

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

Tuesday, October 1, 1968

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS**

**DOCTORS**

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Last week I asked the Chief Secretary whether he could ascertain for me the number of doctors who have come out of the University of Adelaide during the last five years. Has he a reply to this question?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I regret that I cannot give the specific figures requested by the honourable member because there is no way of knowing how many of the doctors trained at the University of Adelaide during the last five years have gone into general practice or into a specialist type of practice, both inside and outside the metropolitan area. The register shows doctors' addresses, but the doctors may be in practice in other States or studying for higher qualifications overseas. They maintain their names on the register by payment of the requisite fee, so that on returning to this State they can immediately commence duty in a hospital or a practice.

According to figures obtained from the University of Adelaide, the number of doctors who have graduated from that university during the past five years is as follows:

	Male	Female	Total
1964 . . . . .	58	10	68
1965 . . . . .	77	8	85
1966 . . . . .	63	14	77
1967 . . . . .	80	20	100
1968 . . . . .	71	13	84
	<hr/> 349	<hr/> 65	<hr/> 414

**GAWLER RAILWAY YARDS**

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On August 28 I asked a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport with reference to the then very bad state of the Gawler railway yards. Has he a reply?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In July of this year a trench was excavated in the paved area in front of the passenger station to permit the renewal of certain sewerage pipes, and it has been necessary to wait some time for the filling to settle before reinstatement of the bituminous paving. I am informed that this will be done at an early date because the filling has consolidated satisfactorily.

**WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT**

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I understand that the Commonwealth Government has allotted \$43,000,000 for the wheat stabilization scheme this year. Can the Minister of Agriculture tell me how much the scheme has cost the Commonwealth Government since its inception?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will obtain a detailed reply for the honourable member.

**TAX**

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Lands. I understand from interested and concerned people that the tax on drainage in some parts of the South-East has been raised recently by as much as 25 per cent (which came as a surprise to those who had been paying the tax) without previous notification. Can the Minister tell me the grounds of and the background to this decision to increase the tax?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Any increase in rates always comes as a surprise to any of us, but I will get full details for the honourable member and let him have them.

**FLUORIDATION**

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Some time ago, early in September, all honourable members received an invitation from the Australian Dental Association to attend a conference to be held by the association in North Adelaide on October 7 and 8. It appears that many honourable members have not accepted this invitation. In last Friday's issue of the *News* the Australian Dental Association's President, Mr. J. F. Irwin, criticized members of Parliament over their handling of the fluoridation issue. He said:

One would have expected members of Parliament to take the opportunity of learning something about fluoridation before criticizing it.

He made some further critical statements about members of Parliament in regard to the matter of the fluoridation of South Australia's water supplies. Can the Minister say whether it is a fact that the matter before Parliament at present is concerned not with the merits or otherwise of fluoridation but rather with the way in which it has been introduced?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not think I can answer for the President of the Australian Dental Association on any statements he may have made, but the contention of the honourable member as regards the motion before this Council is correct.

#### WHEAT

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: For some time now rumours have been circulating that a second advance is likely to be paid soon in respect of the 1966-67 wheat crop. Has the Minister of Agriculture any firm information about this?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Knowing the interest that the honourable member has in getting information for his constituents at all times, I will certainly find out the position for him. I understand a statement is imminent from the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry, but I am not able to get the information until such time as he releases it to the Wheat Board, which, I hope, will be in the course of the next two days. I shall certainly give the honourable member and this Council the benefit of any information I get.

#### EFFLUENT

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works, a reply to the questions I asked on September 25 about the possible use of effluent water from the Bolivar sewage treatment works?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: As the questions asked by the honourable member are fairly technical, the Minister of Works is having his officers prepare a full report for the honourable member, which I shall provide as soon as it is available.

#### FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1966. Read a first time.

#### BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Building Societies Act, 1881-1966. Read a first time.

#### SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Minister of Health): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Few honourable members will be unaware of the growing public disquiet engendered by those associated with the spread of the studies of the so-called sciences of dianetics and scientology. In Victoria, in 1963, a board of inquiry into scientology was appointed by Order in Council. Mr. Kevin Victor Anderson of the Victorian Bar, a Queen's Counsel, constituted the board. His report, the "Anderson report" published in September, 1965, rapidly achieved a wide measure of acceptance as a definitive and impartial study of the subject and its effects on the community. Mr. Anderson's conclusions can be summed up in his words: "Scientology is evil; its techniques evil; its practice is a serious threat to the community medically, morally and socially; and its adherents sadly deluded and often mentally ill." I would commend the 200-odd pages of the Anderson report to the attention of honourable members.

In 1967 a document entitled *Kangaroo Court—An investigation into the conduct of the board of inquiry into scientology* appeared; it is published by the Hubbard College of Scientology and represents the scientologist's view of Mr. Anderson's conduct of the inquiry. Again, I commend this document to the attention of honourable members since it represents the case for scientology. Scientology and dianetics are the brain children of one Lafayette Roy Hubbard, a native of the United States of America, who continues to this time apparently to exercise an extraordinary degree of personal control over the operations of these so-called sciences. He is a prolific writer on these subjects and the Anderson report at page 47 says:

Expert psychiatric evidence was to the effect that the Hubbard writings are the product of an unsound mind. This opinion emerged from a combination of the qualities observable in his writings, which contain great histrionics and hysterical, incontinent outbursts, which, by the very nature of their language, indicate their author to be mentally abnormal. They abound in self-glorification and grandiosity; Hubbard claims that he is always right, that he has all knowledge on all subjects and that he has had supreme experiences, including visits to the Van Allen Belt, Venus and Heaven; he claims equality with Einstein, Freud, Sir James Jeans and others, and immeasurable superiority to all leaders in learning, past and present,

whose teachings do not agree with or support his propositions; he has instituted his own calendar, his own dynasty and he grants amnesties as would a potentate.

This gentleman appears to exercise absolute and total control over scientific activities throughout the world. In 1951 he developed the so-called science of "dianetics", which has been defined as "a system for the analysis, control and development of human thought from a set of co-ordinated axioms, which also provide techniques for the treatment of a wide range of mental disorders and organic diseases". From dianetics Hubbard evolved the so-called science of scientology, which has as its professed aim "to make people more able" and which does not contain any mention of curing mental or physical ills, as does the so-called science of dianetics. Generally the practitioners of scientology state that dianetics is no longer practised as part of scientology, since claims to cure mental and physical illness are liable to attract actions for fraud. However, the Anderson report suggests very strongly that dianetics is practised conjointly with scientology, and certainly the proponents of scientology have no qualms about letting their adherents claim numerous cases where mental and physical ailments have been alleviated through scientology.

Generally a person is introduced to scientology through advertisements relating to improvements in personal efficiency or personal development courses; these courses often do not mention scientology and are usually advertised as being "free" or "without obligation". Once the person attends such courses it is suggested to him that by undergoing a "clearing process" he can increase his efficiency and develop greater intelligence and a more fully developed personality. At this stage all the techniques of high pressure salesmanship are applied and the subject is induced to sign up for a number of hours of auditing at a cost of the order of \$8 an hour.

This process of auditing takes place between the subject and a practitioner known as the auditor and as to this the Anderson report says:

Many scientology techniques beyond the elementary stages are essentially those of command or authoritative hypnosis and are potentially dangerous to mental health. Scientology processing or auditing is administered by scientology trained auditors "who have no knowledge or appreciation of, or skill in, orthodox psychiatry or psychology; they are generally unaware of the dangers of the techniques which they practise and are unable to detect in their patients a variety of symptoms which

would indicate to a medical practitioner or a trained psychologist mental and physical conditions which may require professional treatment.

During these auditing sessions the subject is encouraged and even commanded to reveal his innermost thoughts and fantasies which are recorded and checked against an instrument known as the E-meter which is described in detail in the Anderson report.

The progress of the subject through the audits is assessed, and tremendous pressures are placed on the subject to progress along the stages to his complete release from his alleged aberrations. It must be remembered that further progress is contingent on further hours of auditing at \$8 an hour. The Anderson report suggests that these assessments are nothing more than spurious nonsense designed to ensure that the subject, often fully dominated by the organization, continues to take more and more hours of auditing. It is significant that of the thousands of adherents claimed by scientology no-one has reached the stage of "operating thetan" the ultimate stage of complete release. A characteristic of an operating thetan is his total control over matter, energy, space, time, life and form. An operating thetan can, it is alleged, knock off hats at 50 yards. The remainder of the adherents, wishing to obtain the ultimate development, must continue with their hours of auditing.

What then of a person who sees scientology for what it is and desires to break away from it and even to criticize its tenets publicly? Such a person, in the jargon of the cult called a "suppressive person", can expect considerable vilification from scientologists together with a co-ordinated campaign of poison pen letters and telephone calls, but must he live in fear of something far worse? On critics of scientology Hubbard in his official journal, *Communication Vol. 9, No. 3*, writes:

Now get this as a technical fact, not a hopeful idea. Every time we have investigated the background of a critic of scientology we have found crimes for which that person or group could be imprisoned under existing law. We do not find critics of scientology who do not have criminal pasts. Over and over we prove this.

And he goes on to say in the same article:

We are slowly and carefully teaching the unholy a lesson. It is as follows, "We are not a law enforcement agency. But we will become interested in the crimes of people who seek to stop us. If you oppose scientology we will probably look you up—and will find and expose your crimes. If you leave us alone we will leave you alone".

I invite members to consider the frightening implications of these words for a person who has laid bare his innermost secrets and thoughts in auditing sessions in scientology, who knows that his revelations have been recorded and who now wishes to break away from the movement. Scientology has a particular appeal to people who for one reason or another feel socially inadequate. When such people are subject to the pressures inherent in the "clearing" process of scientology, coupled with the command or authoritative hypnotic techniques of auditing, they may get an illusionary feeling of well-being but there is a greater chance that the application of these techniques by unskilled persons may result in a complete mental breakdown. In any case, the knowledge that the scientology centre possesses a complete record of a person's most intimate revelations places that person in a totally frightening degree of moral subjection. No responsible Government, Mr. President, could be expected to tolerate this situation. In fact, this problem has concerned the Ministers of Health at both their 1967 and 1968 conferences.

The Anderson report recommended, in effect, that scientology should be controlled by the establishment of a council to control the activities of qualified psychologists and as a corollary the improper and unskilled psychological practices of scientists should be proscribed. Mr. Anderson did not consider that suppressing scientology by name would be sufficient. However, in any event the Psychological Practices Act, 1965, of Victoria did both of these things, and its effectiveness can be gauged from the fact that a number of scientology executives appear to have since left Victoria and taken up residence in this State.

The Government has given earnest consideration as to whether it should adopt either or both of the approaches adopted in the Victorian legislation. In this consideration, it has had the advantage of a view expressed to the former Attorney-General from the South Australian Branch of the Australian Psychological Society, an organization of trained professional psychologists, suggesting some opposition by that society to legislation controlling psychologists being linked with the suppression of scientology. The Government's thinking on this matter is that legislation regulating a legitimate profession should be introduced only after the fullest discussion with the members of the profession concerned.

Accordingly, this Bill is based on those provisions of the Victorian Act which relate to the suppression of scientology. Clause 1 of

the Bill is formal. Clause 2 defines "scientological records" and "scientology". Scientological records are, in essence, those records made during auditing sessions, those records, in fact, of the innermost personal disclosures of subjects. The definition of scientology has been adopted from the definition in the Victorian Act. Clause 3 prohibits:

(a) the practice of scientology for fee or reward and hence should go to relieve adherents of the increasingly heavy financial burdens they have undertaken;

and

(b) persons advertising themselves or holding themselves out as teachers of scientology,

and provides substantial penalties for persons convicted of such offences.

Clause 4 enjoins persons holding or having in their custody or control scientological records to immediately deliver them to the Attorney-General where, pursuant to clause 6, they may be destroyed. Clause 5 provides for the issue of search warrants in relation to scientological records. Clause 6, as has already been stated, deals with the destruction of scientological records. Clause 7 prohibits interference, etc., with the execution of a search warrant issued under the Act. Clause 8 provides for summary hearings of offences against the Act, that is, that proceedings may be determined in summary way under the Justices Act, and also provides that no prosecution for a breach of the Act shall be commenced without the certificate of the Attorney-General.

Clause 9 provides that practices and teachings associated with or derived from scientology may be proscribed by regulations, which of course are subject to the scrutiny of Parliament. This provision is designed to ensure that the so-called science is not practised in another form.

In introducing this measure the Government does not impeach the good faith of numbers of adherents of scientology, but it does suggest that their beliefs are misguided ones and it does believe that the system is essentially ill conceived and as such it has inflicted and is capable of inflicting untold distress and harm to the mental health and social fabric of the community. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

## PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 26. Page 1456.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I rise to speak briefly on this Bill and to commend the Treasurer for the excellent way in which he presented to Parliament the Loan programme of the State. It was brought to my notice two years ago that, if this State was to continue its present rate of spending, taxation would have to be increased by about 20 per cent, and this is exactly what has happened. New taxes have been introduced, and the estimated revenue from these taxes will increase our Budget by about 20 per cent.

If some of the articles attributed to politicians today were true, perhaps half of the \$40,000,000 set aside for the gas pipeline could be saved if they were connected directly to the Torrens Island power station. I was pleased to see some of the allocations for the areas that I represent. For instance, \$744,000 has been allotted for the replacement of the Tod water main. We all know that this is a most essential operation because the existing main is in a very poor state of repair. I was disappointed to see that in the \$93,000 for fishing havens no specific amount has been allotted to Eyre Peninsula, and I hope that perhaps this position can be remedied. Perhaps the Minister responsible for this industry will be able to take some action in this respect.

The sum of \$100,000 has been allotted for the Port Augusta Hospital which, of course, is another very essential project. I hope this will be commenced as soon as possible.

An amount of \$58,000 is allotted for the Ceduna courthouse. The state of affairs at this courthouse has been deplorable, because hearings before magistrates or justices of the peace have had to take place in a small room and these have been frequently interrupted by people coming in to ask directions to places throughout the district. They also ask questions about dogs, rifles and everything else at the same time as a court hearing is proceeding.

I want to say something about primary industry which, as we all know, is forever in trouble. I do so because of the comments made recently about the subsidies paid to dairy farmers and wheat farmers. Primary industry is still responsible for producing 70 per cent of the Commonwealth's exports. It has been suggested that some of the subsidies are paid direct to the farmers. It would

be more factual to say that they will more likely fall into the hands of implement manufacturers and hire-purchase companies than into the hands of the farmers. If we do away with the present subsidies, it is likely that our oversea markets in particular will be lost, and it is essential to our well-being and Australia's economic position that these industries be kept on their feet. With ever-rising costs of production and ever-falling prices for our commodities, there seems very little hope of doing that other than by giving subsidies to keep these industries on their feet.

Economists often say that a greater use of land is essential, but few of them have told us specifically how to achieve that. Other primary industries are in just as bad a state as are the wheatgrowing or dairying industries. The present world glut is not brought about by a record acreage, because a somewhat similar position applied in or prior to 1931, when farmers generally were told the only way to combat rising costs was to increase their production. They increased production to a point where 18,000,000 acres of land was under wheat. Most of this was achieved by the use of horse teams or the early types of tractor. As the stability of the industry increased at that time, so the acreage fell, and it took 35 years for that figure to be equalled again.

Some people have the false impression that the present butter subsidy (which the housewife believes she is paying) is making the farmers rich: as a matter of fact, they are barely existing at present. Anyone failing today in the dairy industry is regarded as inefficient, but anyone who borrows \$10,000 or \$12,000 to become efficient finds it hard to meet the interest payment on that money. This makes us wonder whether the subsidies being paid are in our best interests and whether perhaps our oversea markets are really so valuable that we can continue to subsidize these industries at a loss to ourselves.

For instance, butter is sold in the United Kingdom at half the price we pay in Australia, the reason being that we hope to maintain that market. We consider that if we lose it we shall find it hard to regain it. One wonders whether it is worth while. It is not for the producer himself, because he makes no gain from the subsidies, which merely keep him in existence. With those few remarks, I support the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I thank those honourable members who have mentioned some matters that fall within my portfolios. Wherever stress was laid upon certain items, I have endeavoured to obtain replies. The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan spoke about signalling and safety devices at railway crossings, and he and other members also mentioned visual indicators on railway vehicles. The line on the Loan Estimates dealing with that relates to Loan expenditure intended primarily for signalling on lines of railway aimed at the safe and expeditious movement of trains. Funds provided for new warning equipment and improved existing equipment at level crossings are provided, by and large, by the Highways Department. The requirements in respect of visual indicators are that they shall be effective at all times and that they shall not prejudice the safe working of trains, either in transit or during marshalling operations. This matter has had the active attention of railway administrations, both in Australia and overseas, and so far no administration has succeeded in developing an indicating system that satisfies the above criteria. As indicated by me previously, the South Australian Railways Department is continually evaluating suggestions and instituting trials with the aim of developing a satisfactory device. These tests include the painting of vehicles in bright colours, and more recently the provision of reflectorized material on the opposite side of the rails from approaching traffic so that an intermittent reflection may be given when a train is passing over the crossing.

When a satisfactory device has been developed, it may be expected that all railway systems will adopt it. In view of the inter-system movement of rolling stock, the effectiveness of any device will depend upon its general adoption. In this connection it should be appreciated that, following the conversion of the line between Port Pirie and Broken Hill, the vehicles of five railway systems will traverse it. On September 24 the Hon. Mr. Kemp mentioned a particular light at a railway crossing and asked me to investigate the matter. I now report that the overhead light referred to was installed a few months ago by the District Council of Mount Barker. However, it only supplements an existing light provided by the Railways Department, which has existed at that crossing for many years.

The Hon. Mr. Kemp then spent some time discussing the interchanges on the South-Eastern Freeway. One of the basic principles

of freeway design is that full interchanges are provided only where absolutely necessary in the light of present and expected future conditions. This principle has been adhered to in the planning of the South-Eastern Freeway, despite considerable opposition and pressure for more frequent access points. Under present planning, the South-Eastern Freeway will end as a freeway in the Callington area. It is not expected that a controlled access type facility will be required beyond this point for many years.

The total freeway length from Crafers (and by that I also mean Measdays) to Callington will be 25 miles, and in that length only five interchanges have been provided. These interchanges are at Crafers, Stirling, Bridgewater, Hahndorf and Littlehampton.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is not every five miles, is it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It averages five miles, but where the residential area is greater they will no doubt be closer. To give the relatively closely-settled areas between Adelaide and Littlehampton reasonable access to the freeway, these interchanges are considered essential.

The alignment of the South-Eastern Freeway towards Callington and ultimately through the Murray Bridge area was selected several years ago. All alternatives, including the Hartley, Wellington, and Coomandook proposal suggested by the honourable member, have been considered fully. Despite certain physical and economical advantages, this route could not be justified on examination of all the facts. For instance, there is no evidence to show that a bridge at Wellington would be cheaper than one downstream from Murray Bridge. Also, if a bridge were placed at Wellington an additional 15 miles of road would be required to connect with the Dukes Highway north-west of Coomandook.

It is a common fallacy to assume that the major road easterly from Adelaide to Murray Bridge and points beyond is very largely required by traffic generated along the Dukes Highway south-east of Coomandook and beyond. In fact, the warrant for such a road and its development to freeway status is almost wholly caused by demands of traffic with its origin and destination between Adelaide and Murray Bridge and that feeding into Murray Bridge from east of the Murray River from various directions.

The relatively close spacing of interchanges between Crafers and Hahndorf is clearly needed, in view of the present traffic on this section of the Princes Highway. On the Adelaide side of Crafers there are about 10,000 daily vehicle movements, but at Hahndorf this figure has dropped to about 1,500.

The Hon. Mr. Geddes argued a matter about which we have heard a great deal, and I commend him for continuing the issue, because it is important from the aspect of safety in regard to railway level crossings. The treatment implemented at railway level crossings conforms with the recommendation of the National Association of Australian State Road Authorities (or, as it is quite often known, N.A.A.S.R.A.) for use in Australia. This treatment has subsequently been endorsed by the National Committee on Road Devices (A.C.O.R.D.), which is preparing a manual of uniform traffic control devices for Australia.

In most cases where these signs have been erected the South Australian Railways Commissioner has insisted on reducing the width of crossing to the minimum possible. This has resulted in the railway protective fencing, which is normally short lengths of railway line, being brought to within four to six feet of the edge of the bitumen carriageway. The hazard markers (the sign with black diagonal stripes on a white background) have been placed with the sign edge to cover the fence post nearest the carriageway to keep motorists away from the hazard of the post.

In a recent analysis of accidents at level crossings, it has been found that more than 85 per cent of all reported accidents involved a motor vehicle to motor vehicle conflict or a single vehicle accident with railway property. For this reason, improved delineation was introduced in South Australia to lessen these type accidents and also to accord with practices for delineation as carried out in other States.

A study of vehicle placement before and after the installation of these signs has shown no significant shift in the majority of vehicles that pass over the crossings. The existing type hazard marker, which the Hon. Mr. Geddes claims has camouflaging tendencies, is currently being investigated with a view to using a chevron type marking, which should give a more descriptive illustration of the restrictive pavement width.

Reference is also made to the height of the existing signs obscuring vision. The signs are set at between 3ft. to 5ft. to minimize dirt and mud, thrown up from passing vehicles, from

obscuring the sign. As the average eye height of a motorist is 3ft. 9in., and the height of a train is about 15ft., it is unlikely that these signs could restrict the visibility to such an extent as to endanger the motorist approaching the crossing. Every care will be taken, however, in erecting these signs to ensure that visibility is not impaired. The signs at the Roseworthy crossing have been examined, and it is found that they have been erected too close to the bitumen edge. These signs will be adjusted as soon as practicable.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone touched on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. I thought I would go back upon the general history of this report, indicating when and why the whole study was introduced, and then, in reply to the honourable member, reiterate (because it seems necessary to do so) the attitude of the present Government to that report.

In 1955, the State Parliament amended the Town Planning Act to require a development plan for metropolitan Adelaide to be prepared. The Town Planning Committee established for this purpose presented to the Government in 1962 a development plan and report. These documents provided a basis for more detailed planning of transportation for metropolitan Adelaide. Subsequently, following the recommendation of the Commissioner of Highways and the Town Planner, the Government approved the formation of a joint steering committee to examine and report upon the transportation needs indicated by the development proposals. The joint steering committee, which reported to the Minister of Local Government, consisted of the Commissioner of Highways and Director of Local Government as chairman and, as members, the Government Town Planner, the assistant to the Railways Commissioner, the General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust, and the Town Clerk of the City of Adelaide.

A prospectus outlining details of a proposed metropolitan Adelaide transportation study was prepared, and the joint steering committee recommended that transportation consultants be engaged to assist in carrying out the proposed study. It was stipulated that the consultants must have had extensive experience in comprehensive transportation planning and be either established in Australia or associated with a firm of Australian consultants. The Government approved the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study in December, 1964, and authorized the engagement of

DeLew Cather and Company, of Chicago, in association with Rankin and Hill, of Sydney, and Alan M. Voorkees and Associates, of Washington, as consultants.

The study actually commenced in February, 1965. During the ensuing three and a half years a comprehensive study of transportation needs in metropolitan Adelaide up to 1986 was undertaken, and recommendations for improvement and extension of transport facilities and services to meet these needs were prepared. At an early stage in the study a conference was held which was attended by members of the Joint Steering Committee and Ministerial representatives, and at which financial matters concerning the study were discussed. Subsequently, the study proceeded according to principles established at this conference.

At a later stage, in August, 1967, when the general form of the recommendations was apparent, some further consultations took place between Cabinet and representatives of the transportation study, during which the proposals were discussed in broad terms. During the course of the study a progress report and a series of newsletters were published to keep those interested informed as to progress. A basic data report was also published.

In September, 1967, arrangements for the printing of the final report were discussed with the South Australian Government Printer and an Adelaide-based printing firm. At that stage, however, it was apparent that a shortage of staff in the Highways Department for preparatory work would cause considerable delay. The preparation and printing of the final report by the consultant in Sydney was ordered in November, 1967, and the report was received by the Government on August 2, 1968.

Completion of the transportation study took considerably longer than the two years originally expected. Principal reasons for the delays were the insistence by the participating agencies on the examination of more alternatives than had been allowed for in the original planning of the consultants, shortage of professional staff in the Highways Department, and delays in printing. While details of all costs have not yet been finalized, it is estimated that the total cost of the transportation study will be \$702,400. This figure includes the costs of consultants' fees, computing services, printing, and salaries of departmental officers engaged on the study.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That will come out of the Highways Department's funds.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not know the degree of contribution by the other participating agencies in the cost of the study. It may well have been agreed at the commencement at the Ministerial conference that it was to come out of the Highways Department's funds. In releasing the report on August 12, 1968, the Premier announced the Government's intention to defer its detailed consideration of the proposals for six months. This period was to be allowed for public review of the report and for the making of submissions by persons or organizations wishing so to do. Representatives of councils in the Metropolitan Planning Area were given a special presentation of the proposals of the study on August 13, 1968.

Councils have been requested to consider the proposals and to submit a report on their views to the Chairman of the Joint Steering Committee, for consideration and subsequent transmission to the Government. In order that councils will be fully informed of the views of ratepayers in their respective areas, arrangements have been made for public submissions to be received, in the first instance, by the councils, which will, in turn, transmit these to the Government through the Chairman of the Joint Steering Committee.

Councils have also been invited to arrange public meetings to be addressed by officers of the Highways Department on behalf of the Joint Steering Committee of the study. The purpose of these meetings is to explain the proposals and to answer questions relating to the study proposals and their proposed implementation.

Since the release of the report, departmental officers have attended public meetings in the Para Hills, Hindmarsh, Walkerville, Seacombe Gardens, Clovelly Park, Edwardstown, Glandore, Campbelltown and Unley areas. Arrangements are now in hand for a further 12 public meetings. Officers have also attended special council meetings to discuss the M.A.T.S. proposals in the municipalities of St. Peters, Marion, Thebarton and Payneham. More such council meetings are planned.

At the expiration of the six-month period allowed for public review, the Government proposes to consider the M.A.T.S. proposals, together with the submissions and reports received, and then to make a statement about further actions that will be taken in connection with these proposals. The Government is aware that the time is approaching when it may be advantageous to undertake a general review of the authorized development plan for



metropolitan Adelaide, and it is also aware that decisions relating to the M.A.T.S. proposals could involve amendments to the development plan.

The Government has kept itself informed of criticism of the M.A.T.S. proposals to date, and intends to continue to do so. The Government is aware of much comment concerning the basis of determining compensation for properties to be acquired by the Government. It is also aware of the concern of property owners whose properties are near the proposed new transport facilities and may accordingly be affected indirectly.

I wish to make clear again the Government's attitude to the M.A.T.S. Report. If there is any need to defend the Government's actions so far in regard to this report (and I do not think there is any such need) I shall be happy to do so. The Government received the report which, as I have said, is costing more than \$700,000. It is a study that involves the transportation needs of metropolitan Adelaide for about the next 20 years. It is a major proposal for forward planning, in which the present Government is genuinely interested.

The Government had to decide what it would do about the report. The most democratic step any Government could have taken at that stage was to release the report for public scrutiny, and this is what the Government did. The Government said, "We are not going to accept this report now. We are not going to approve it, nor are we going to take parts out of it and approve those parts, while not approving other parts. We are not going to carry on any more investigation behind closed doors into this matter: we are going to make the whole thing public and see what the people think about it. We are going to encourage the people to comment on it and, if they wish, criticize it."

As soon as the Government received the report it was very concerned that, if the report was accepted in the form in which it reached the Government, many people would lose their homes. The Government was also concerned that commerce and industry would be affected. It would not be proper to make a final decision on this report until these people and these interests had had ample time in which to study it. Further, the Government realized that it was necessary for the experts involved in the study to explain it to the people and the interests affected. Consequently, the Government turned to local government for assistance.

As I said earlier, a day after the report was made public the Government asked councils to meet together and requested those councils affected by the M.A.T.S. proposals to hold public meetings, which people affected could attend. The Government arranged for officers involved in the study to attend these meetings, explain the proposals to the people and, wherever they could, answer questions. I am pleased to see that that idea is bearing fruit, and that local government is co-operating in this manner because it is at that local level that such discussion should take place. Many of these meetings have been held and many more are to be held, as I have mentioned.

I want to commend highly the officers from the M.A.T.S. organization, who have not had an easy time at those meetings. They have conducted themselves in the fine traditions of the Public Service; they have factually commented upon and discussed the subject proposals and I cannot speak too highly of those officers. The M.A.T.S. organization is hopeful that the councils will gradually process all comments, questions, and matters raised by the people and eventually forward them to the M.A.T.S. organization for further processing.

However, we were not interested only in those people who would have been involved in acquisition. We knew, too, that there were a great number of planning experts in metropolitan Adelaide who had from time to time over this three and a half year period shown an interest in this transportation study. We know some of these interested people are from the university; some are qualified planners and members of the Planning Institute, and other groups of that kind. We wanted to open the plans up for close scrutiny and critical comment. Some of these people may have had alternative proposals either in totality or to cover certain sections of the report, because the report is, of course, very extensive and covers a far greater field than that in which only the Highways Department is involved.

We have offered information and experts from the M.A.T.S. organization to confer with these outside experts (if I may use that term) in order to provide data so that they could carry out a study in depth of the report. So, taken overall, I submit that the Government's attitude has been extremely democratic. I submit it is proper that we acted as we did, and I further submit that there is nothing secret about the manner in which the Government has handled this report so far.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Nobody has ever suggested that.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Let us deal with what people have suggested. They have suggested that we have accepted the report. The Hon. Mr. Kneebone said that, and I want to make the position clear to the honourable member.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I did not say you had accepted it; I said your explanation was different from the Premier's.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the honourable member is now denying he claimed that the Government had accepted the report then I am perfectly happy with that.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: The statement in the press about the plans for the underground railway was very different from what the Premier was saying.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I agree there was some misunderstanding in regard to some report concerning my comment about finance for the underground railway. When a report of this kind comes before any Government the Minister involved has a duty, in my view, to say to himself, "Now, if this report, or parts of it, are ultimately accepted, from where will the finance come?"

In regard to the railway sector, I have some knowledge that a Government of another State has made inquiries regarding finance from overseas for underground railway work. I believe that at least two Governments of other States are considering approaching, or have approached, the Commonwealth Government for special aid concerning underground railways. Therefore, I considered it my duty at least to consider, in a forward-planning manner, that if this report was accepted the problem of finance ought not to be left out of consideration until the last moment.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is our criticism at the moment. Where is the finance coming from? That is what we are concerned about. The report does not cover it; it only makes suggestions.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The report makes a lot of suggestions; it makes a few which are ridiculous, too.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is what a lot of people have been saying.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is criticism of that particular part of the report about finance, and not criticism of the Government.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What about the *Advertiser* report that you said the funds would come from the users of the facilities?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The Minister was reported as having stated that in the press.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Apparently the honourable member has recalled a comment I made in regard to a method by which some additional finance could be obtained. On the question of finance, as I understand the report, it is not unrealistic in bringing forward proposals that will cost the amount of money estimated in the report.

The majority of the total finance required will be for road purposes, and I think the figure is about \$436,000,000 over the next 18 years. The Highways Fund, of course, is increasing in size all the time and has gone up by just over \$2,000,000 in the last year.

The money that will be channelled into the Highways Fund as the years progress will increase annually. That is a reasonable assumption to make because of the additional cars that go on the road, and therefore because of the added returns from the Motor Vehicles Department and the additional money allocated by the Commonwealth Government for road purposes it is not unreasonable to say that this fund will increase all the time.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: But not sufficiently to meet the estimated cost of the proposals.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am coming to that. Based on an assumption (and not an unreasonable one) that the Highways Fund will increase over the next 18 years, the estimate of the Highways Department is that it will be about \$100,000,000 short. That amount spread over, say, 20 years is, \$5,000,000 extra a year that will be needed.

We also know there is a world-wide trend for extra finance to be diverted by central Governments into metropolitan development. It is a trend that cannot be avoided because metropolitan areas throughout the world are growing in size at the expense of rural areas. More and more people are coming from the rural areas to live in the cities. We know that in Australia approaches have been planned if not actually made by some of the large metropolitan areas to the central Government for extra finance to assist in metropolitan development.

Now in the knowledge of this trend I submit it is not unreasonable to expect that metropolitan Adelaide could average an extra \$5,000,000 from the central Government for this class of metropolitan development over the next 20 years. I admit that that is, an assumption.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is, \$5,000,000 a year?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, on average over the next 20 years, and that is the \$100,000,000 that the M.A.T.S. officers are short of in their estimating.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: This is only in regard to roads?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes. Analysing each particular sector here, I submit again that it is not unreasonable to assume that there is a possibility that the figures shown in the M.A.T.S. Report can, indeed, be reached over this span of years up until 1986.

I want to make one relevant point in regard to the great deal of criticism lodged against the report because of the inclusion in it of freeways. I make the point that at present there is a proclaimed metropolitan plan for Adelaide. This was proclaimed as a result of the planning and development legislation passed by this Parliament in 1967. That Act made it automatic that the 1962 plan was to be proclaimed as the plan for Adelaide.

We all knew at the time that supplementary plans would follow, but that is a continuing process in regard to any plan. However, there were freeways proposed in that 1962 plan. In other words, there is a lawful proclaimed metropolitan plan in existence now and that plan shows 97 miles of freeway.

In the proposal now being considered by the people, the length of freeways is reduced to 60.8 miles. I think that is a very pertinent point and that people who criticize the length of freeways in the current plan must realize that if something is not done in regard to a transportation plan they are and will be subjected to a plan which shows freeways of a length of 97 miles, which is in excess of 50 per cent more than the proposal within M.A.T.S.

The point about the M.A.T.S. proposal which gives me a great deal of concern (and I know it gives the Government a great deal of worry) is the question of compensation. The paramount issue arising at all these public meetings is, quite understandably, the question of compensation. People are naturally fearful that if, in the public interest, the authority must compulsorily acquire their homes they will not receive fair and just compensation.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It is not only those who will have their homes taken over: other people fear that their homes will lose value.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is another point that is being raised at a great number of the public meetings. However, the paramount issue concerns the person whose property will be acquired. The second issue of most importance to the people, as disclosed at these meetings, is the one the Hon. Mr. Kneebone mentions, namely, the case where a person has a property which is not going to be acquired for freeway purposes but which is situated adjacent to a freeway.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: And devalued because of it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is the general belief. However, an interesting point is that some studies in America indicate that in fact values are not adversely affected for this class of property but rather are they appreciated. However, that is something I do not want to pursue now. People are, quite understandably, fearful that if their properties are near a freeway they will drop in value.

It is of interest to note that in most instances on these plans within the M.A.T.S. Report a service roadway is provided between the actual freeway and the new residential alignment. Houses simply cannot front a freeway proper because a freeway proper has, in effect, a 6ft. cyclone fence running along it to keep children and tennis balls and so forth completely away from the freeway.

The important point is, therefore, that the people whose homes remain nearby will perhaps not be as close to the freeway as they expect to be. Another point of interest is that in some of the M.A.T.S. proposals are suggestions that some freeways will be constructed below normal ground level and as a result the noise will be suppressed to a much greater extent than would be the case if the freeways were at ground level.

Nearness to interchanges on the freeway mean that some people who live nearby will be able to get on to it very quickly and they might consider this to be a considerable advantage because the time of travel is decreased. I agree that concern is being expressed by those people whose properties will be nearby and who are fearful that their house values may be adversely affected.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: At this stage their questions and fears are justified.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is only human that they should bring up these points. The Government wants to hear of all these fears and comments and criticisms from the people: that is the very reason we have given this six-monthly period for consideration of the report.

Of course, we could not give longer than six months. It was not an easy thing to fix that time, because as against the advantage of giving to people the maximum time possible to probe this M.A.T.S. Report was the distinct disadvantage that some people whose properties came in the freeway plans and were for sale could not sell those properties for six months.

These people had to be considered, and indeed the M.A.T.S. organization is considering them and in cases of extreme hardship is, in fact, buying these properties now. I do not want that grasped upon by critics and used as evidence that the Government has approved the plan; rather it ought to be accepted as evidence of the sincerity and the good faith of both the M.A.T.S. people and the Government.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: When did you make the first purchase?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The honourable member ought to be sure of his terms. One thing is to purchase, and there is usually about four weeks between purchase and settlement. I have signed some letters where cases of hardship have been put to M.A.T.S. and have been processed by M.A.T.S. Of course, the organization has to investigate these things. In the cases I have referred to, in which transfers of business people to other States are involved, the M.A.T.S. organization is going to find the money for these people.

We know that, if the M.A.T.S. scheme is not proceeded with, these properties will just have to be put on the market again, but there is a genuine endeavour by the M.A.T.S. organization and the Government to assist people as much as possible in the problems that have arisen. I hope the whole issue does not become too political and that it will receive deep and intensive study and consideration by the public at large. I hope, too, that as Adelaide is a growing, modern, go-ahead city, it will accept a modern transportation plan that will eventually provide the people with the transport facilities they require and deserve over the next 20 years.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Minister of Agriculture): I thank honourable members for the interest they have taken in the departments I represent. I shall reply to a few matters raised by various honourable members. First, as regards Chowilla, it is important to get the record straight at this stage, because the State Government wants to be sure it is straight. We are dealing with a

most important matter and do not want it thought in other places that this State Government is cooling off about Chowilla or that there is any division of feeling in Parliament about it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I do not think anything I said lends itself to that assumption.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member implied (in fact, he said) that he wondered how we could proceed with Chowilla when there was no provision for it on the Estimates.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I wanted to know where the money was to come from.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think I should make this point clear, as it may be wrongly thought in some places that we have given up the idea of fighting for Chowilla.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No. My point was not that the Government had given up the idea but that there was no monetary provision for it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I just wanted to get it right, that this Government, as was the case with the last Government, has not abandoned the idea. The matter went into abeyance during the term of the last Government and, when the River Murray Commission appointed a committee of inquiry, the moneys then available for Chowilla were reallocated to other important works in the State, and those works are well under way at present. I make it perfectly clear that, if the committee of inquiry decided in favour of Chowilla, our State Parliament would be asked to approve supplementary estimates, which would immediately provide funds for the project to go ahead.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That was my point; I did not know about that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This is an explanation for the honourable Leader and I hope it is an explanation for anybody who may have doubts about the matter. The general overall water position in this State is, of course, critical at any time. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins, the Hon. Mr. Hart and the Hon. Mr. Rowe mentioned effluent from the Bolivar treatment works. That has caused much research by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It is not an easy problem because the cost of supplying water from that source is doubled, as it were (there is the cost of getting it into commercial use, which is not small) but everything humanly possible is being done to use that water. The Government's policy is to use water wherever it can get it. The overall water position in the State has to be looked at carefully.

Water licensing on the Murray River caused not only this Government but also the last Government much concern. The position has to be resolved, but the utmost research is needed into the amount of water to be used in growing certain crops. We have to take account of places like Israel, which has great water problems but is exporting a tremendous amount of primary produce, particularly citrus, as a result of the clever use of water.

The dairying industry was mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Kemp. I think he is aware, as many other honourable members probably are, that the Commonwealth Government made available \$25,000,000 for dairy improvement. Just how much advantage this State will derive from it at present we are not sure, but we are conducting a survey into it. Shortly, the Prime Minister will be making an announcement about the final amount of dairy assistance to be given to this State. All our primary industries are at present suffering a slight depression, brought about mainly by the state of our oversea markets and the attitude of the United States of America in restricting the entry of some of our primary products, particularly meat, for it has been an excellent market for meat producers both in this State and in the Commonwealth. It seems to me that the old days when people talked about the farmer putting on his best suit and getting out and becoming a salesman for his products have long passed, and that the thing to do these days is to get the best brains available to go out and sell. I do not notice in the motor car industry the man who designs the motor car or the man who designs any parts being sent out to sell a car. We have reached a high pitch of efficiency in production in our various primary industries. Much money has been spent on reasearch work, but it is necessary that, for a period at least, some of the effort be channelled into training more people in the art of selling primary produce. As one who is responsible for a number of boards dealing with primary industry in this State, it is clear to me that we have to improve our selling methods.

The Hon. Mr. Hart and the Hon. Mr. Whyte spoke of boat havens around the coast. Northern members have complained that most of the allocation (\$93,000) is being spent in the southern areas of the State this year. The reason is that those areas have two major projects under way. The \$93,000 allocated, which is greater than the allocation has been for some years, is to complete the works that the Government has pledged itself

and promised to undertake, and will undertake; also, it is to make safe some boat havens on the exposed coast and provide better fishing facilities. I shall be going to the West Coast in October to look at the fishing ports there. At the same time it will be of interest to the Hon. Mr. Whyte to know that I will examine many of the wombats on the West Coast.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Will you take "deadly Ernest" with you?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. I want to have a look at the dog fence and try to assess the need for the proper control of wombats in its vicinity. I said I would examine the matter raised by the Hon. Mr. Geddes regarding the protection of wildflowers in this State, and that matter is being examined. I do not believe anyone desires a situation where people cannot pick a few wildflowers in the bush, but it is ridiculous that they should pull up and destroy everything in sight because it is colourful. Those people apparently have the same instinct as a magpie has, which has to grab anything with a bit of colour in it.

The Hon. Mr. Kemp mentioned the position of the apple industry. I am pleased that this State's applegrowers have approached the problem (which could easily have been a problem of over-production) in the manner in which they have, and I thank the Hon. Mr. Kemp for his reference to what was being done at Ministerial level in this matter.

From time to time I have received many complaints regarding the egg levy that is imposed under the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities' plan. However, the State Egg Board acts only as an agent in regard to the hen levy. As Minister of Agriculture, I have no powers whatsoever to remit any of the levies imposed under the Act. At the moment the egg industry in this State is in a difficult situation, and I realize (as I am quite sure the board realizes) that the producers are not getting the cost of production for their eggs. This is another indication of the fact that to implement any of these schemes properly it is necessary that we have a fully Commonwealth scheme. I do not believe South Australia got the best deal that it could have got when the C.E.M.A. plan was implemented. Further, it was a great pity that the scheme was introduced without a poll of producers. This is one of the fundamentals that we must always have if we are to have these orderly marketing schemes (as they are so called, although they do not always work out that way). We should

give the producer, the person vitally interested, the opportunity to vote upon these matters to see whether he wants such a scheme.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They are not getting that on fluoridation.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I believe they will get that on fluoridation. I believe, too, that if the honourable member is not bound by his Party he will vote on fluoridation in the way his conscience dictates.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I am talking about the people who are bound to use it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Parliament is always responsible for its own destiny: it is supreme, even above the Government. I refer now to the forestry industry in South Australia, which has for many years played such a big part of this State's economy. There has been criticism that the Woods and Forests Department buys land in the Adelaide Hills from time to time. However, forestry concerns cannot go out on the Murray Plains and buy land. First, there must be good soil and, secondly, a 25in. rainfall is needed for the industry to be able to make a profit. It is a profitable industry because forestry has probably the highest return of any industry today. I know it takes a good while to obtain that return, but it is a useful and necessary industry, and our softwood forests are second to none.

I have had discussions with some district councils in the Adelaide Hills area, and I hope that a little more understanding on both sides will satisfy the people in the area that the Woods and Forests Department buys its land at ruling prices, it pays no more than Land Board valuations for the land it purchases, and there is no compulsory acquisition. I have undertaken to discuss this matter fully with the representatives of local government in the future, and I think that the people in the area will be very much happier. I thank honourable members for the attention they have given to the measure, and I support the second reading.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I too, thank all honourable members for the attention they have given to this measure. Members' comments fell into three categories: first, those who supported the Bill with enthusiasm; secondly, those who supported it with constructive criticism; and, thirdly, those who supported the Bill reluctantly.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And those with enthusiasm that were not so enthusiastic towards the finish.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That was constructive criticism. I point out that in framing the Loan Estimates this year the Government was faced with difficulties, many of which honourable members would appreciate and none of which could be laid at the door of this Government. Of course, many of them were outside the scope of any State Government in finding a solution.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You were still able to put \$6,000,000 away on ice.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This is a conscious move which has been made for a specific purpose and which was dealt with when the Loan Estimates came before this Council. They were designed to the best of our ability to suit the present situation. I would like to comment on one or two matters that have been raised, first on the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition, when he suggested—

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: All he said was that the Government was seldom right, but on this occasion it was still wrong.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: He referred to the allocation of \$19,500,000 (compared with last year's figure of \$21,000,000) of new funds for housing purposes under the terms of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. The Leader said that this had failed to give a stimulus to the building industry. However, it is the Government's opinion that it can give a stimulus to the whole State, and not just to one section of it, by concentrating on those things that only the Government can do, and by encouraging free enterprise to do those things that it is equipped and willing to do. What sort of stimulus would we give by continuing to build sale houses at the levels of past years when there is no demand to absorb these houses and the output of the private builders as well? The answer is that we can give a far more effective stimulus by refraining from unreasonable competition in this field and by using the Government's funds so freed to push on with other works which are urgently needed by the community and which only the Government can provide.

Moreover, whilst the provision of new money for the Housing Trust this year is \$9,500,000, compared with last year's provision of \$10,150,000, the trust had in hand on July 1, 1968, at least \$2,000,000 more than it had in hand a year ago. Consequently, it is able to carry out a significantly increased total programme for 1968-69. There is clear evidence that the Government is able, with no harmful effects, to withdraw to a small extent

from the field of financing house purchases and to make more effective use of the funds made available on other high priority works.

Whereas in earlier years there had been an unsatisfied long-term demand for housing finance, in 1967-68 there was a marked shortening of the waiting time experienced by new applicants for housing finance. I believe that the Savings Bank of South Australia, the Commonwealth Savings Bank, private savings banks, building societies (through their own funds) and insurance societies are prepared to keep up their contributions in respect of finance for house purchases. What purpose would be served if the Government allocated special funds in such a volume that it actually competed with these institutions for the business offering?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Haven't you also reduced the amount made available to the State Bank for housing?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There has been a slight reduction, but not a very great one.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: There has been an increase in the maximum loan to \$8,000.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: But this does not alter what I am putting. I have not yet referred to the State Bank: I have referred only to the Savings Bank of South Australia, the Commonwealth Savings Bank, private savings banks, and to building societies (in respect of their own funds), and insurance companies. The allocation to building societies has been increased in the Loan Estimates. We believe that a more effective stimulus can be given to the whole State by the Government's diverting a small measure of funds to other high priority works, I remind honourable members that the sum of \$19,500,000 of new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement funds (which amount, I agree, is less than that of last year) is still a much greater provision in relation to our population than that in any other State. It amounts to more than \$17 a head of population, whilst the figure in the other States is less than \$10.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We have always demanded more.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, but the Government believes that channelling more finance into this field would not give the impetus to our economy that we are seeking. In this field at present there is only a short waiting time, private finance is available, and private builders are capable of providing a service to the community, so the Government cannot see any great sense in offering further competition in this field.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Don't private builders build for the trust?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. Free enterprise organizations are also involved in providing finance. Matters that do not come within my portfolio have been covered by the Minister of Roads and Transport and the Minister of Agriculture. The Leader of the Opposition said the Government had repudiated an agreement with Mr. Currie. The Government has not—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Didn't the Minister of Agriculture and I agree that it was the wrong verbiage? I said "the appointment": I am not questioning the agreement from a monetary point of view.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I should like to state the Government's viewpoint. The only alterations to the agreement have been the change in Mr. Currie's title to Director of Industrial Research and the change in his duties to full-time engagement on research work. The Government has placed great emphasis on industrial promotion. The Premier undertook the responsibilities of Minister of Industrial Development, a portfolio created when this Government came to office. In order that the work of industrial development may be successful, we must vigorously promote the advantages that South Australia has to offer to industrialists contemplating establishing factories in South Australia. Consequently, there must be adequate research to support the promotional activities.

The Government has appointed Mr. A. M. Ramsay, a man of significant experience and success in the promotion of industry, industrial premises and housing, Director of Industrial Promotion. In turn, Mr. Currie has agreed to continue his employment under the agreement entered into with the previous Government for five years, and he has agreed to engage in research on specific projects to support the activities of the Director of Industrial Promotion. Therefore, there is no substance in the suggestion that the Government repudiated an agreement entered into by the previous Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't you believe that. Go outside and see what people are saying.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I could comment on other things, but I should like to leave the matter at this point. If any honourable member requires further information I am prepared to supply it. I have already replied, during Question Time, to one of the questions about hospitals. The Leader of the Opposition

referred to the Port Augusta Hospital in his speech, and I think he should be quite happy with the proposals for rearrangement.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I have never objected to them, because the last time I was there I advised the board to go into the matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I realize that. Some alterations have been made to the original plans for the Port Augusta Hospital: the original plan was for a 108-bed hospital, but this has been altered; the original plan was for a hospital without air-conditioning, but this has now been included; the original plan was for a hospital without a regional mental health centre, but this has now been included—the present maternity ward will be used for this purpose.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The internal arrangements for the maternity section have been twisted about.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The lay-out has been altered, with the complete agreement of the medical people in Port Augusta. The proposal for an operating theatre adjacent to the delivery rooms is to be deleted. Generally, the Leader will be quite happy with the alterations made in regard to the Port Augusta Hospital.

The Government accepts that a public general hospital of 800 to 1,000 beds will be required to serve the south-western district of the metropolitan area. It has been agreed between the Government and the Council of the Flinders University that such a hospital should be located in the university area. I think all honourable members will agree that it is desirable that a medical school be established at Flinders University.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The whole purpose of the hospital is that it should be a teaching hospital for the university.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is so, although my view is that, irrespective of that, it is necessary that a large hospital be established in the south-western districts.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: But you would not put it on the university grounds unless it was to be a medical school, would you?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: We are still awaiting the report of the Australian Universities Commission.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: While it is being built near the university it is not on university grounds because the Government made a swap with the university.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In any case, it is desirable that the medical school be established in that area to tie in with the Flinders University. The following three elements must be provided to establish such an integrated complex: (a) the hospital, providing medical care for patients; (b) clinical school areas to provide for the last three years of the medical course; and (c) medical school areas to provide for the first three years of the medical course. Currently, the Council of Flinders University has before the Australian Universities Commission an application for a grant of funds during the 1970-72 triennium towards the cost of the construction of items (b) and (c), which I have just mentioned.

It is highly desirable that the whole of the building complex to comprise the medical school and teaching hospital should be integrated to the greatest degree possible. For this reason, it is most important that the intentions of the Australian Universities Commission should be made known without delay so that detailed planning for the hospital and associated clinical school areas may continue. It must be pointed out that the Australian Universities Commission does not recommend any grant of Commonwealth funds for the provision of a teaching hospital. Grants-in-aid are made only in respect of areas related specifically to additional provision made for the teaching of medical undergraduates.

As far as the policy of the Government is concerned, it is believed that, in the interests of South Australia and of providing sufficient doctors for our future, it is extremely necessary that a second medical school be provided, and all our endeavours will be towards that end.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Are separate representations being made to the Australian Universities Commission?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Representations are being made to that body on behalf of the Government. I was pleased at the tribute paid by the Leader to the late Reg Hairfield. The Leader had a much longer association with Mr. Hairfield than I had, and I fully support his remarks. During the brief time I worked with Mr. Hairfield I, too, came to appreciate his outstanding services to the Prisons Department. I was pleased that the Leader commented on the fine work carried out by Mr. Hairfield, and I support him entirely. I thank all honourable members for their attention to the measure, and I hope I have answered most of the questions raised.

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



## STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 26. Page 1459.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I support the Bill, which contains amendments intended to bring the Act up to date following the imminent danger of foot and mouth disease and rabies being brought into this country. The Hon. Mr. Kemp, when speaking to the Bill last week, said that he gave it his wholehearted support, and I agree with that comment. I endorse the honourable member's remarks complimenting the Animal Husbandry Division of the Agriculture Department on its work.

The Hon. Mr. Kemp said that pleuropneumonia in cattle had been pushed back to the North; he also mentioned the eradication of foot-rot throughout South Australia. I believe that the work of the Animal Husbandry Division is of great value to this State. The diseases with which we are now concerned are much more dangerous than is foot-rot in sheep, but they have one thing in common with that disease (which, I am thankful to say, is almost completely eradicated from South Australia): that both are very contagious. However, these diseases are infinitely more dangerous to human life in one case and to the economy of the country in the other than is the disease of foot-rot.

I think it was the Hon. Mr. Kneebone who mentioned that both foot and mouth disease and rabies were to be found to the north of this country. With the existence of fast air traffic, people can be in an area that has both foot and mouth disease and rabies and then within a few hours can be in Australia, and this is a constant source of danger to us. Therefore, I believe the provisions of this Bill to tighten up the Act are very necessary.

I join with the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan in paying a tribute to the Hon. Mr. Kneebone for his contribution to this debate. I have studied the speeches of all the honourable gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate, and I believe they all did a considerable amount of homework. I believe Mr. Kneebone's contribution was meritorious, at least so long as he was objective. I do not know that he was always completely objective, but he certainly did some homework and research on this measure.

The Hon. C. R. Story: So long as he was not objectionable.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not think I have ever known the honourable gentleman to be objectionable. As I was about to say, the honourable gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate have dealt with the matter in detail, and I do not believe that at this stage it is necessary for me to go into the Bill in great detail and become repetitive.

The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan said that few, if any, stockowners would be aware of the wide and stringent obligations on them to comply with the provisions of this Act. I wonder whether the honourable gentleman is quite right there. I think many stockowners would be aware of at least some of the provisions they are obliged to observe. However, I agree with the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan when he implies that many people would not be as aware of these provisions as they should be, and I believe he has a point when he indicates, at least by implication, that stockowners need to be educated on their obligations in these matters.

I believe that a publicity campaign on the dangers of these diseases which it is intended to avoid if possible would be well worth while. I know that the gentleman who is now the Deputy Director of the department has on occasions given public lectures and shown slides on the dangers of these very diseases. Only recently in the Adelaide Royal Show there was a very good display in the agricultural pavilion with regard to the dangers of rabies.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone said that some of the provisions (I think he was referring to clause 6) were quite drastic, and I agree with the honourable gentleman. I believe that in ordinary circumstances we might look at this Bill and find several things in it that we object to quite strongly. However, I believe that honourable members are aware of the very great dangers that lie before us if these diseases come into this country.

For that reason, the provisions of this Bill are necessary, and even though they are drastic I think we have to accept them, knowing as we do the great sense of responsibility our Department of Agriculture has had over the years.

I agree with the Hon. Mr. Kemp in that I do not really concern myself greatly with the reservation (perhaps "suspicion" is too strong a word) of the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan with reference to clause 4. The Hon. Mr. Kemp also said that he thought donkeys and hybrids ought to be included. I was prepared to go along with this, but then I had a look at the

definition of "horse" and saw that in the original Act this takes in just about everything on four legs that is not a cow. I thought that if a definition of "cat" was as wide as this particular definition it would probably include all possible members of the cat family. In any event, the definition of "horse" includes the words "ass or mule", so it takes in the point raised by Mr. Kemp. Nevertheless, I think the real query of the honourable member is that we make sure that all animals that may be affected by these dread diseases are included in the ambit of the legislation and that there is no loophole if drastic measures have to be

taken; we all hope they will not have to be taken.

I will not deal with the clauses as a whole, because they have been dealt with by other honourable members. However, in the circumstances in which we could find ourselves if these diseases came here, I support the second reading.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.28 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 3, at 2.15 p.m.