served for the shortest term in the Ministry. As a result of the recent fire in the Whyalla shipyards, the Port Pirie council has again raised the question of the fire hazard that exists at the Port Pirie oil tanker berth. The council claims that the fire-fighting equipment there is inadequate, and I agree. It has

requested me to bring to the Minister's notice the extreme fire hazard. Will the Minister consider having the proposed oil tanker berth constructed soon?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I thank the honourable member for his kindly references; I have particularly noted his comment about the possibility of a new record being established. I shall be pleased to take up his question with my department.

KIMBA MAIN

Mr. EDWARDS: The people along the route of the Kimba main are concerned that work is proceeding very slowly. Can the Minister of Works report on the progress of the work and can he say what progress the new trench digger has made compared with the other two trench diggers there? The last time I inspected the work it appeared that the new trench digger would do a much quicker job than the old ones would do. Can the Minister say how much of the main has been completed?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I do not at present have the specific details for which the honourable member has asked. I can, however, inform him that the Government has referred the Lock-Kimba scheme to the National Water Resources Council but has not yet received a reply. I will take up with my department the honourable member's question about progress on the main and bring down a reply. I will inform him, too, of the result of negotiations between the Commonwealth Government and this Government.

SEMI-TRAILERS

Mr. VIRGO: My question relates to the tragic accident that occurred last month when a semi-trailer got out of control in the Adelaide Hills, and three lives were needlessly lost because of inactivity following similar accidents in the past. I should like to extend to the bereaved people the condolences of members—certainly members on this side. Many people contacted me as a result of reading a press report on the following day; it is as follows:

The Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Hill) said restrictions on semi-trailers through the Adelaide Hills would be considered when it was felt the need existed.

I think everyone will agree with me that, if ever the need had been shown to exist, it was shown on the day before the Minister made this statement. Although it seems strange for me to do so, I congratulate the Premier on

publicly repudiating the statement of the Minister of Roads and Transport a few days later by asking for an inquiry and, a few weeks later, by publicly announcing that the Government would build two run-offs to try to prevent a recurrence of the tragedy. However, in this and in many other instances this Government seems to go half way but never the whole way. I commend the *Advertiser* for its editorial, in which it said that it was amazed that apparently no consideration had been given to building a run-off into land owned by the Waite Agricultural Research Institute. Even if the two run-offs now proposed had been built, it appears, from the facts given, that the tragedy would still have occurred. As a further one is still needed, will the Premier take up this matter from the point at which he left it, with a view to providing a run-off into the Waite Agricultural Research Institute in the interests of road safety and of the public as a whole?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government is paying close attention to the problem of road accidents occurring throughout the State. I think the honourable member would be the first to admit that accidents and their cause are not simple things to study with a view to coming to a finding and a conclusive result. Obviously, the cause of the accident in question was not the lack of a run-off: it involved some fault with vehicle or driver. I think that, having said that, we only open up a tremendously wide field of investigation on which it would not be proper for me to comment here. We did take the rather immediate action of looking again at the position concerning run-offs, knowing that they are extremely difficult to build in the areas chosen. We believe, however, that because of the increasing volume of traffic they are to be regarded as a considerable safety factor in connection with heavy vehicles that may get out of control because of brake failure. We are led to believe, so far at least, that the major problem occurs in the Adelaide Hills, where the presently planned run-offs will be effective, and that the problem generally arises way beyond the place referred to by the honourable member, namely, the Waite Agricultural Research Institute. However, I will bring his question to the department's notice and bring down an assessment for him. I know he will realize that this sort of assessment has already been made, but as I do not retain in my mind the result of that assessment I will bring down a new one for him.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In asking a question of the Minister of Works, I join with other members in congratulating him on his appointment. Earlier this afternoon the Premier referred to movements in the costs of pumping water through the three major mains. Can the Minister of Works say just how much water has been pumped through those mains during the summer months, and can he give us any information on the present state of the metropolitan reservoirs?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I acknowledge the honourable member's congratulatory remarks regarding my appointment. The present reservoir holdings amount to 17,490,000,000gall. compared with 25,051,000,000gall. at this time last year. From July 1, 1969, until the present time consumption has amounted to 28,529,000,000 gall., whereas for the corresponding period last year it was 23,378,000,000gall. The estimated consumption this year to June 30 is 32,000,000,000gall., which is the highest annual consumption recorded and which represents a daily consumption of 105gall. a head. This is not as high as the 112gall. recorded in 1961-62. Murray River pumping to date amounts to 10,200,000,000gall., and it is estimated that May-June pumping will need to be about 600,000,000gall. Reservoir holdings are satisfactory and provide the necessary reserve for adequate supplies to be maintained next year.

WALLAROO HARBOUR

Mr. HUGHES: From July 15 last right up until the end of last session I consistently asked questions of the Premier and the former Minister of Marine in an endeavour to obtain the results of the seismic survey carried out on the eve of the Premier's visit to Wallaroo on July 15. In one of the replies that the then Minister of Marine gave at the time he said:

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.

Continuing in relation to Wallaroo, the Minister said:

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.

That left no doubt in the minds of the people I represent that in the event of the seismic survey, which was carried out in connection with the drilling operations, proving successful, Wallaroo would become the second "super" port. This has been substantiated in the Minister's letter to me of April 7, in which he says:

Studies of the seismic survey at Wallaroo, carried out in conjunction with the results of the recent drilling operations, indicate that dredged material from the harbour would be mostly limestone with bands of sand and clay which could be dredged but with some difficulty. No hard igneous rock would be encountered.

In view of that reply, I now ask whether the Government intends to proceed with the work of dredging the Wallaroo harbour to enable it to become a second "super" port in South Australia.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Obviously, the honourable member would not expect me to have a reply to this question today. Considerable dredging is required, and the nature of the dredging and the quantity that will have to be cleared will have a great bearing on the future of Wallaroo as a port. In view of the question, I will have discussions with the Director of Marine and Harbours and bring down a considered reply.

Mr. FERGUSON: During last session, the former Minister of Marine said in this House that a thorough investigation would be made into the pros and cons of establishing a deep sea port at Ardrossan or Wallaroo. Can the Minister of Marine say whether a report on those investigations will be available before a decision is made about where the second "super" port will be established in South Australia?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I will bring down a report.

SUBDIVISIONS

Mr. EVANS: Before asking a question of the Minister of Works I, too, offer him my sincere congratulations on his new appointment. A recent Government announcement was made to the effect that in subdivision and resubdivision in the Adelaide metropolitan reservoir catchment areas only areas of 20 acres or more would be approved, with one or two stated areas of exception. It was announced that the restriction would not apply in township areas, which would be defined by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in consultation with the Director of Planning.

Can the Minister of Works say whether definitions of the proposed township areas will be given after agreement has been reached between the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Director of Planning and local councils or whether local councils will be told what are their township areas without being consulted?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I will discuss this matter with Cabinet and bring down a considered reply.

FOREMEN

Mr. BROOMHILL: I refer the Minister of Labour and Industry to the April issue of *Public Service Review* (which I hope he has already seen) and to the article headed "Association Charges the Board with Obstruction" and sub-headed "'Explosive Situation'". I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that recently a new award was made for Government foremen, following which action was taken by the Public Service Board to reclassify all the foremen concerned. This resulted in a situation wherein the substantial weekly increases granted by the court were taken away from Government foremen.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Say that again.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Because of the reclassification that the Public Service Board undertook, the increases awarded by the court were not provided to these foremen. From this article, it appears that a deputation met the Minister asking him, among other things, whether the Government would consider having the board retain in the grades that they enjoyed immediately prior to November 1, 1969, all the present foremen whose classifications had been reduced and defer implementing any downgradings until such positions were vacated by their present occupants. I understand that the Minister has since informed the Public Service Association that he cannot comply with this request. I point out to the Minister that at a meeting foremen have indicated that they will hold another meeting soon to consider carrying a proposal to work only to rule. As the Public Service Association has never previously taken such a serious step, this confirms that a truly explosive situation exists. Will the Minister reconsider his refusal to intervene, ensuring that the downgrading of foremen is deferred until the positions that the foremen currently hold have been vacated by their present occupants?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This is a matter of long standing which has, I admit,

caused me much concern since I came to office, as it caused concern to my predecessor. Indeed, I think the matter goes back to a period over two years ago, before this Government took office.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: As the *Public Service Review* points out, we intervened.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As you, Mr. Speaker, warned me to ignore interjections, perhaps I had better do so.

Mr. Broomhill: Which means that you don't know the answer.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We intervened in favour of the foremen, as the *Public Service Review* points out.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: When the deputation saw me, I considered the matters put before me. Since then I have spoken on several occasions and written to Mr. Mitchell, the General Secretary of the Public Service Association. The member for West Torrens is not quite up to date on the matter; I think he has taken his facts only from the journal from which he has quoted.

Mr. Broomhill: That's not true. If you can tell me anything else I shall be pleased to hear about it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: In the lengthy preamble to his question, I got the impression that the honourable member was no further advanced in his information than what was provided in that journal. The honourable member apparently does not know that last Friday afternoon there was a voluntary conference of the parties at which an offer was made to the Public Service Association, which acted on behalf of the foremen. On Friday evening there was the meeting of foremen to which the honourable member referred, at which it was decided to work to regulation, but at some future date to be fixed.

Mr. Broomhill: They're hoping you'll fix it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I hope indeed that the matter can be fixed.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable Minister will answer one question at a time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. The matter has dragged on far too long. The board, which made the offer at the conference last Friday afternoon, is awaiting a reply from the Public Service Association. In these circumstances, I can say nothing further at the moment.

MOUNT GAMBIER COURTHOUSE

Mr. BURDON: About eight years ago a former Attorney-General said publicly in Mount Gambier that his Government had prepared plans and specifications for a new courthouse building in Mount Gambier. During the intervening years many approaches have been made to have this work carried out. Following considerable recent activity, the Government has now announced the purchase of certain land and promised that the Public Buildings Department will be requested to prepare plans and specifications forthwith. In view of the recent announcement by the Minister of Works about the purchase of land and the preparation of plans and specifications, can he say what steps, if any, have been taken to ensure that money is provided so that these necessary buildings can be constructed as soon as possible?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I shall be pleased to get a report.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: On January 13 this year, the Acting Minister of Works informed me by letter of details of contracts let on December 15, 1969, in relation to phase 1, part 1, of the main building of the Modbury Hospital, although the date of completion of the building was not included. I have since seen a completion date in a newspaper, but I am not sure whether or not it is correct. Will the Minister tell me the correct date and say whether construction of the Modbury Hospital is running to schedule?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Although I have not seen the newspaper to which the honourable member has referred, I shall be pleased to get the information she seeks.

SHIPYARD EMPLOYMENT

Mr. HURST: The Premier will recall that about seven months ago I introduced to him a deputation of shipyard workers from the Adelaide Ship Construction Company that expressed fears for the future of the industry. It was suggested to the Premier that the Industrial Development Branch should make some submissions at a Tariff Board inquiry that was being conducted at that time. I thought we had convinced the Premier of the necessity of assisting this valuable industry, which is established in my district and which provides considerable employment. However, there have been further retrenchments in the yard since that deputation met the Premier. I am somewhat concerned to read in today's *News* that

Mr. Burke has said that the construction of a second roll-on-roll-off freighter has been deferred indefinitely because the Commonwealth Government has permitted entry of two new bulk Bulgarian-built ships to serve the Gulf of Carpentaria traffic. In view of the Commonwealth Government's attitude in permitting this work to be performed by overseas companies, I again request the Premier to try to get the Commonwealth Government to realize the necessity of maintaining this particular industry in South Australia.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: My department and the Director of Industrial Promotion (Mr. Ramsay) have been most active in bringing to the Commonwealth Government's notice the need to support this valuable industry in South Australia. Mr. Ramsay has prepared a case and presented it in the quarter referred to by the honourable member. This industry does not have one problem: it has several. The honourable member will be aware that demarcation disputes and other industrial troubles have caused great concern amongst those employed in and those managing this industry. Undoubtedly these troubles have meant rising costs in the industry. This is another factor affecting the general demand for ships built at this shipyard. I think the honourable member will realize that the demand for this smaller type of ship (I use the word "smaller", of course, in comparison with the large ships built at Whyalla and other places in Australia) is fluctuating and can depend very much on port development, off-shore drilling and mineral and mining development in the rest of Australia. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that the demand will be kept at the constant level at which every business would like its operations to be kept. Many problems face the industry, and the management is dealing with the matter energetically. It has approached my department for assistance in the preparation of the case to which the honourable member has referred, and constant contact is being maintained. I think the last time I had a visit from the management would have been about a month ago, and we have had other communications since. My department is constantly aware of the trends in the industry and the desires of the persons in it, but finding a solution in that regard is not simple. The honourable member has raised the matter of tariffs or, should I say, the reverse effect of letting in foreign-built ships rather than subsidizing locally-built ones. We are keeping this matter under consideration. I assure the honourable member

that the department and I have done, and will continue to do, as much as we possibly can in that matter. I will bring down a report by tomorrow if I have time to prepare it.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently the Matron of the Royal Adelaide Hospital stated that, because of shortages of staff, particularly nurses, 100 beds at that hospital were not in use. I have been told, on reliable authority, that more than 100 beds are vacant in the north and east wings at the hospital. Will the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, say why the Government has not taken the necessary steps to ensure that persons can obtain the urgent medical attention that they deserve, and can he also say what action the Government is taking to make full use of the hospital, which is costing the taxpayers of South Australia much money that is wasted if the full facilities of this hospital are not used?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Usage of the beds referred to is obviously a matter of acquiring sufficient staff to maintain them, according to patient input and use. The Minister of Health has recently announced some significant changes in nurse training and recently announcements have been made about new wages and salaries for nurses, and we hope that a combination of these matters will have some effect on the number of girls and women entering the nursing profession. Of course, this profession is affected by the complicating effect of a general high demand for personnel in the community for unfilled jobs, and this adds to the already difficult position to which the honourable member refers. I will bring down a report from my colleague on the positive steps that have been taken in the matter to which the honourable member has alluded.

RECEIPTS TAX

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The High Court of Australia has ruled that receipts tax applying to goods produced in Australia is an excise and, therefore, invalid. It has been announced that the Commonwealth Government intends to legislate to validate the States' collection of what has been held in excise, since the Commonwealth has power to levy excise. As legislation has not so far been passed by the Commonwealth to give effect to this undertaking to the States, can the Premier say what assurances he has from the Commonwealth as to the date on which legislation will be passed? Also, is it intended that the

legislation will be retrospective in operation to cover all collections by the States so far held to be invalid?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Announcements have been made from time to time, the details of which I cannot recall because of the detailed nature of the question, but I can tell the Leader that legislation will be retrospective to some time in October, I think October 18. It will be retrospective in relation to business receipts but may not be retrospective in relation to private transactions. I think that about 3 per cent to 5 per cent of the total collections are in this latter category. I understand from the latest negotiations that the Commonwealth will move only in relation to business receipts, but I will obtain from the Under Treasurer the latest details of his discussions so that I can clarify the position.

Mr. CORCORAN: As pointed out by the Leader, and acknowledged by the Premier, part of the receipts tax as it was originally introduced is no longer valid. However, on the present form of return to the department it is impossible to separate the valid duty from the invalid duty, and many people have asked me about the present position concerning the payment of receipts tax because they are not aware of what has to be done in these circumstances. Can the Premier say why the fullest information on the present procedure has not been given to the public, particularly people in business, so that they would know their exact position in this matter? In some cases, I may add, people have been fined simply because they were under the impression that because of the High Court decision the thing was no longer valid (and they wrote and informed the department that this was their belief). They had no further correspondence from the department except a notification that they had not met the requirements of the department and the fine was imposed. Why has the fullest information not been given to the public in this matter? Will the Premier undertake to give people the full facts so that they will know what to do?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Several full statements have been made about the responsibilities of the public—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Several widely publicized statements have been made about the responsibilities of the public in relation to stamp duties. The category I referred to, I understand, must still pay the tax: that part of the law is valid and has not been questioned.

I hope the honourable member realizes that the payment for services can still be insisted upon; it is the payment of the excise that is the problem, as judged by the High Court. I will bring down for the honourable member the statements that have been made and details of the current situation, as far as I can take it, as regards meshing in with what the Commonwealth intends to do. There are small and insignificant but nevertheless different aspects in each State's legislation and, if the Commonwealth legislation is to be taken as the only one that will be acted upon, certain small differences will occur in particular States in their administration of stamp duties in this regard. That makes the explanation a little more difficult than it would be if we were dealing with it only as it applied to this State. However, there are six States and one Commonwealth that must mesh in with the validating legislation that the Commonwealth will pass. It will be Commonwealth legislation and a Commonwealth tax which will not be payable to the Commonwealth if it is paid to the State. I will bring down tomorrow the further detail that the honourable member requests.

WOODSIDE EFFLUENT

Mr. GILES: Before asking a question of him, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Minister of Works on his appointment. I am sure from the way in which he has vigorously attacked his new office that he will be in it for a long and successful stay. The township of Woodside has been seeking a common effluent drain for some time. As I believe that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has now completed plans for this drain, can the Minister say when this work will be started?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I formally acknowledge the honourable member's kind sentiments. I shall be pleased to discuss this matter with officers of the department.

DRIVING TESTS

Mrs. BYRNE: I quote from a notice received from the Motor Vehicles Department headed "Practical Driving Test". It reads:

Because of your age you must pass a driving test before your licence can be renewed.

1. If you live in the country you may attend at a convenient police station.

2. If you live within 15 miles of the G.P.O., Adelaide, your test must be conducted as follows: residents of the Stirling area—Stirling police station; residents of the Blackwood area—Blackwood police station; residents of the Unley area—Unley police station,

and so on. Norwood, Glenelg and Port Adelaide are mentioned. The notice then states:

Residents of all other areas—Police Driving Wing (Port Road, Thebarton).

Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether this privilege of being tested locally can be extended to residents of the suburbs lying within the boundaries of the city of Tea Tree Gully who obviously come within 15 miles of the General Post Office?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask the Minister to consider the suggestion.

GUARD RAILS

Mr. VENNING: Last year I asked a question in this House about guard rails at railway crossings in this State. At the time, there had been a fatal accident at the railway crossing about a mile north of Melrose. I was interested, following an accident that occurred near Gawler recently, to find that the Minister made a comment about these heavy guard rails adjacent to road crossings over railways. Will the Attorney-General further take up this matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport in order that more flimsy construction may be used at railway crossings throughout the State? In many cases, as has been stated, if the construction of these guard rails had been of a flimsy nature the seriousness of accidents that have occurred would have been considerably lessened.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I know that this matter has exercised the Minister's mind. I will discuss it with him again and let the honourable member know.

WHEAT POOLS

Mr. McANANEY: Last year I was informed that some wheat pools had not been wound up and that it was possible that dividends would be paid in respect of them. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Acting Minister of Agriculture to ascertain why these pools have not been wound up and why the dividends have not been paid to the wheatgrowers?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

SWEETS CONTAINERS

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: A company within the square mile of Adelaide is selling sweets attractively packaged in containers identical with those used by chemists for supplying drugs, some of which are dangerous, that are prescribed by doctors. Can the Premier say whether the Government's attention has been drawn to this matter, and

can he say whether the Government has acted to protect children from being encouraged by these containers to take drugs in the future?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I cannot remember whether any action has been taken in relation to this matter. I can, however, remember that the Minister of Health made a public statement relating to a similar incident (if not the same incident). I will obtain from the Minister information on what he has done and on his powers in respect of such containers. I will obtain a report on the possibility of dangerous habits being developed as a result of this kind of activity, which I personally deplore.

At 5.5 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the introduction forthwith and passage of the Bill through all stages without delay.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. S. HALL obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to ratify and approve an agreement for the further variation of the agreement entered into between the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth and the Premiers of the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia respecting the River Murray and Lake Victoria and other waters, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I am sure the House understands that this session has been called to deal with this Bill. The Government wants to place before the House the agreement to construct the Dartmouth dam and to ensure South Australia's developmental future through the increased water allocation that will be available as a result of the passage of this Bill. This agreement has been signed after many long years of research, years of research that first centred

on constructing a dam at Chowilla but then shifted to alternative sites. The experts finally recommended that the Dartmouth dam should be constructed because of the greatly superior water supply that it would achieve.

After long study the Government has agreed to accept the Dartmouth proposal and by negotiation has achieved a significant increase in South Australia's water allocation. Because I have been personally involved in the negotiations, it is particularly satisfying for me to be able to present this Bill in such a successful form. It has been the subject of great political argument in the community, and it will be the subject of great argument here as the debate proceeds. The agreement is in a simple form and concerns not only the Dartmouth dam but also certain other machinery provisions that are essential for the operation of the River Murray Commission in these modern times. It will provide, as I have said, a number of distinct advantages to this State. I have here a lengthy prepared second reading explanation, which I will now proceed to give to the House. I commend this document to members for their study, and I hope that it will remove any concern that they may still have about the construction of the Dartmouth dam.

The purpose of the Bill is to ratify and approve an agreement made on February 26, 1970, between the Prime Minister of Australia and the Premiers of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia with respect to:

- (a) the construction of a major storage of 3,000,000 acre feet near Dartmouth on the Mitta Mitta River, a tributary of the Murray River, as the next major development of the Murray River system;
- (b) new arrangements for sharing the waters of the Murray River and its tributaries; and
- (c) a number of machinery and administrative changes designed to clarify the River Murray Waters Agreement to make it more workable and to permit a greater degree of direct participation and control by the four contracting Governments.

This measure is the result of 10 years of investigation and negotiation seeking more water for South Australia. In March, 1969, Ministers representing the contracting Governments reached agreement in principle that the Dartmouth project should be the next project to be constructed for development of the

Murray River resources subject to Commonwealth finance being available to assist the States in meeting their shares of the cost and subject also to the following further conditions which I propose to discuss in some detail:

(a) That South Australia's entitlement to water is increased from 1,254,000 acre feet to 1,500,000 acre feet annually:

Provision for this increase is accordingly made in the 1970 amending agreement and will become effective when the Dartmouth reservoir becomes effective. This is the first and only increase in regulated flow to be passed to South Australia since September, 1914, when the original agreement was signed. It is also worth noting at this point that the amendment dealing with the Chowilla proposition did not provide for this 20 per cent increase to South Australia which, in fact, means 37 per cent more usable water for South Australia. The increase is not only vital for South Australia because we are hard pressed by salinity problems along the lower river but also provides us with water required in this State for diversions already committed. The existing agreement assumed a quantity of 564,000 acre feet as adequate for dilution flow covering river losses, evaporation and water movement to control salinity, although this last item was not specifically included. This left 690,000 acre feet for use. Present irrigation commitments, including development of land not yet in production but holding licences for diversion, is estimated at 450,000 acre feet a year. Pipelines for water supply diversion are built or under construction to a capacity of 325,000 acre feet a year. The above shows an over-commitment of 85,000 acre feet, and it is now recognized that South Australia must employ more than 564,000 acre feet for evaporation make-up, losses and salinity control. The second condition states:

(b) That in times of restriction the available water would be shared equally between New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia:

This provision is also incorporated in the new agreement and takes effect from the time the Dartmouth reservoir becomes effective. It vastly improves the security of the supply to South Australia as compared with the present arrangement which provides for sharing in times of shortage in the ratio 5:5:3, the smaller share going to South Australia. This new provision gives South Australia almost complete protection against restriction on its entitlement. The available water is assessed after provision is made for river losses and

evaporation losses in South Australia. The South Australian entitlement is nominated as 47,000 acre feet a month (which is the 564,000 acre feet a year equally divided) plus an equal share of the available water. Under these conditions the upper States will experience about 30 per cent restriction on their anticipated normal level of demand before South Australia is affected. Studies have shown that under conditions as severe as any yet known, South Australia would have been restricted in one year only and then only by some 80,000 acre feet. The third condition states:

(c) That parties accept the responsibility of meeting their shares of the cost of any future works which may be constructed by the River Murray Commission:

Works other than Dartmouth which are covered in the new agreement are as follows:

- (i) possible enlargement of the large channel from the Murray River below Mildura to Lake Victoria storage and also the channel by which water is returned as required from this storage to the river; and
- (ii) river channel improvement works between Hume reservoir and Yarrawonga weir pool.

Provision is made in both these cases for appropriate action without further amendment of the agreement. However, in the case of the Lake Victoria works, which might involve each Government in an expenditure of up to \$2,000,000, the extent of the enlargement will be subject to individual approval by each of the four Governments. In other words, all those concerned with financing the work must be satisfied it is fully justified. The change in the Lake Victoria subclause was introduced at the request of this State. The existing agreement specified the capacity of the inlet works and there is some question as to their adequacy for efficient operation with the larger flows to come with South Australia's increased entitlement. The proposed wording allows this to be investigated, and for the contracting Governments to accept proposals for enlargement.

In addition to the inlet works it is considered likely that operation of the Lake Victoria storage may need to be modified for salinity control, and outlet and other works may also require reconstruction or alteration. In the case of proposed river works between Hume dam and Yarrawonga, the financial commitment is expected to be only about \$200,000 to each Government, and it has been agreed in this case that the necessary arrangements be

made to the approval of the River Murray Commission. Work in the areas nominated will be necessary to handle with safety the larger flows without waste. Where the main channel is overtopped, river flow can be lost in effluent channels and by land flooding. Channel improvement will probably consist of renewal of fallen timber, bank stabilization and minor dredging in areas of restriction. The fourth and fifth conditions state:

(d) That investigations proceed with a view to determining the extent of works necessary to ensure effectiveness of the Lake Victoria works when operated in conjunction with Dartmouth:

These investigations have been put in hand.

(e) That the Menindee Lakes Storage Agreement be extended in perpetuity, but at the same time the reservation of water for New South Wales be increased by from 90,000 to 100,000 acre feet a year:

This agreement provided for temporary use by the River Murray Commission of extensive works constructed by the New South Wales Government about 10 years ago to impound Darling River waters in a series of lakes adjoining the river near the township of Menindee. Appropriate payments (\$373,000 for 1968-69) are made by the River Murray Commission to the New South Wales Government in respect of interest on capital, maintenance and operation. This provision is worth about 140,000 acre feet annually to the commission. This water will be mainly available for supply to South Australia but the benefit will be shared by the States as it allows some releases from Hume dam or substituted tributary releases to be used in Victoria and New South Wales.

The existing Menindee Lakes agreement is to be extended in perpetuity with minor amendment and incorporated in the amended River Murray Waters Agreement. This is an integral part of the hydrological studies used to evaluate the Dartmouth scheme, and is shown to be significant to the water benefits to be derived. The increase in the water yield reserved to New South Wales is based on the riparian needs in that State as evaluated over the seven years of operation of the Menindee Lakes agreement, and the further allowance of 10,000 acre feet a year does not materially detract from the benefit to be gained from placing the residual water under the control of the commission.

The sixth condition states:

(f) That New South Wales be entitled to use 45,000 acre feet a year of Victorian tributary flow, reducing to 30,000 acre feet in a year of restriction:

This is included in the amending agreement, having been ceded by Victoria as against receiving benefits from the improved regulation of surplus water from Victorian tributaries, rising out of greater river flows made possible by the Dartmouth reservoir. Because of increased upstream storage certain benefits accrue out of improved regulation of surplus flows, mainly those coming from the Ovens River in Victoria. In the original agreement the benefit of this belonged to Victoria. This sharing of the benefit with New South Wales will bring the operation of the river nearer to the basic provision of the agreement that the resources of the river are equally shared by the two upper States. The outcome is that New South Wales is better able to meet its joint commitment with Victoria to supply South Australia with its entitlement. This arrangement is also valuable to New South Wales because much of the 45,000 acre feet will come each year from the uncontrolled flow of the Ovens River. The seventh condition states:

(g) That certain specified flows downstream of Torrumbarry and Euston weirs be maintained for salinity control purposes on lines decided by the River Murray Commission:

This is so provided in the amending agreement, the agreed basis incorporated being as follows:

Flow below Torrumbarry weir: This should be sufficient to prevent the salinity of river water rising above 300 parts per million of total dissolved solids, but not exceeding 1,600 cusecs.

Flow below Euston weir, near Robinvale: This should be as for Torrumbarry, except that the flow limit is 1,000 cusecs plus the diversion requirements of the pumping districts of Red Cliffs, First Mildura Irrigation Trust, Merbein, all in Victoria, and Coomealla and Curlwaa in New South Wales. These diversion requirements may be as high as 750 cusecs on occasions, but of course vary from time to time. This provision is most important for the people of Victoria because of their very considerable use of water from the river between Swan Hill and Merbein. It is equally important for South Australia, but less so for New South Wales because most of that State's water is diverted above Echuca.

This provision is inserted to assist in salinity control. It is set out with control set in the Mildura area, but carries real and significant benefits to South Australia (a) by setting as far as practicable limits on salinity of water reaching South Australia; and (b) by providing relief against slugs of salt water moving into

South Australia. It is important to note that, under normal operation of the river, flow up to the limits set will be required to meet the South Australian entitlement.

The benefits to the three States arising from Dartmouth and all the other arrangements I have referred to are as follows:

- (a) the safe level of operation for annual diversions in Victoria will rise to 1,670,000 acre feet, an increase of 300,000 acre feet (this figure is derived from consideration of the irrigation practice of the two upstream States whereby high level usage subject to intermittent restriction is preferred to a lower level with an assured supply);
- (b) the safe level of operation for annual diversion in New South Wales will rise by about the same amount to 1,380,000 acre feet annually;
- (c) as already indicated the increase in South Australia's entitlement in periods of regulated flow will be 20 per cent from 1,254,000 to 1,500,000 acre feet annually. The increase in minimum flows under restriction will be considerably greater and, based on the knowledge of river flows since 1905, it will be increased from 920,000 acre feet to 1,420,000 acre feet. In addition, restriction in South Australia would be limited to one season, as against 17 periods that could be expected without new storage works (I emphasize the figure of 920,000 acre feet, which was the quantity of water available to South Australia in the 1967 season, and the figure of 1,420,000 acre feet, which is the lowest quantity that would have been available to South Australia from Dartmouth in all of the years studied, and I think that covers the past 60 years; putting these two figures together we get the worst situation in each case, and there is an increased availability to South Australia in those years of crisis, which are the years for which we build a dam to provide an increase of 500,000 acre feet);
- (d) the total increase in available supply to the three States above present safe levels is 1,350,000 acre feet, at a cost, shared four ways, of \$57,000,000. The base date of this

estimate is March, 1969, and it was prepared after thorough investigation by the River Murray Commission.

The increased entitlement to South Australia is significant when considered as practically ensuring for this State the increased entitlement in all years. South Australia is the only State with an entitlement. The Victorian demand for 1,670,000 acre feet and the New South Wales demand for 1,380,000 acre feet (aggregating a total of 3,050,000 acre feet) will need to be reduced below 1,900,000 acre feet before South Australia is placed on restriction. It is also significant that the Chowilla reservoir proposition would have produced about one-quarter of the total benefit derived from Dartmouth at a higher cost of \$68,000,000 and there is no doubt as to which is the better proposition for South Australia.

There is a vast difference between the results of the earlier investigations of Chowilla and those now before us. This is the position as I see it: First, the benefits from Chowilla to the upper States have been appreciably eroded by the following:

- (a) The recognition that today we have to maintain a flow of up to 900 cusecs below the Merbein pumps in order to protect water quality and to keep salinity in the Sunraysia area under control. The Government's advisers consider this to be a most significant factor. This operational procedure arises from the hard lessons of experience gained during the dry period from 1965 to 1968, when the really critical nature of river salinity between Wentworth and Swan Hill came to notice.
- (b) The average annual evaporation loss from Chowilla as reassessed, this loss rising by 75 per cent from 600,000 acre feet to 1,050,000 acre feet.

This arose from two factors. After an accurate survey was done by the South Australian department the area of Chowilla reservoir was found to be about 25 per cent greater than previously estimated from existing maps. Also, the estimated rate of evaporation from the water surface was investigated with assistance from the Bureau of Meteorology and had to be significantly increased.

Secondly, the original cost estimated by the South Australian department rose from \$28,000,000 in 1961 to \$43,000,000 early in 1966, and again to \$68,000,000 when tenders were received and assessed about 12 months

later. Faced with this situation, the River Murray Commission called a halt in August, 1967, and deferred the project to permit closer examination.

Returning now to the satisfactory outcome of the comparative study with the Dartmouth proposal, the Commonwealth last year agreed to representations by the three States for special loan advances to enable them to meet their shares of the cost. The Commonwealth will also meet its normal 25 per cent share, as it does for all River Murray Commission works. The approval and ratification of this arrangement is the subject of a separate companion Bill.

The dam at Dartmouth will be of earth and rock-fill construction. Rising about 600ft. above the bed of the Mitta Mitta River, it will be the highest in Australia and will rank with the world's great dams. This site is in a steep-sided gorge a few miles above the small township of Mitta Mitta. There are few, if any, land resumption problems as the basin is mostly virgin forest. A very thorough investigation, together with a preliminary design and cost estimate, has been carried out by the Snowy Mountains Authority, retained in a consultative capacity for this purpose. A limited number of copies of the excellent and well-documented report of the Snowy Mountains Authority has been left with the Clerk of this House in case members wish to refer to the report.

The serious need for additional storage resources from the River Murray Commission was brought home in the 1967-68 season. The water available to South Australia through the summer was equivalent to an annual supply of 920,000 acre feet as against the entitlement of 1,254,000 acre feet. Monthly supplies in the period of restriction from September, 1967, to April, 1968, were as follows:

	Supply to	
	Australia	Entitlement
	(acre feet)	(acre feet)
September	79,791	114,000
October	82,489	114,000
November	92,110	134,000
December	95,500	134,000
January	94,064	134,000
February	101,812	134,000
March	92,656	114,000
April	84,360	94,000

In this period the commission allowed reserve storage to be dissipated and less than 50,000 acre feet was available from reserves in Hume dam and Lake Victoria, a situation that all members will admit was indeed precarious.

This occurrence illustrates the urgency of providing further storage.

The provisions of the Bill itself are simple and straightforward, and I take it that all members now have copies before them. Clause 2 deals with the commencement of the measure and provides that the proclamation bringing the Act into operation may be made when the Governor is satisfied:

(a) that the Parliaments of the Commonwealth and of each of the States of New South Wales and Victoria have ratified the agreement, a copy of which is set out in the Bill; and

(b) that the Governments of the Commonwealth and of the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia have agreed to request the River Murray Commission to make a study of the Murray River system with a view to ascertaining where the next River Murray Commission storage is to be situated. The matter contained in paragraph (b), which I just read out, is not an exact replica of the Bill. If members study the Bill, they will find that clause 2 (b) provides:

that the Government of the Commonwealth and the Governments of the States of New South Wales and Victoria have agreed with the Government of this State to request the River Murray Commission to make a study of the Murray River system, including the proposed Chowilla reservoir, with a view to ascertaining where the next River Murray Commission storage is to be situated to meet the needs of persons using the waters of the river.

There is a simple explanation to the additional subclause that was not included in any of the three Bills ratified by, respectively, the Commonwealth Parliament and the Parliaments of New South Wales and Victoria. As I have said earlier, there has been a great mass of political discussion about where the next river storage will be. One objection raised by opponents to the ratification of this agreement and the passing of this Bill has been that Chowilla is in no way mentioned in them and that we would be giving away what was termed our legal right to Chowilla. Upon the advice of the Crown Solicitor, we believe that South Australia no longer has a right to Chowilla, and this has been fairly explicitly set out for us by our legal advisers.

However, to illustrate the good faith of this Government and of the other Governments that are members of the River Murray Commission, I wrote to the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victorian Governments, asking them to accept the proposal that, concurrently with the building of Dartmouth,

there would be another study of the Murray River system, which must include the Chowilla proposal as part of that study. These Governments have now all agreed to this and I have written agreement that no objection exists to the inclusion of the provision in this Bill. Some people who do not seem to understand this Bill are amused and there has grown up already a sort of attitude that the provision does not mean anything.

However, it means exactly what its states, and any person who has been educated to grade 7 standard or who can understand at all will understand fully what the provision states and not make out that it intends either more or less than it states. There is little point in taking politics one step further and saying that it is not what it is. It is, as the Bill states clearly, nothing more than a commitment to study. It is, however, such a commitment to study, and that study must include the Chowilla proposition. I am sure that those who state so vocally that we should do something else must accept the proposition that, if Chowilla is as good as we hope it is, it will stand up to the comparison that will be made in this survey. To make any other proposition is to deny the efficiency of the dam and say that it will not stand up to the study that we intend shall be made of it. Whether members opposite accept this is their privilege in this House, but I assure them that the provision is not dressed up to be something that it is not and that it is nothing less than it is stated to be.

The provisions of clauses 3 to 6 are simple and need no explanation. I shall now deal with the main provisions of the schedule to the Bill, which is the agreement to be ratified. Part I, containing clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4 and dealing with ratification and enforcement, is formal and needs no further elaboration. Part II deals with the agreed further amendments to the River Murray Agreement. Clause 4A is formal. Clause 5 adds to clause 11 of the agreement by extending the indemnity already accorded to the four River Murray Commissioners to their officers and servants. The new provision will cover these officers in respect of any losses, costs or damages they might suffer in the *bona fide* execution of their duties. The officers of the River Murray Commission are not numerous, comprising the Executive Engineer and his assistant, the Secretary-Accountant, an administrative assistant, and a stenographer. I believe no-one would quarrel with granting them the indemnity as provided.

It might be mentioned here that detailed operation and maintenance of the numerous River Murray Commission works is carried out on behalf of the commission by State instrumentalities. Investigations are handled by the States or by consultants so that the River Murray Commission is able to function effectively with very small administrative overhead costs.

Clauses 6 and 7 provide for the deletion of outmoded clauses 15 and 16 in the present agreement, which require officers handling funds to lodge personal security, to render a personal account for funds and personally to meet deficiencies. These provisions date back over half a century to 1915 and there are better ways today of handling such matters. In this connection I would like to mention, too, that a very searching annual audit is carried out for the River Murray Commission by the Commonwealth Auditor-General and that the financial administration of the commission does not require dealings in cash; all payments are made by cheques which are countersigned, and this gives adequate protection against misappropriation of funds by an officer. The deleted clauses are now obsolete.

Clause 8 adds a machinery provision which requires and permits the River Murray Commission to deal with any surplus assets. Clause 9 adds a provision to permit the commission to delegate by resolution appropriate matters to the Commonwealth Commissioner (who is President) or the Deputy Commonwealth Commissioner. This really corrects an omission, as quite obviously no body can function effectively without delegating matters of detailed administration and operation. In fact the commission already delegates a number of matters of this nature, usually to the Deputy Commonwealth Commissioner, at present Mr. Lloyd Bott (Secretary of the Department of National Development). However, as some doubt exists as to the legality of this procedure, the amendment will put the matter right.

Clause 10 is the most important clause in the amending agreement as it adds to the works to be constructed the following three projects:

(a) the increasing to an extent agreed by the four Governments of the capacity of the large channels leading to and from Lake Victoria storage as may be necessary to ensure that this storage operates effectively in the Murray River system: (It is believed that some enlargement will be desirable when the higher

summer flows available to South Australia become available after completion of Dartmouth dam, but the extent and likely cost of this work has yet to be clarified. This provision of this clause was included in the agreement to meet South Australia's needs to ensure that Lake Victoria can be up-dated to meet new operating conditions as they develop.)

This was one of the clauses that I insisted be included in the schedule, regardless of the fact that investigations were not yet complete. I considered it vital to South Australia's water management that we have a more efficient Lake Victoria close to our headwaters so far as South Australia is concerned so that the salinity and quality of the river, as well as the quantity, could be controlled, and upon my insistence over several weeks the respective Governments that are members of the commission have agreed to allow it to go in as an expression of opinion and of their intention, but I repeat that the investigations are not complete and that it is impossible to put into this schedule detail as to just what these works may be. Clause 10 also provides for the construction of the following projects:

(b) the very large Dartmouth storage reservoir, of approximately 3,000,000 acre feet capacity on the Mitta Mitta River:

(c) works on the Murray River as may be decided by the River Murray Commission to keep high regulated flows in summer and autumn within the banks, so preventing the loss of valuable water. This extends a similar provision which already applies between Tocumwal and Echuca.

Clause 11 provides for the works for Dartmouth reservoir being constructed by the Government of Victoria. This is a logical move because the site is in Victoria. In accordance with past practice the Government of Victoria will arrange for the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission to carry out the work and the commission, with the concurrence of the Government of Victoria, intends to enter into an arrangement with the Snowy Mountains Authority to make any further necessary detailed investigations, to carry out the detailed design and to prepare the specifications and the other documents necessary for calling tenders. It is also possible that the authority may be asked to help with contract supervision.

Clause 12 (a), (b) and (c) contains machinery additions to permit and require approval by the River Murray Commission of contract specifications, as well as designs

and estimates. Almost all River Murray Commission works have been carried out up to the present by the day labour forces of one or other of the three States involved, so that specifications in the formal sense have not usually been necessary. As it is intended to carry out Dartmouth dam by contract the additional words are clearly most desirable.

Subclause (d) is a safeguard to ensure that the design and construction of large and costly works are in accordance with the purposes for which the work was proposed, and that the four contracting Government parties to the agreement must be satisfied that this is so. This clause is quite important in relation to the improvement of the Lake Victoria works and the river works between Hume dam and Yarrawonga. In both these cases the intention is clear, but the precise programme of works has still to be developed. It is, therefore, desirable that all parties should have an opportunity to satisfy themselves that developed programmes conform to the intentions as expressed in this agreement.

Clause 13 provides for the deferment of Chowilla reservoir until the contracting Governments agree to proceed, thus confirming action taken by the River Murray Commission in August, 1967. It also provides a financial restraint in that if a revised estimate of cost escalates by more than 10 per cent the four Governments will be advised and, further, that work will be suspended unless within six months all Governments agree to proceed. The financial restraint on escalation as now introduced spells out what had been accepted in principle. The Chowilla issue led to requests for this to be defined.

Clause 14 is a machinery amendment consequential on the deferment of Chowilla reservoir. In any event, it is an improvement as it gives the River Murray Commission authority to have any ineffective works dismantled. The superseded clause was geared to provide only for the removal of weirs and locks which would have been inundated by Chowilla reservoir.

Clause 15 provides for a small but quite important addition. The present arrangements provide for operation and maintenance of the numerous structures of the River Murray Commission by one or other of the three States, without any qualification. This works well in practice and an excellent liaison exists between the commission and the various State instrumentalities which carry out operation and maintenance. The additional words will

formalize what actually happens now. The State instrumentalities concerned will operate and maintain the works concerned "in accordance with procedures laid down by the commission". This is a proper provision, because otherwise the commission would not be able properly to co-ordinate operation and maintenance programmes, both technical and financial.

Clause 16 (a) formalizes something that happens now by liaison. No-one will question that the River Murray Commission should have authority to ensure "the efficient construction and required performance" of works entrusted to it, instead of merely their "uniformity, stability and durability". The change is a good one as it incorporates effective performance as well as efficient construction and maintenance. Subclause (b) has the effect that no tender for works exceeding \$500,000 can be accepted without the approval of both the commission and the contracting Governments. This is desirable because the commission will watch the technical aspects, and the Governments their financial commitments. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that one Government or another (possibly our own) might wish to delay acceptance of a large tender for a period to tide over a period of financial difficulty.

Clause 17 corrects the rather inappropriate wording of subclause 28B (1) of the existing agreement, which appears to imply that the commission may carry out preliminary investigations but must delegate to the State instrumentalities the next stage of more detailed investigations and surveys. The present words are inappropriate and confusing, and the Governments are agreed that the commission should not in future feel restrained in the way it considers it should best arrange for investigations. This is an improvement and avoids the existing device of arranging for one contracting Government to enter into contract to achieve the desired investigation. The commission has also established a larger technical staff of its own who may, on occasion, be required to take part in investigation work. Clause 18 corrects a marginal note which is obviously incorrect.

Clause 19 deletes an estimate of cost which is no longer relevant. Consideration was given to inserting a revised figure, but it was finally agreed that it might be misleading to quote an amount which would necessarily be inaccurate because of inflation. Also, there is a degree of uncertainty about the cost of river works between Hume dam and Yarrowonga together with possible major improve-

ment of Lake Victoria works and of minor improvements of a capital nature at existing works and other possible contingencies such as investigations and river gauging installations.

Clause 20 effects a simple procedural improvement. The present provisions mean that the financial contributions from the Commonwealth and the three States each financial year must be in strict accordance with estimates prepared in March of the previous year. In practice these estimates are continually reviewed to accommodate over and under expenditure, and, in fact, the final all-up payments are invariably less than provided in the March estimates. The simple change put forward will put the matter right. Clause 21 is a machinery change and is self explanatory.

Clause 22 provides for salinity management by flow regulation below Torrumbarry weir, which is sited not far above Swan Hill, and also below Euston weir, which is located 328 miles farther down the Murray River at Robinvale. The regulation of the Murray River as planned in 1961 allowed for the isolation of Chowilla from the upper river at times of short supply when Chowilla was holding adequate water to maintain the South Australian entitlement. In the later assessment of Chowilla it was realized that this provided a dangerous terminal condition at Mildura and adjacent areas and was deleted, with some detriment to the quantitative water benefit to be derived by the upper States.

The provision of basic flows at Swan Hill and Merbein is now inserted for the protection of that area. With Dartmouth the effect on river regulation is minor, and only protects the Mildura and adjacent areas against relatively short-term isolation while South Australia may be given its allotment of water out of Menindee Lakes and Lake Victoria. The clause in no way reacts against South Australia and does prevent the accumulation of a block of saline water that could, when ultimately released, cause difficulty in its passage through this State.

Subclause 23 (a) is a machinery change consequential from adding subclause 23 (b) by which Victoria cedes 45,000 acre feet of its tributary flow to New South Wales. The figure is less in periods of restriction. This adjustment of water between Victoria and New South Wales is a mutual arrangement on the distribution of water belonging to the upper States, and is acceptable.

Clause 24 implements the negotiated agreement in principle reached between Governments more than a year ago to provide for a minimum

annual flow of 1,500,000 acre feet to South Australia on completion of Dartmouth dam. This represents an increase of nearly 20 per cent on this State's present gross entitlement, and is an increase of 37 per cent in available water in excess of the basic flow which has to be maintained for river operation. The corresponding minimum monthly flows both current and future are given in the clause. It will be observed that the increase in some months is more than 20 per cent and less in others.

In two cases, that is the months of May and September, when irrigation demands are not high, the existing minimum flow has actually been reduced. The biggest increase (81 per cent) is in July, because the present monthly minimum of 47,000 acre feet is much too low for proper salinity control. However, the increase of about 33 per cent in the months of December and January is the most significant. This will rise to 2,840 cusecs, equivalent to 5,680 acre feet a day and 178,000 acre feet for each of these two summer months. In February the daily flow will be only slightly less at 2,680 cusecs, but the minimum monthly total will be much less because there are (except in leap year) three fewer days in the month. Altogether this is a very sensible arrangement that will contribute enormously to the prosperity and happiness of the people of this State, where the Murray River flow is by far the most important water resource. This State retains, as before, the right to seek adjustment of the monthly figures within the annual total and this clause allows South Australia to make the best possible use of water available.

Clause 25 makes a necessary change consequential on the deferment of Chowilla reservoir. It fixes the minimum reserve of water for use in dry years at 2,000,000 acre feet as at April 30 each year—that is, at about the close of the irrigation season in the vast gravitation systems in southern New South Wales and northern Victoria. With annual commitments in three States rising to the order of 4,500,000 acre feet annually, no-one will question a carry-over in storage of 2,000,000 acre feet in normal years against the contingency that the rains will fail during the ensuing winter and spring, as they did in 1967.

Clause 26 amends the provisions of the agreement dealing with the rather involved procedures in a period of shortage. Subclauses (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) are necessary consequential changes. Subclause (f) provides for a considerable simplification arising from

the completion by the Snowy Mountains Authority of works necessary to divert Snowy waters to the Murray River. Subclause (g) is to some extent consequential, but it is worthy of special note because in the amended form it will provide for equal sharing of available water between the three States in years of restriction, a matter referred to earlier. Subclause (h) covers arrangements between Victoria and New South Wales for the use by the latter of part of Victorian tributary flow to the Murray River during periods of shortage. Provision is also made for arrangements when the period of restriction applies for part only of the irrigation season, which in fact is the most probable case. Subclause (i) is important. It fixes the volume to be passed to South Australia in respect of losses, lockages and dilution at 47,000 acre feet a month in a period of restriction. This is added to South Australia's share of the available water. This allowance is the same as that actually made by the River Murray Commission during the periods of restriction imposed during the dry period extending through 1965 to 1968 and is a figure recognized as an equitable allowance. Its formal inclusion in the agreement extends this recognition to the contracting Governments and is an improvement. Subclause (j) makes a consequential change, the wording having been simplified at the same time.

I hope the House understands that in a period of shortage South Australia is supplied with this water for loss of operation of the river, amounting to 47,000 acre feet a month, before the remaining water is divided for equal sharing between the three States, the equal share being available only on the passage of this Bill; but the quantity required by South Australia for river management, known as dilution water, is first obtained from the pool available and does not come out of the share available to it afterwards.

Clause 27 omits the misleading phrase "at Lake Victoria outlet". What is meant is "below the confluence of the Lake Victoria outlet channel and the Murray River". However, the clause is quite clear without elaboration. Clause 28 provides for a definition of the Menindee Lakes agreement and relates to the amendment made by clause 29.

Part III deals with utilization by the River Murray Commission of waters of the Darling River as regulated by the Menindee Lakes storages, situated about 60 miles east from Broken Hill. Clause 29 provides for this to be done by the inclusion of a new clause

numbered 60B near the end of the River Murray Agreement. Subclause (1) of the new clause 60B is formal and needs no elaboration. Subclause (2) (a) provides for the Menindee agreement remaining in force in perpetuity instead of for seven years. It is by this instrument that Victoria and South Australia acquire for all time a share of the flow in the lower Darling River. The short-term agreement for use of these waters expired on December 31, 1969, but by arrangement between the parties these waters are still being used by the commission pending ratification of this further amending agreement. It further reinforces the need to have this agreement ratified because, if it is not passed, there will be no legislation in force to secure the continuation of the proper distribution of the water, which is now taking place by a *de facto* or gentleman's agreement.

Subclause (2) (b) increases the reservation made for use in New South Wales from 90,000 to 100,000 acre feet a year, which we consider reasonable. This is essentially water for the use of riparian landholders between Menindee and the Murray River and the increase is minor in relation to the long-term commitment given by New South Wales as to the availability of the storages to the commission. The increase represents about 7 per cent of the water contribution that the commission can obtain from the Menindee Lakes storage. Subclauses (2) (c) and (2) (d) provide for the omission of words no longer relevant.

The agreement, a copy of which is incorporated in the schedule to this Bill, has been signed and sealed by John Grey Gorton (Prime Minister of Australia), Robin William Askin (Premier of New South Wales), Sir Henry Bolte (Premier of Victoria) and myself.

This is an extremely important measure; it is vital to South Australia's future development. As I have said in another place, we all know from experience of the climate in this State and in Australia that in the future there will develop somewhere at some point in time a drought of extreme proportions. We are on a collision course with it and must be prepared to meet that event. If we refuse to pass this legislation, South Australia will be at extreme risk and, under conditions as severe as those of 1967, we would be not only under severe restrictions but also facing a great deterioration of the river districts in their irrigation and management of the irrigated crops that depend on adequate water.

There is little more I should add now; I am sure other speakers will take part in this debate. I can only re-emphasize that this is not a choice between one dam and another: it is an agreement to ratify a proposition that has been put forward and unanimously recommended by the experts of four Governments. It contains the results of negotiations that are extremely valuable to this State and give the first increase in water allocation we shall have been able to get from the Murray River since the inception of the River Murray Waters Agreement—an increase in quantity of 20 per cent, an increase in use of 37 per cent. To deny this to South Australia is not to give us another choice but is simply to turn our backs on the water we must have for development.

When all members have considered this, they must understand that, whatever their personal views may be of any alternative or any other negotiations that may be entered into, there is no alternative to accepting this agreement and there is no alternative as desirable to South Australia as the agreement before us. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Bordertown Primary School,
Campbelltown Technical High School
Additional Wing,
Ceduna Police Station, Courthouse and
Government Offices,
Croydon Park Technical College (School
of Graphic Arts and School of Hair-
dressing),
Glenelg Sewage Treatment and Disposal
Works Extensions,
Mount Barker High School Additions,
O'Halloran Hill Technical College,
Port Pirie Sewerage System,
Roseworthy Agricultural College (New
Buildings, Alterations and Additions),
Salisbury Primary School,
Sewerage System for Blackwood, Belair,
Glenalta, Sun Valley, Monalta, and
parts of Hawthorndene (Stage I),
Strathalbyn to Victor Harbor-Milang Rail-
way (interim report).

Ordered that reports be printed.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS (DARTMOUTH RESERVOIR) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the introduction forthwith and the passage of the Bill through all stages without delay.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. S. HALL obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to ratify and approve an agreement relating to financial assistance for the construction of the Dartmouth reservoir, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It seeks the approval of Parliament to an agreement between the Commonwealth and the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia for provision of Commonwealth financial assistance to the States in respect of their shares of the cost of construction of the Dartmouth reservoir in Victoria. This Bill is a companion to another measure introduced into this House to approve amendments to the River Murray Waters Agreement mainly for providing for the construction of the Dartmouth reservoir as a work under that agreement, the cost of the project to be shared equally among the Commonwealth and the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. When that measure was introduced, the important purposes that will be served by the Dartmouth reservoir were explained, and I shall not go over that ground again.

During the inter-Government discussions that led to the decision for construction of the reservoir as a work under the River Murray Waters Agreement, the Governments of the three States concerned all indicated that they fully agreed with the desirability of going ahead with the project as quickly as possible, but each of those Governments stated that it was not in a position to provide its one-quarter share of the cost in full as it arose, because of other commitments. In view of the great national importance of the project and its special value to the State of South Australia,

the Commonwealth offered to provide assistance by way of special loan to each of the three States to enable them to complete the financing of their shares of the cost. The three States accepted the Commonwealth's offer, and the agreement now before the House incorporates the arrangements that have been agreed between the Governments for the provision of financial assistance. Under the agreement the Commonwealth will provide assistance in amounts equal to one-half of each amount a State is required to pay from time to time to the River Murray Commission in respect of its share of the cost of construction of the project.

The present estimated cost of the project is \$57,000,000. If the estimated cost of the work rises, the Commonwealth will continue to provide financial assistance towards the States' shares of a cost up to \$62,700,000 (that is, 10 per cent above the present estimate). Under clause 4 of the agreement, a maximum amount of assistance of \$7,837,500 is provided to each State to meet its share of a maximum cost of \$62,700,000. However, it has been agreed that the arrangements for financing the cost of the project above \$62,700,000 will be reviewed if the estimated cost rises beyond that figure. Under the arrangements as described, the Commonwealth will be contributing its own one-quarter share of the cost of the project and will be assisting the States by making available as a loan a further three-eighths of the cost.

The three States will repay each Commonwealth payment in 30 equal half-yearly instalments commencing 10 years from the date each advance is received from the Commonwealth. Interest will be paid by each State on the outstanding balance of each Commonwealth payment calculated at half-yearly intervals from the time each Commonwealth payment is made. Interest will be payable at a rate equal to the yield to maturity on the long-term Commonwealth securities that were last issued in Australia for public subscription before each advance is received from the Commonwealth. The agreement also contains a number of machinery provisions of a kind similar to those embodied in recent Commonwealth-State agreements for the grant of special Commonwealth financial assistance for major developmental projects in the States. I commend the Bill to the House.

This is an important supplementary Bill and, while it does not make money available on a grant basis, it removes for the benefit of

the States the impact of their having to find their half share from Loan Account for the first 10 years after receipt of the money. This is a significant period, of course, during which the States will be able to spend an equivalent sum on other projects. This is a companion Bill which, as I have said, is strictly related to the Dartmouth scheme and

which further enhances the value of Dartmouth to South Australia.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, April 29, at 2 p.m.