

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, July 29, 1969

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

QUESTIONS

FLAMMABLE CLOTHING

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: On more than one occasion during the past two years I have asked about the use of flammable material in the manufacture of clothing, particularly children's night wear. Following a meeting with his interstate colleagues, the Minister of Labour and Industry recently made a statement in which he emphasized that he recognized this problem and the difficulties surrounding its solution. I do not know whether it is a coincidence, but there have recently been reports of several tragic burnings of children. Hospitals such as the Adelaide Children's Hospital are never without victims of such disasters. It is estimated that, in New South Wales alone, at least 20 children are burnt to death each year as a result of their clothes igniting. Consequently, will the Chief Secretary ascertain from his colleague whether there is any possible way of expediting a solution to this problem?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am aware that my colleague recently made a statement on this matter, so I will obtain a full report for the honourable member.

SAND

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Has the Minister of Mines a reply to my question of last week about the removal of sand from the West Lakes area?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As I said previously, there is no lease in the West Lakes scheme where sand is being used for glass manufacture. There is, however, a mineral lease of 11 acres (lease No. 2856) held by South Australian Silicates Proprietary Limited, a subsidiary of Australian Glass Manufacturers Company. The area is south of Fort Glanville adjoining Military Road, which area is not within the West Lakes area. This lease is still current until December 31, 1985, but it is expected that operations will cease within 12 months.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I was interested to read in the press recently of the leasing of sandhills at Normanville for the purpose of utilizing sand for the manufacture of glass in this State. I have been interested also in previous mining leases that have been issued over a number of years. In some instances no limitation was previously imposed in relation to back filling; nor was there a limitation on the depth from which sand or any other substance could be taken. Can the Minister of Mines say whether the company that now has the lease for the removal of sand at Normanville is the same company as that in the Woodville area that has the lease to which the Minister has already referred? Is there a condition in the lease relating to the depth to which sand may be removed—for instance, that it should not be below road level? Also, is there any provision in the lease about the backfilling of sand at Normanville?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I could answer this question at some length but I will undertake to make available to the honourable member the full particulars of the sand-mining proposed at Normanville. Briefly, Australian Consolidated Industries, which will be mining this sand, has been most co-operative in the conditions it has agreed to for mining at Normanville. The area to be mined was subdivided into building blocks in 1925, and A.C.I. has purchased the freehold of those blocks over a period of years. Therefore, it has a legal right to mine these dunes as it sees fit. With the Yankalilla District Council and the Mines Department, A.C.I. has been completely co-operative in the conditions that have been laid down: for example, in regard to beach erosion, it has been clearly found by the research that has been done that the regeneration of the beach depends upon a reservoir of sand in the dunes immediately behind the beach.

A.C.I. has agreed to make available 60ft of the blocks it has purchased, which takes in the total amount of the front dune. In the opinion of Mr. Sainsbury and other departmental officers, this provides an ample reservoir for beach regeneration in that area. Also, A.C.I. has agreed not to mine the front dune and to backfill where necessary to a prescribed level, so that at no stage will the front dune be touched at all and, where the company begins its mining back to the road level behind the

dune, the top level up to 30ft. will not be interfered with. The company has also undertaken to do filling for the wind gully on the front dune. This is quite a large question and I am prepared to make available to the honourable member full details of the agreement that has been reached, with the concurrence of the Yankalilla District Council, on the terms and conditions that will govern the mining of certain areas of the Normanville sand dunes.

COLEBROOK HOME

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Last night, during an interview on the television programme Today Tonight, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs said that he had certain evidence that substantiated his stand regarding the question of renewing the lease of Colebrook Home to the United Aborigines Mission. He said he would not divulge this information unless he was requested to do so. Since this statement followed so closely after the report of the Select Committee of this Council that investigated the welfare of Aboriginal children and that committee's recommendation regarding Colebrook Home, I was interested to hear it. Since the Minister has indicated that all is not as it should be and has told the public this, I believe it would be most appropriate for him to divulge his reasons why a renewal of this lease should not be granted to the U.A.M. Pastor Samuels, the spokesman for the U.A.M.—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr. Whyte must not debate this question. I do not know what the honourable member is leading to, but he is getting close to debating the question.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I did not wish to debate it, Mr. President. However, I did want to say that the spokesman for this mission was quite agreeable to having any information revealed. Will the Minister make known his reason for refusing a renewal of the lease of Colebrook Home to the United Aborigines Mission?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I saw my colleague on television last night on the same subject; apparently he appeared on more than one station. In the interview that I saw, as I recall his words, he indicated that he would prefer not to disclose these reasons without first discussing the matter with the U.A.M.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He never said that.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: He did say that on the station that I watched. To my knowledge, he was on channel 7 and channel 9, and channel 2 as well, last night. However, I am very happy to discuss the matter with the Minister. I shall put the request that the honourable member has made in his question, and I shall bring back to the Council my colleague's reply.

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the Motor Vehicles Department?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Individuals can obtain information as to the ownership of a vehicle only for purposes which bear some relationship to the business of the Motor Vehicles Department. Since about 1934 the Registrar has supplied copyrighted lists of new registrations and transfers to subscribers in the motor trade and associated industries, and these are used for sales analysis and promotion. These lists are supplied on an undertaking that the information contained in them will not be divulged to anyone outside the subscriber's organization.

The recipients of this information are charged a fee. For individuals the search fee prescribed by the regulations under the Fees Regulation Act is 50c. Firms pay on a subscription basis a total of \$7.50 a month for the lists of registrations and transfers.

Similar practices are adopted by registration authorities in other States. There is no suggestion that in so doing the ethics and integrity of the Public Service are jeopardized. There is at present an investigation in progress into possible leakages of this copyrighted information and use by unauthorized people.

GLENCOE PRISON

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Concern has been expressed in some sections of the press recently at the announcement regarding the establishment of an open-type prison in the Glencoe area. Since modern treatment of offenders is based on a continuous system of rehabilitation and not just punishment, can the Chief Secretary tell the Council of the scheme proposed, and can he also reassure us that an institution such as this carries within it more than the seeds of benefit to society whilst at the same time not endangering or exposing to risk the local population?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I should like to point out that the full recommendations in relation to the proposed training centre have not yet reached me, although I have approved of the question in principle. I am rather astounded and somewhat astonished at the reaction in some quarters to the extension of this type of unit to the South-Eastern area. I point out that in 1960 the Cadell Training Centre (which anyone who is prepared to examine the matter would agree has been an outstanding success) was established. Not only that, but I believe that since 1965 prisoners from the Gladstone Gaol have been used on work being carried out at the Wirrabara forest.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think it is at least since 1964.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It may be; it has been happening for three or four years. While this work has been continuing no Government has changed this approach, and I am keen to see a greater emphasis placed on the rehabilitation of prisoners in our prison system with, of course, the due safeguards that were taken both at Cadell and at Gladstone being taken. I hope this year to be able to introduce amendments to the Prisons Act that will allow a greater emphasis to be placed on such rehabilitation. I assure honourable members that the safeguards that have already been taken at Cadell and Gladstone will also be taken for the proposed new training camp in the South-East. I am astounded at the attitude expressed by certain members of Parliament through the press in the South-East.

WATER RESOURCES

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a short question of the Minister of Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: In the area east and south of Kingston in the South-East, where there is artesian water, a new bore has been brought under control recently, but, as the Minister is well aware, many of the older bores are in a bad state and a huge amount of water is leaking away; it cannot be checked. This is an extremely valuable water source, though we do not really know what the reserves are. Is there any move to bring these older bores under control? It will be a difficult job; they will have to be plugged to a great depth, and redrilled.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am aware of the problem that the honourable member mentions; I will get a full report from the Director of Mines.

NURSE'S PAY

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My attention has been drawn to the fact that an advertisement appears in the *Advertiser* seeking a nurse for a position at the Islington workshops. The salary advertised is \$46 a week. In view of the Nurses Conciliation Committee Award, which contains the classification entitled "Nurse" as indicated in an extract from the *Government Gazette* of December 12, 1968, at page 2615, Part II, Clause 5, giving a rate of pay of \$50.80 a week, will the Minister tell the Council under what award it is proposed the sister will be working at Islington? In addition, will the Commissioner consider paying this sister at the rate set out in the *Government Gazette* of December 12?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall refer this matter to the Railways Commissioner and bring back a report.

BRINKWORTH AREA SCHOOL

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: For some time the Education Department has proposed building a new area school at Brinkworth, but there is little indication at present when work on this school is likely to commence. I have correspondence before me from the Brinkworth Area School Committee, which reveals that previous deputations and correspondence in dealings with the Education Department have had little effect; the committee is still very much in the dark as to if and when the building of this school will commence.

The correspondence further reveals that the only recent information received was forwarded in April, 1968, some 15 months ago, when the Minister advised that because of the urgent need for new schools and other replacement schools the Brinkworth Area School had not been included in the 1968-69 Loan Works Building Programme, but that its needs would be assessed along with those of other schools requiring replacement when the next priority list was prepared.

Prior to this Government taking office, I understand from members of the committee that the Brinkworth Area School priority was No. 8. Will the Minister ascertain the present

priority of the Brinkworth Area School and if it is intended to put it on the Loan programme this year?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The member for the district has not done much about it!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. R. HART: Yes, he has, as a matter of fact, because the correspondence indicates a letter was received by the committee from the Hon. Steele Hall, who indicated what the Minister had said, and therefore the member for the district is involved in this matter, also.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer this matter to my colleague.

ELIZABETH BUS SERVICE

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of June 17 regarding juggernaut buses and the policy of the Municipal Tramways Trust in connection with the Elizabeth route?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The existing provisions of the Road Traffic Act limit vehicle widths to 8ft. although there is a proposal to raise this limit to 8ft. 2½in. (2½ metres) to come into line with International standards.

The Road Traffic Act enables the Road Traffic Board to issue permits in certain cases for vehicles, including buses, to be operated on public roads, which vehicles are in excess of the 8ft. limit. The M.T.T. has for many years operated buses 8ft. 6in. in width under such a permit.

The honourable member is evidently concerned that overwidth buses would be permitted to operate over a further portion of the road system when a direct bus service is instituted between Adelaide and the Elizabeth region. It is not likely that the M.T.T. will operate any such service. It is probable that the service instituted will be operated by a private bus operator, whose buses are within the 8ft. limit. However, final arrangements for this proposed service have not as yet been concluded.

However, I share the honourable member's concern at the possible hazard of the 8ft. 6in. wide M.T.T. buses ever being used on the Main North Road or like facilities outside of the built up areas, where speeds are high and lane widths are generally 11ft. or less.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: For many years employees of the Municipal Tramways Trust have given loyal service to the community, and there have been good relations between them and the trust. I understand that the M.T.T. is considering introducing one-man buses and that two or three years ago, and again recently, the Tramway Employees Union told the Minister that its members were prepared to operate one-man buses between Adelaide and Elizabeth. Now, I am amazed to hear the Minister's reply to the Hon. Sir Norman Jude, in which he said that it was unlikely that the M.T.T. would be operating this service. Will the Minister seriously consider allowing the M.T.T. to extend its services to the Elizabeth area, because this would relieve the M.T.T. employees of their worry that their jobs may be jeopardized?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will consider the points raised by the honourable member when I further deal with this matter and when I take the question of the Adelaide-Elizabeth bus service to Cabinet.

PORT PIRIE BOGIE EXCHANGE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of June 19 about the bogie exchange depot at Port Pirie?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The South Australian Railways is reimbursed out of the total freight rate for the cost of bogie exchange at Port Pirie. Some delays are inevitable at transfer stations, but the introduction of bogie exchange has minimized not only this delay but also damage to goods. Manual transfer of the tonnages now involved at Port Pirie would inevitably result in serious delays.

When the bogie exchange depot was opened on October 19, 1965, the Railways Department commenced working one shift a day and handling about 50 vehicles a week. The department is now working three shifts a day and has handled over 700 vehicles a week. The system of bogie exchange is infinitely better than the manual transfer of goods. However, it does not overcome the problems of break of gauge.

NEW BRIDGE AT MURRAY BRIDGE

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on New Bridge at Murray Bridge.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 22. Page 347.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I support the motion and, in doing so, congratulate His Excellency on his appointment as Governor of South Australia. This State is very fortunate in obtaining the services of such a distinguished person to represent Her Majesty the Queen. I join with other members in extending condolences to the relatives of those former members of Parliament who passed away during the last 12 months. Some of these members were known to me personally and others were not, but all of them in their own way rendered sterling service to this State.

I am pleased to note the reference in His Excellency's Speech to oversea travel by certain Ministers. I believe that all honourable members agree that such travel should be available, if possible, not only to Ministers but also to back-benchers. We all realize that nothing but good can accrue from such travel. As a result of his two trips abroad the Premier has brought back to South Australia some very valuable knowledge and some information that will probably enable certain industries in this State to expand and further industries to be established. The problems any Government faces today are very complex, and the easiest way to solve many of them is for Ministers to travel overseas to deal with them at first hand. Paragraph 17 of His Excellency's Speech is as follows:

With the aid of Commonwealth Government financial assistance, the Department of Aboriginal Affairs has expanded its developmental programme during the last twelve months. Considerable progress has been made towards ensuring that standard housing is available to Aborigines whenever needed. A programme of public health education has been prepared by the Department of Public Health and a hostel for maternity and medical cases is to be constructed at Port Augusta.

As all honourable members know, the Select Committee appointed by this Council to inquire into the welfare of Aboriginal children recently presented its report. Although honourable members probably have not yet been able to peruse it closely, I think they will agree with a number of recommendations in it. The committee has recommended the provision of hostels for various purposes and it has made several recommendations regarding the education of Aboriginal children. On July 18, under the heading "Study of Aborigines", the following article appeared in a local paper:

Eighteen trainee teachers from Western Teachers College have completed a fortnight at Koonibba and Yalata Aboriginal Reserves as part of their Aboriginal studies. They inspected schools, taught lessons and saw how Aborigines live.

The question of the education of Aborigines greatly concerned the committee. One of its recommendations was as follows:

The committee is concerned at the very low standard reached by many Aboriginal children at the reserve schools. This is largely due to the environmental handicaps that these children suffer. Another contributory cause is that teachers have not been specially trained for working with Aboriginal children. Consequently, they have little insight into the problems before them, and, sometimes, they have no particular interest in this special area. There is an urgent need for an extension of courses such as that recently introduced at the Western Teachers College; and provision should be made in the regulations under the Education Act to induce teachers who become properly trained to remain in this field. Teachers should not have to move into a different area to gain promotion or salary increases.

Now those last two sentences are very important indeed. We have seen the situation where a person who is particularly adapted to the teaching of Aboriginal children has had to move into another area of education altogether to gain promotion. The committee considers that alterations should be made to the regulations under the Act to enable promotion to be granted to such a person without his having to leave the field of Aboriginal teaching.

From an article that appeared in the press over the weekend and from certain television interviews last night it is apparent that all is not well in the Aboriginal field. It is rather unfortunate that there should be some conflict between the Aboriginal Affairs Department—and the Social Welfare Department, for that matter—and what is known as Colebrook Home. During its investigations the committee received from time to time varying comments about Colebrook Home and, as many of the comments did not seem to tie up, the committee decided to have a look at the home.

One morning the Secretary of the committee rang the person in charge of the home and suggested that the committee come up and inspect the home. We were invited to come, and the Secretary indicated to the person there that we would like to come immediately. Within half an hour the committee was at the home making a detailed inspection of the premises, so obviously no preparation could have been made to receive the committee.

Therefore, we saw Colebrook Home in the raw. I think I am expressing the sentiments of all the members of the committee when I say that we were agreeably surprised with the conditions that existed at that home.

Certain attitudes are being expressed and fostered in the Aboriginal Affairs Department that I believe should be thoroughly investigated. It was the feeling of the committee when it was sitting that it was perhaps a pity that the committee had to submit its report and then be disbanded, because members of the committee considered that there was considerably more work that they could do, despite the fact that they had been functioning as a committee for seven months or more. In fact, a similar committee in New South Wales sat for 18 months before presenting its report.

The situation at present seems to be that the Government is not going to renew the lease of Colebrook Home, and the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs indicated last night that he was not prepared to say why the lease would not be renewed. Our committee, which looked at this thing very critically, thought this was a home that should be encouraged and, in fact, even expanded to accommodate Aboriginal children from outback areas. Admittedly, Colebrook Home is not the last thing in modern amenities, but at least it is clean and it does provide for the welfare of Aboriginal children in many respects. It is a home for them; they are given the opportunity of education while living there; and indeed, far from being restrained, they are encouraged to visit their parents during school holidays and the parents are encouraged to visit the children.

It is hard to understand the attitude of the Aboriginal Affairs Department and also the Social Welfare Department in relation to Colebrook Home. It is fairly obvious that the attitude of the Aboriginal Affairs Department is that children must not be parted from their parents, whereas the evidence shows that practically without exception the only Aboriginal children from outlying areas who have received a decent education are those who have been parted from their parents during their period of education.

I have already indicated that during this period of education they are encouraged to return to their parents, and some of them do, as indicated in our evidence, a portion of which I wish to read. This is evidence that we took at Marree from Mr. George Herle, the Pastor of the United Aborigines Mission at Marree. Incidentally, this mission is a non-

denominational body. Many of the members of that organization are Baptists, but Mr. Herle is a Methodist. He said:

One boy here, Geoffrey Kennedy, was picked up with his parents and his sister. The parents went to gaol for seven months for neglecting the children and the boy went to the home.

That is Colebrook Home. He continued:

When he returned after six months I asked how he liked being back in Marree and he said, "I hate it." He said he would like to go back to Colebrook and I telephoned the secretary, who said he would accept him. That boy is about 12 or 13 years of age. Mr. Shepherd got Mr. Cassidy to come up.

Mr. Shepherd is a welfare officer in the area, and Mr. Cassidy is a welfare officer of the Social Welfare Department. The evidence goes on:

Mr. Cassidy saw Geoffrey and then told me, "Boys are fairly fickle. Geoffrey Kennedy has changed his mind." I said that I did not believe that, because three days before he had said that he would go to the home.

He wished to go back to the home. It goes on:

Mr. Cassidy then said, "It's funny, but that boy has strong emotional ties. It is his brother." That brother had left here 17 years ago, and the boy would not know him. I told Mr. Cassidy, who is the welfare officer in the Social Welfare Department, that I did not believe that and I asked how the boy could have strong emotional ties with someone he did not know.

That indicates some of the obstacles placed in the way of bringing neglected children from outback areas into an environment that offers them some possibilities in life, as it offers them the possibility of having an education and of being associated with people with whom they will have to live in later periods of their life.

Colebrook Home has turned out several first-class Aborigines. Why is there this opposition to Colebrook Home from Government departments? Mr. Herle, who is a very dedicated officer, brought to Adelaide during a school holiday period 10 or 12 children from the mission at Marree. He went on to say:

I took 12 children to Colebrook and 10 of them would have stayed there. When I asked one why he had said that Colebrook was better than Marree, he said, "I am never hungry here." Another told me that he would like to stay there because it was clean and the people were lovely. For a fortnight they had a taste of a different life.

It must be realized that Colebrook Home, whatever it is, must surely offer a better environment than that which surrounds these children when living under car bodies and sheets of iron, as they are doing in these

outback areas. Why are the department and the Minister not prepared to grant another lease and, further, to assist a home of the type of Colebrook to expand its activities so that the children in these outback areas can have the same opportunities in life as white children have? This is difficult to understand.

I am surprised at the Minister's having said he is prepared to give information provided that the Secretary of the United Aborigines Mission indicates his willingness. The Minister knows that the Secretary has no objection to this information being given; that has been indicated to him time and time again. What is this secret information the Minister has on why this lease should not be renewed? I commend the Hon. Mr. Whyte for having asked that question this afternoon. If something is so wrong with the home that it should no longer exist, let the department come into the open and close the home once and for all instead of indicating to the public that something is wrong with the home but not being prepared to say just what is wrong.

I know the department's attitude in relation to children in the outback areas. About six weeks ago I attended a meeting of Aborigines and white people which was held in Flinders Street and at which a high-ranking officer of the Aboriginal Affairs Department was asked a question regarding the children being brought down into hostels and homes in the metropolitan area. He replied that he opposed children being taken away from their parents. A prominent person in the audience interjected, "Even if they live in squalor?", to which he replied that in no circumstances would the department separate children from their parents. This shows the department's attitude: that in no circumstances will it take children away from their parents even when they are living in squalor under car bodies, sheets of iron or saltbush, and being neglected.

Shortly after our visit to Marree, the Pastor of the United Aborigines Mission there, at the request of the parents, brought four children to Colebrook Home, which accepted them. However, within a short time the department forced the return of three of these children to their parents, and what sort of parents were they? The father had left the mother, and the mother was drunk most of the time. That is the environment to which the department is prepared to return these children after they have had the opportunity to live at Colebrook. This is a serious situation, and the evidence of the committee that investigated all these matters will be completely lost if its

report is pigeon-holed and if the Aboriginal Affairs Department and the Social Welfare Department continue to impose their policies upon the Minister.

The Minister has said he has taken the advice of two departments in deciding not to renew the lease. Something is very much wrong within these departments if they are not prepared to make available facilities to give these outback children a better way of life. If Colebrook is not up to standard, surely a few dollars of the \$1,500,000 that this State allocates to the Aboriginal Affairs Department could be used to bring it up to that standard. That cannot be the reason. Is the home required for another purpose? If it is, let the Minister say so and let him assist the United Aborigines Mission, a body trying to do something for Aborigines, to obtain other premises.

A similar situation exists to a degree at Oodnadatta, where the mission has another home for Aboriginal children. The committee has also commended this body for the work it is doing at Oodnadatta and has suggested that assistance could be given in this respect also.

I know that some Aborigines are opposed to Colebrook Home, but this is easily understood when children are taken from their parents and brought down to the home because they are neglected and, after two or three months at the home, the children do not want to return to their old environment. In those circumstances it is natural that the home should be opposed. However, many Aborigines are willing to have their children taken to this home and, of course, this could occur if only a small amount of co-operation and assistance came from the department. I trust that another close look will be taken at this matter and that Colebrook Home will not be closed. I now refer to paragraph 23 of the Governor's Speech, where His Excellency said:

The law restricting the times of trading in retail shops has not been altered for many years. My Government is making a complete review of the situation with a view to inviting Parliament to enact laws appropriate to current conditions.

All members appreciate the chaos that exists in relation to trading hours and in relation to articles that can be sold after hours. Some chemist shops are open for long hours seven days a week and are contravening the Early Closing Act by having on display and selling after normal trading hours certain articles that should not be on display and sold.

The Act is so much out of date that one can go to a chemist shop after hours and buy a hair brush but cannot buy a hair comb. We

have also had a taste of what would happen in the bread industry with certain bakers in the metropolitan area baking bread at weekends. The question of the weekend baking of bread is a big problem and can be solved only by a sane approach. Of course, this problem exists not only in this State but also in other States. I understand that Victoria has a six-day baking week and that one can nominate one's own six days. A bakery has only to split its operations in two, and one subsidiary can bake for its six days and the other for another six days. In this way, they get over the problem and can continue to bake on Sundays. New South Wales, which I believe has a five-day baking week, has Queensland on one border, Victoria on the other and the Australian Capital Territory in the middle. Therefore, the whole thing breaks down in New South Wales. In Victoria, I believe there are certain zoning regulations that have not been successful, either. But in South Australia we have the present situation where baking is not being carried on in the metropolitan area on Sundays because the Bread Manufacturers Association has taken out an injunction restraining bakers from baking during the weekend. The bakers who were baking weekend bread have agreed to certain conditions in relation to this injunction but we still have the situation where bakeries outside the metropolitan area can bake bread at weekends and bring it into the metropolitan area to be sold on Sundays.

This will be a difficult problem to solve; I do not know how we can get around it. Much of the trouble has been brought about by problems of competition within the industry. Some bread-baking complexes are very large and have a terrific production capacity. In fact, I think the largest bakery in the metropolitan area could, if it worked three shifts, bake nearly all the bread required in this State. It is only by mass production that we can reduce the cost of bread; in fact, it is only by mass production and higher turnover that we can hold the price of bread where it is rather than increase it.

Several aspects must be considered. One is the delivery of bread, which plays a big part in bread distribution. The retail trade is not geared to handle all the bread sold during the week, and delivery is necessary; but, when we come to the situation where we are going to spread the sale of bread over seven days a week instead of five, the delivery of bread becomes a costly process and, eventually, if

the delivery of bread is to continue and we are going to sell bread on seven days a week, its price must inevitably rise.

It has been said on many occasions that the paramount consideration should be the interests of the public. I would agree with that up to a point, provided the public is not a small minority group. There is no reason in this day and age why bread should have to be baked on seven days a week. In fact, many people today buy bread only twice a week. This is a problem the Government now faces, and it must be solved. Whether we should have an authority controlling the bread industry, as is the case with the milk industry (or the liquor industry, for that matter) will need to be considered closely. However, I do not want to delve deeply into this matter now, because negotiations are taking place between the industry and the Government which, it is hoped, will be successful, and I do not want to be accused of rocking the boat. This is a wide and complex question that will have to be faced up to and solved, as is the case with the Early Closing Act. It is a nettle that will sting. Unless we grasp a nettle tightly, it stings a lot more.

A similar situation is developing in the meat industry, where distribution centres have recently been set up just outside the metropolitan area which trade in meat on seven days a week and for long trading hours. How the local butcher shop will survive this type of competition is hard to visualize. The local butcher will have a difficult time competing with this class of trading. Admittedly, he can indulge in the same class of trading if he wants to but, there again, it becomes a matter of economics. Where there is not sufficient turnover and there is a high capital cost within the butcher shops, competition is difficult.

The Early Closing Act will have to be closely examined. Nowadays, people desire to purchase their requirements at any time convenient to them. To a large extent, this pressure comes from oversea people accustomed to being able to shop 24 hours a day in countries with a population able to sustain this kind of trading; but in this State we are not yet ready for it.

I am pleased to see in the Governor's Speech that there has been an increase in the intake of migrants into this State. Over the years we have found that, when our economic situation has been on the downward trend the intake of migrants has decreased and then, when there has been an increase in the intake of migrants, the economic situation has usually

been improving. I trust that the arrival of more migrants in this State not only to increase our work force but also to increase the home market consumption will have a beneficial effect on the general community. Paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech states:

South Australia entered last summer with vast quantities of dry pasture and an extremely high fire risk. Yet, I am thankful to say, the State was relatively free from serious fires during the summer.

I am sure we all agree with those sentiments expressed by His Excellency. There are two reasons why we had a summer fairly free from bush fires: one was the very heavy rains in February, which reduced the fire risk, and the other is the efficiency of our Emergency Fire Service units. The pride of many a district council is its extremely efficient and up-to-date fire fighting units. I commend not only this Government but past Governments for the assistance they have given the E.F.S.

There are a number of other matters in this Speech to which one can refer, but they will probably be dealt with later in this session of Parliament. However, during Question Time a short time ago I was interested in a question asked by the Hon. Mr. Banfield about the Elizabeth bus service and the suggestion he made that the Municipal Tramways Trust should be allowed to extend its services to Elizabeth. This may be all right in theory but, when we look at this service in practice, we find there are certain private bus services operating within these areas in addition to the train service and, if the M.T.T. wishes to extend its services out to these areas, it will be to the detriment of not only the train service but also the private operators, who have been through a fairly lean time. In fact, in Elizabeth an internal bus service is operating.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I think the Hon. Mr. Banfield was referring to the proposed bus service already suggested.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Yes; I know what the honourable member was referring to, but I am saying that an internal bus service is already operating at Elizabeth. For the benefit of the people at Elizabeth, it would be unwise to do anything to upset the operation of this service.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Aren't you in favour of the proposed bus service?

The Hon. L. R. HART: Yes, I am, but I also point out that it would not be to the benefit of the people of Elizabeth if their internal bus service should be upset by the operation of the proposed M.T.T. service.

However, I have no doubt that the Minister will take all these things into consideration. With those few remarks, I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): I also support the motion and in doing so I join with other honourable members in expressing sympathy to the relatives of several former members in both the State and the Commonwealth Parliaments who have passed away since the close of the last session. The former members to whom I refer are Senator Keith Laught, the Hon. Clarence Goode, the Hon. R. R. Wilson, and Messrs. H. B. White and E. E. George, all of whom gave excellent service to the Commonwealth or the State during their various terms of Parliamentary duty.

However, there is one of whom I would speak in particular, and that is the late Hon. Bob Wilson. His friendly attitude, irrespective of Party allegiance, made him popular with all members. I well remember his friendly attitude towards me when I first entered this Chamber, an attitude that continued up to the time of his lamented death. I think I would be right in saying that with his death we all lost a true friend. To his family I extend my sincere sympathy in their loss.

I would like to comment on several other matters contained in His Excellency's Speech, and the first of these deals with the announcement that from the beginning of this year approval has been given for medical officers of the School Health Branch to examine all school children in private schools as well as those in Education Department schools. The children are to have a complete medical examination in their first and last years at primary school, with a further examination restricted to vision and hearing in Grade IV. That is, that examination will be conducted at about the halfway mark of primary school education. In secondary schools one complete medical examination will be conducted, and a further examination of vision and hearing will be made. This appears to me to be an extension to the children of private schools of the principle of medical examination of children in Government schools.

The practice of a medical examination of school children attending Education Department schools has been in operation for many years, and I remember having to go through such an examination when I went to school, which is more years ago than I like to remember. No doubt examinations have been increased in frequency and are much more

searching than they were in those days. I agree that it is probably wise that they are to be extended to children in private schools.

I am informed there is a certain disability affecting, on an estimate, about 5 per cent of all school children; it is called dyslexia. Unless the medical officer or teacher is aware of the symptoms of this malady and makes proper tests, the fact that a child has dyslexia could be completely overlooked before or during the medical examinations. The dyslectic child finds great difficulty in learning to read or write; he suffers from a form of word blindness. One indication that a child is suffering from the disability is that he reverses the word he sees in front of him. For instance, the word "was" becomes "saw", and the word "dog" becomes "god". In addition, the letter b is confused with the letter d, and the letter q becomes the letter p. Most children affected in this way are neither right-handed nor left-handed; they may also find marching with the right arm swinging forward with the left foot, and *vice versa*, a most difficult exercise to master, though it is quite natural with the great majority of people.

While not originally a psychological problem, it can rapidly become one because of the sense of failure associated with the inability to learn to read, as this has a far-reaching effect on such children. It is only in recent years that much has been heard of this complaint overseas, and even more recently in Australia. My attention was drawn to it by Dr. Dennis Burke, of Woodville, who has discussed with me the effects of dyslexia on the young pupil and the growing need for the early spotting of symptoms associated with the complaint, also the special attention and remedial classes needed for these children. An Australian symposium on the subject was held in Melbourne last year; it was here that evidence was given that one child in 20 suffered from dyslexia. Dr. McDonald Critchley, a world-renowned neurologist who attended the symposium, is quoted as saying that dyslectic children are definitely not lazy, nor do they have brain damage; they have an inborn immaturity, and the disability can be likened to being tone-deaf or colour-blind. It is unrelated to intelligence. In fact, there is evidence that dyslexia often cloaks in its confusion a high or even genius I.Q. Many of these children who have a high I.Q. rating are often classified by the casual observer or by teachers who have not been trained in the detection of symptoms of the malady as being retarded, slow, backward, or just plain naughty.

Because of the estimated number of children suffering from dyslexia, there appears to me to be an urgent need for the training of teachers in the recognition of the symptoms. This is particularly necessary for teachers in charge of first or second-year classes in primary schools. This special training is particularly necessary, because some of the difficulties experienced by these children are those experienced by others in normal development.

Should a teacher find a child who she believes has the symptoms, this should be reported to officers of the School Health Branch of the Education Department for confirmation. If there is confirmation by the medical officers, the child should be transferred to a remedial class for special treatment. I am informed that, given this special attention, and provided the disability is detected early enough, there is no reason why the disability cannot be eliminated. I would like to see the medical officers of the department pay special attention during the first medical examination of school children to any symptoms of dyslexia in children.

Another matter in His Excellency's Speech dealt with standardization of railway gauges in South Australia. In line with the statements made regarding other matters on the subject of negotiation between the Commonwealth Government and the Government of this State, the electors were led to believe before the last State election that, given an L.C.L. Government in this State, the "Big-Brother" Government—the Liberal Party-Country Party coalition in Canberra—would be more willing to act in a co-operative manner for railway standardization in this State. Nothing seems to be further from the truth, however. It took several months to get the Commonwealth Government to sign an agreement for the building of the Cockburn to Broken Hill 30 miles of railway, even though the agreement was in draft form before our Government left office. The Minister's colleague who temporarily represents the District of Grey continues to blame the South Australian Government for any delay in the building of that railway line in this State. It is interesting to note the attitude of Liberal and Country League members when they become members of the Commonwealth Parliament; almost invariably they adopt the Canberra line and forget the just claims of their own State. The present member for the Commonwealth electoral district of Grey has disregarded the best interests of South Australia in regard to standardization, and other L.C.L. members had done so previously.

Most honourable members will remember a personal controversy between Sir Thomas Playford and the four L.C.L. senators of the time regarding their less than helpful attitude towards the standardization of the railway line from Port Pirie to Broken Hill. More recently, we witnessed the lack of co-operation by L.C.L. members of the Commonwealth Parliament in connection with this Parliament's request concerning the Chowilla dam. I think that even the Premier is now disillusioned in connection with the pre-election statement about help from Big Brother in Canberra. Regarding any past delay, I point out that during my term as Minister a major difficulty was that of getting the Commonwealth and New South Wales Ministers to the conference table. When this was achieved the next greatest difficulty was that of getting South Australia's just claims recognized.

Apparently the present Minister of Roads and Transport is having the same difficulty with the Commonwealth and is being sabotaged by his own colleagues in Canberra. Had we given way on all points and let the Commonwealth Government ride rough-shod over our submissions, the standardization programme for the line from Cockburn to Broken Hill might have been advanced by a few months. Despite the written request to the Commonwealth Minister by Sir Thomas Playford as far back as 1964 for a standardized rail connection between Adelaide and Port Pirie and between Port Augusta and Whyalla, and despite similar requests by the Hon. Mr. Dunstan when he was Premier, and despite my own requests when discussing other matters in conference, the Commonwealth Government is apparently in no hurry to move in this matter.

Throughout my discussions with Commonwealth representatives it was fairly apparent that all they were interested in was completing a glamour passenger train service across Australia, and they could not care less whether this was to South Australia's advantage. With no decision yet made, the connections I have referred to are still some years away. The Commonwealth's attitude towards South Australia's standardization proposals has been tough ever since the L.C.P. coalition replaced the Chifley Government in Canberra. I think we can all remember how this tough Commonwealth attitude forced Sir Thomas Playford to take the matter to litigation before anything could be achieved.

I suggest to the Minister that he discuss with his New South Wales colleague, Mr. Morris, what sort of pressure he was able to

use on the Commonwealth Minister at the time a section of the line from Sydney to Broken Hill (in the Parkes area) was upgraded under the terms of standardization finance (to the extent of \$10,000,000), when the line was already of standard gauge. I was unable to find out what technique the New South Wales Minister used on the Commonwealth Minister, but our present Minister in this State may be more successful than I was. If he is, he may be able to use the same technique on the present Commonwealth Minister to get something done urgently on this much-needed link.

At the time this agreement was reached I was trying to get the two Ministers to the conference table, but I could not do so. We were trying to finalize arrangements for the link between Cockburn and Broken Hill, but the New South Wales and Commonwealth Ministers were more concerned with helping out the New South Wales Government on a line that was already standardized—it was simply to be upgraded. I thought the attitude displayed was completely wrong. The apparent lack of activity in regard to linking Adelaide to the standard gauge line is very serious. During the second reading debate on the Railways Standardization Agreement (Cockburn to Broken Hill) Bill in this Council last year, the Minister informed us that the Commonwealth Government had suggested that an independent feasibility study be conducted; the State Government had agreed to this suggestion, despite the fact that both the Commonwealth and the State Railways Commissioners had given much time to investigating and discussing the proposal.

The Minister informed us, too, that the study would be conducted by consultants approved by both Governments and on terms of reference approved by them. We were told that the consultants were expected to have their report available within six months. This statement was made at least eight months ago. The Minister, however, informed me last Tuesday that at that time there had not been agreement on the terms of reference. This is most unfortunate, as it now means that (even if agreement is reached on the "short while" promised so often in past months by the Commonwealth Government, the Premier and the Minister) the report cannot be completed before work on the link between Cockburn and Broken Hill is finished. This will mean that the standardization work undertaken by the South Australian Railways will come to a standstill.

It was of the greatest importance that the work should at least have been phased in with the phasing out of the work on the line between Cockburn and Broken Hill. Once the subcontractors and the present departmental force engaged on that work is disbanded it will take some time to organize such an effective operation again. Once the report is submitted I can foresee further months of indecision on the part of the Commonwealth Government. In connection with the Commonwealth's slowness in reaching decisions, I know from experience how one is fobbed off in regard to these matters by the Commonwealth. No doubt the reason for the disagreement on the terms of reference is that the Commonwealth Government and those (such as the present member for the Commonwealth electoral district of Grey) who support its attitude could not care less about the problems created for South Australia by a standard gauge connection in isolation between Adelaide and Port Pirie.

To prevent a chaotic disruption of traffic flow and, with it, the creation of additional break-of-gauge transfer difficulties, it is necessary for at least some additional ancillary work to be done. I hope the Minister will use his best efforts to see that the terms of reference do, in fact, cover these ancillary works. I hope the delay in reaching agreement is not engineered by the Commonwealth in the hope that it can make some announcement later as a Commonwealth election gimmick. This could be the reason, and South Australia's best interests may be sacrificed for this purpose. The matter of standard gauge entry to the Adelaide station yard is not unrelated to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposals. The plan provides for some major alterations to that area for the purpose of constructing an underground railway line under King William Street. I hope that, in the planning for this part of M.A.T.S., the planning of the standardized terminal is not lost sight of.

This brings me to the M.A.T.S. plan. There has been much confusion in regard to this matter since it was first dumped so unceremoniously into the lap of the public, and much of the confusion has been caused by the various statements made both by the Premier and the Minister of Roads and Transport. I have referred to this previously, when it appeared that the Minister was determined to push the plan through willy nilly and the Premier was saying that it was a matter that

was up for consideration. The most recent efforts of the Minister have further confused the public. He was quoted in the press and on television as saying that M.A.T.S. was a dead issue. Well, everybody is confused in the interpretation of that statement. Perhaps he believes that all the shouting and tumult is over and that it is a foregone conclusion that the plan will go ahead.

From what we hear of acquisitions and road widening going on in line with the plan, it would appear that this is what the Minister believes. Twice in recent months he has made a statement which is palpably designed to put pressure on members in their consideration of the plan, if and when it comes up for consideration. Some weeks ago, and again yesterday morning, he was quoted as saying:

While we have M.A.T.S. we have the Commonwealth grant of \$59,000,000 for planned transportation over the next five years. The money must be expended in accordance with a detailed and approved plan.

Earlier in the quoted statement he referred to the previous plan of 1967, yet he is trying to imply that without M.A.T.S. there is no plan. I was not aware that the \$59,000,000 was given on the basis that we had to approve of the M.A.T.S. plan, and I would hate to think that that was so. The Minister is quoted as saying in an earlier statement that we would not be able to spend that amount of money if we did not have M.A.T.S. Well, there are plenty of areas of transportation where I believe the \$59,000,000 could be well spent.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It cannot be spent in a city unless the population is over 40,000 people, and we have only one city of this kind in South Australia.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: There are plenty of areas around the metropolitan area and close to the metropolitan area where it could be spent. I only have to mention the need for over-passes and under-passes, grade separation in regard to railway crossings, and plenty of instances of the necessity for road widening and bridge building within the areas the Minister mentioned, where this money could be spent to good purpose so that transport on our roads could be made much safer.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: And all those things you mentioned are in M.A.T.S.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: This does not mean that if M.A.T.S. is not approved these things could not be done under some other plan. We are still left in doubt about when and how the debate on M.A.T.S. is to be handled. There are many separate features of

the plan, some of which may be acceptable to the majority, some acceptable to a minority, and some again acceptable to hardly anybody. Are we going to debate the matter on each separate feature, or are we going to take it or leave it as a whole? I will be interested to hear the answer to this, particularly because it was said that the public was to have six months in which to make submissions to a committee regarding their thoughts on the plan and that the committee was going to make some recommendation. That six months has gone, and I presume that the committee is doing something; at least, I hope it is. Are we going to debate what this committee has recommended, or are we going to talk about the plan itself? These are the things I would like to know.

I have only a couple of other matters that I wish to refer to. Notice has been given of many Bills that are to be introduced this session, and I will await their introduction with interest, particularly in view of the fact that there are a number of an industrial nature. I will be interested to see what happens in this Chamber, where so many members of the present Government showed their anti-union and pro-employer bias when this type of Bill was before the Chamber during the Labor Government's term of office.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think you did fairly well, you know.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: But not good enough. It was only through plugging away at honourable members and keeping them here all night that we got some sort of improvement. I am interested to see why these Bills are being introduced and what is going to happen to them.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They might be going to take away what they gave us.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. Another Bill foreshadowed relates to the Prices Act.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That's a joke.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In view of this Government's action in decontrolling prices of most items and the Premier's own statement that he did not support the control of prices, the announcement must be classed as just a hollow sham. Indeed, the Premier announced in another place last week that there were no longer any employees of the Prices Branch; they had been transferred to the Treasury Department.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: How many?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not know. There are no longer any employees of the Prices Branch, and this indicates the attitude of the Government towards the Prices Branch and the Prices Act. One might therefore ask: why bring another Bill down?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You suggest they are just doing this for the sake of appearances?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I think the Government realizes that if it disbands the Prices Branch we shall only put it back in about 18 months' time when we again take office. We have heard from the members of the Government that tradesmen have left the State to find work in other States, and there is no doubt about this. However, it is for a different reason from the one that has been submitted. My colleagues, who with me have had some interest in wages of employees over the years, will know why those tradesmen have left this State. The reason is that wages in other States, particularly Victoria and New South Wales, have always been higher than wages in South Australia.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You cannot get away with that one; they left here because they were out of work and did not get any wages at all.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Unemployment in 1962 was much higher than at any other time.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am not denying—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You are denying something.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Kneebone.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not deny that some people left the State during the Labor Government's term of office and that some people were unemployed then; but this unemployment was the result of matters beyond our control.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You are not blaming the drought too!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Those matters were natural disasters caused by drought.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: This Government has the third highest unemployment in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In reply to the Minister, I do not deny that some people left the State during our term of office to go to other States to get higher wages and perhaps to get work.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: During the natural disaster!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: But this was brought about by the fact that there were natural disasters in the whole of Australia as a result of drought and so forth affecting the sale of the commodities produced in South Australia at that time. However, the tradesmen and other people who are leaving South Australia now are leaving because of the actions of this Government, because of the strangulation of the Prices Branch, and because of the rapid and massive increase of taxation in South Australia. In the old days those people remained here because of the activities of the Prices Branch and because taxation in South Australia was on a lower scale than it was in other States. Thus, the real value of wages was greater than it was in the other States, and that was why people stayed here. However, that incentive to stay in South Australia has gone as a result of the actions of the present Government, and I submit that is why tradesmen are still leaving the State.

Finally, I notice that His Excellency reported that at June 30, 1968, there had been another decrease in the number of industrial accidents. It gave me great pleasure in 1966 when I was Minister of Labour and Industry to report that for the first time since records had been kept there had been a decrease in the number of such accidents, and again in 1967 I was able to report that there had been a further reduction. It is therefore most pleasing for me to see that during the financial year ended June 30, 1968, during the major portion of which Labor was in office, there was a further drop. I hope this trend will continue.

We always hear of the great cost to industry in loss of man hours and production as a result of this type of accident. However, such cold statistics do not take into account the human side of the problem; the pain and suffering of an injured man and the financial loss and hardship of the family of the injured man. Compensation payments being what they are, a family finds great difficulty in making ends meet when the breadwinner is laid low for long periods by an industrial accident. This is especially so when a permanent disability is sustained as a result of such an accident, or when the accident is fatal.

I hope we can continue to improve our results in our attempts to bring a greater degree of safety to industry. I am convinced that the safety clauses included in the Industrial Code and the Construction Safety Act and other Acts that were introduced into this Chamber during Labor's term of office have had much to do with the continuation of those good figures.

I remind honourable members of the difficulty I had at that time in convincing them that those Bills should be passed. I shall be interested in the contents of the Bills to be introduced to amend those two Acts. I will strongly oppose any move designed to make them less effective than they have been. I support the motion.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.55 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 30, at 2.15 p.m.