

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, July 30, 1969

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

### QUESTIONS

#### NORTH-SOUTH METROPOLITAN ROAD

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: This morning's newspaper contains a statement that the Adelaide City Council is planning a north-south arterial road from Lower North Adelaide to Parkside. Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether this road is connected with the proposed Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study scheme or is it inter-connected with it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The proposal to which the honourable member refers is connected with the M.A.T.S. scheme. Part of the proposed north-south road, of course, is Frome Street, which honourable members will recall has been a north-south thoroughfare that the Adelaide City Council has been planning and indeed implementing over many years. I think that particular portion of this north-south thoroughfare, in its planning and in its actual construction, goes back for about 10 to 15 years.

However, the part of the north-south thoroughfare that is more actively involved (if I can use that expression) is that part that goes through North Adelaide. The M.A.T.S. scheme proposed that LeFevre Terrace was to be widened and joined with Frome Road in a direct route. However, the Adelaide City Council has now decided that it would prefer that LeFevre Terrace be not touched and that Margaret Street, a thoroughfare a little to the west of LeFevre Terrace, be widened and used for this portion of the north-south arterial road.

The question of LeFevre Terrace widening was one of the proposals in the M.A.T.S. scheme which was deferred by the Government pending further investigation. That investigation, of course, involved the work that the City Council has been doing, and now it appears that the council wants the alternative route.

#### WHYALLA RAILWAY

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: When glancing through the publication *Railways of Australia Network* I saw an item referring to the Commonwealth Railways expansion at Port Augusta as follows:

The Commonwealth Railways opened a new goods rail-road transfer area at Port Augusta on June 2. The new depot will facilitate the loading of steel from Whyalla, for dispatch by rail to destinations in Victoria and New South Wales. Improved facilities became essential because of the considerable increase in the steel traffic in recent months. In addition to the steel traffic, which is expected to reach 125,000 tons per annum, the Commonwealth Railways handles large tonnages of goods at Port Augusta for destinations in Western Australia and the Northern Territory.

To meet this overall expansion in goods traffic, the Commonwealth Railways began a progressive programme of development, estimated to cost in excess of \$750,000 when completed. The new goods handling facility is the forerunner of a larger concept which will include new travelling gantry cranes, associated track work, marshalling and dispatch roads, ramps for loading motor vehicles, double-deck rail wagons, and other general construction which will include offices and covered storage facilities.

Does this development mean that the Commonwealth Government has rejected the move for a rail link between Whyalla and Port Augusta, or does it mean that this link is so far off that the spending by the Commonwealth of this \$750,000 becomes an economic proposition?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have heard of nothing proceeding from the Commonwealth to say that it does not propose to continue its spending on a Commonwealth line from Port Augusta to Whyalla. In fact, I have heard from the Commonwealth that it is actively interested in this proposition.

#### GAS CARTAGE

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: A few months ago the Premier opened a carbon dioxide plant in the hundred of Caroline in the South-East. This gas, which naturally occurs on this site, is taken in tankers, under pressure, and is carried by road daily to Melbourne and Adelaide for commercial use—I emphasize, under pressure. The road near the well head that is used by these tankers is, I understand, becoming increasingly broken up due, in no small measure, to the practice of logging going on in this area. There is therefore an increasing strain on these gas-carrying tankers which are exposed to risks of structural defects, which can be dangerous. Can the Minister indicate whether this road is likely to be repaired or put into better shape in the immediate future?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: From time to time since the well has been opened, the question of the maintenance, repair and possible reconstruction of this road has been brought to my notice. It is a district council road and, for a period of time, the Highways Department was waiting for an application from the local council for funds for maintenance purposes down there. Just what the exact position is at this stage I am not sure but I will find out from the Highways Department and inform the honourable member.

#### KIMBA MAIN

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture obtained from his colleague the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked on July 22 about presenting a case to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance for the Polda-Kimba main?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My colleague, the Minister of Works, has advised that documents are being prepared covering the Lock-Kimba main in the form required by the Commonwealth Government for submissions for assistance under their rural water aid grant. At the present time the \$50,000,000 made available for these grants has been fully allotted and no further funds have been made available for this purpose.

#### RESERVOIRS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works, an answer to a question I asked last week about water storages, and particularly about the Warren reservoir?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is planned to meet any deficiency in the Warren water district during the coming summer from the Swan Reach to Stockwell pipeline rather than from the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline. It is therefore unlikely that the branch main from the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline to the Warren reservoir will be used this year, but it will be available if required.

The Swan Reach to Stockwell pipeline is ready for use with temporary plants installed at the three pumping stations, and, as mentioned by my colleague on July 22, 1969, in his reply to the honourable member for Angas, approval had been given for the pumping of water from the Swan Reach to Stockwell pipeline into the Warren main on Friday, July 18, 1969. This pumping was stopped on July 23, 1969, following a rapid increase in the storage in the Warren reservoir which was holding 777,000,000 gallons on July 25, 1969.

It will be necessary during the next few weeks to transfer some water from the Swan Reach to Stockwell pipeline to the Warren trunk main to enable operating procedures to be established. Apart from this, as a result of the increased storage in the reservoir, it will now not be necessary to supplement the Warren system from the Swan Reach to Stockwell pipeline before November and, if further good intakes are received, this date would be put forward further into summer.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 29. Page 486.)

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): I join with my colleagues in expressing pleasure at the appointment of His Excellency the Governor, Sir James Harrison, to the highest office in this State. I feel certain that both he and Lady Harrison will enjoy their stay and will, I am sure, contribute to the general welfare of the people of South Australia. I also record my sincere regrets at the passing of so many of my colleagues in both the Commonwealth and the State spheres, and I endorse all that has been said by my colleagues regarding them.

I listened with considerable interest to the Speech made by His Excellency the Governor on behalf of his Ministers, and I pondered with some cynicism on the extraordinary amount of legislation contemplated by a Government that has not got a majority, but this is a progressive and a youthful Government in the making. Today I wish to cover a few matters other than the M.A.T.S. plan that have not been dealt with at any length in this debate. I shall leave any comments I may make regarding the M.A.T.S. Report and local government for a more appropriate occasion.

Looking back with a little hard-earned experience, I think something is lacking in our present outlook. It is not the will to do something, because the Government has plenty of enthusiasm to put through effective measures, though it is somewhat circumscribed by finance or financial capability. The will is there, but I am concerned about the general programme. With the financial limitations that face the Government, both the Government itself and, consequently, the Legislature must pay some heed to priorities. Every year the Government appears to arouse the ire of one group or another by allowing certain Ministers or their departments to make numerous and sometimes untimely statements. I will venture to say

that from time to time they have been misquoted, and such statements have sometimes been taken to mean that some project will be carried out in the near future. Unfortunately, in many of these cases nothing does happen, but inquiries reveal that a committee is, or will be, appointed. I can only suggest that we must surely be running out of good committee men.

Frankly, the few items that have received the plaudits of the layman in the last 12 months mainly fulfilled plans set in motion as far back as the Playford Government and, particularly in the socialistic section, the Walsh-Dunstan Governments. I am fully aware that the socialistic policies of the Labor Government presented us with a problem, and the Treasurer is to be congratulated on his attempts to rectify the situation by sound means. Whilst it is easy to reply to requests by saying, "If you want this, you must expect to pay for it", what did we do? We went into two forms of taxation—receipts duty and gift duty. Ye gods! The Treasurer's experts cannot even explain the gift duty provisions to our leading lawyers and accountants. I am glad, however, that the Treasurer has indicated his willingness to consider amendments to clarify the position.

Other States have imposed receipts duty, but their actions do not make it a good form of taxation. Even the Commonwealth Government sounded a warning that State Governments should keep off its grass, or else! During the last few months I have been inundated by complaints from numerous small bodies that have been expected to spend valuable minutes, sometimes hours, in handling clerical work associated with the receipts duty; I am sure that such time far outweighs the resultant benefit to the Treasury. The hundreds of sporting organizations and club secretaries who receive subscriptions of only a few dollars from each member should be exempted from paying receipts duty, and the rest of the system should be very carefully looked into. It is obvious to honourable members and Ministers that in some cases this duty is paid over and over again, so it is most unfair and most unsatisfactory.

Reverting to the question of priorities, while the Treasurer is trying to square the accounts we cheerfully commence fluoridating our water supplies at some expense (I am not opposing it), but what about filtration? If a Gallup poll was taken, honourable members would find what the people really wanted. Is

it suggested that every householder should put in his own filtration plant? We are increasing charges for water and changing the rating system, not to mention drainage rates in the South-East. We establish committees in connection with this, that and the other *ad nauseam*, but what have we actually done? We still have soldier settlers in the South-East who had expected that they could dispose of their land, if they wished, after 10 years. They still have not got a firm valuation 20 years later. Whilst the fault is not entirely that of the present Government in particular, nothing is being done about it—only further committees are being established to report further.

The apparent bungling over the Keith water scheme would appear, on the surface at any rate, to be indefensible. There is something wrong here and it should be cleaned up forthwith. It should not be necessary for people to be talking about writs, etc. If I support my neighbours to get an amenity that they want but which I do not need, am I expected to contribute towards it? It is adding insult to injury to me if I have to put up with an easement across my property.

I would like to record my satisfaction at the action of the Bush Fires Advisory Committee in this State, supported by the Government, of course, and the general attitude of Government departments towards this always grave danger of bush fires, particularly in the Hills area. Dr. Melville and his committee, and Mr. Kerr, Supervisor of the Emergency Fire Services, should be sincerely congratulated and supported on every occasion for the work they do. I add that it is most pleasing to me, as a founder and first President of the fire fighting associations, to note the practical attitude adopted by most local government bodies and the Highways Department regarding the use of machinery in an emergency without having to get the approval of some remote authority to use the equipment when the fire is virtually out. This shows an awareness, so essential in this State, that damage done by fire cannot be replaced at any cost whatsoever.

While speaking of combating the fire menace, it should be of interest to note that our much-condemned freeway, particularly through the Adelaide Hills, probably presents us with one of the finest fire-fighting aids that could possibly be imagined. We intend later to beautify this section, and I hope the Minister will give some thought to suggestions made from time to time, but perhaps not volubly enough, to plant fire-resistant trees,

particularly the sequoia-type trees of Southern California that are noted for being fire resistant, although they may not be fireproof.

I now bring to honourable member's attention something that has shocked me gravely within the last few days: I refer to the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act of 1969. A few days ago my attention was drawn to a statement made by the Hon. Murray Hill, the Minister of Roads and Transport, to the effect that without approval of one or other parts of the M.A.T.S. metropolitan plan it would be very difficult to go ahead, as Commonwealth money would not be available. Quite frankly, I thought the Minister had been misquoted, that he was off-beam, so I decided to make myself *au fait* with the new Aid Roads Act and find to what, if any, extent it had been altered from the previous five-year Act.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Perhaps the answer suited the question at that particular time.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: No, I thought my knowledge was lacking on the point and that is why I failed to understand the Minister's statement. When I queried this (and I have before me a copy of the second reading speech and a copy of the Act) I found that the Act provided for new partitions of money to be reimbursed, in that it now included urban roads of the freeway type and other urban roads, also certain money for research, and so on, and also certain money for rural roads. I could go along with that; I realize it was a slight variation in formula, but what proved most revealing and far reaching (far beyond, Mr. President, what State Senators of all States should have approved) is that I have learnt that nearly every State Government and its Highways Department have been upset by some of the new clauses. I think honourable members should be advised of them.

The second reading explanation of the Bill is fair and reasonable, and is available to all honourable members. I shall be glad to lend my copy to any member who wishes to see it. A reasonable explanation of the Bill was given, but there was no mention of individual controls, as such, that arose from the nomenclature of the Bill and the definitions of "Minister" and so forth. I worked on the assumption that "the Minister" meant the Minister of the department in each individual State, but of course it did not: it meant the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport. Closer examination

showed that the Minister is given fantastic powers. It means that he will delineate and name all urban roads, particularly the freeway type, and this means that he would have to refer to the Federal Bureau of Highways for that information.

It means then that the money allocated in the particular schedule could only be spent on roads nominated by the Minister, who might never even have been in the State. That might apply also to some of the members of the Federal Bureau of Highways. Mr. President, what it actually means is that we have established this bureau contrary to the expressed opinion of the State Ministers of the day. I said this at the time, and in fact I am on record as saying that at an Australian Transport Advisory Council Conference. It was made quite clear both to Mr. Opperman and to Mr. Freeth that there was no necessity for a Federal Bureau of Highways such as has now been set up. All that was necessary was a very small committee or commission of able men to call evidence from the various State Highways Departments, collate the material and make recommendations to the Commonwealth Government regarding interstate highway problems—north and south, east and west, and so forth—not to advise the Highways Department in Adelaide as to whether a road should go—as the Minister of Roads and Transport suggested this afternoon—on a certain route through North Adelaide or otherwise. That should not be a matter for a Federal Bureau of Highways, and as long as I have any influence I will not accept that position, and neither should the States accept it.

I realize that the Commonwealth Government reimburses—and "reimburses" is the word, not "grants"—to the States portion of the petrol tax and that it expects to have some accounting of the way the money is spent. To my knowledge there has never been any suggestion in the years gone by, during the two previous five-year plans, that the States have not spent their money properly and not given a proper rendering of it. Naturally, some transfers are necessary as a result of inability to plan ahead in some cases, land acquisition, and so on. This Federal Bureau of Highways is pursuing a duplicating task, and in a day when our Ministers find it so difficult to get experts such as surveyors, highway engineers, draftsmen and so forth, it is entirely redundant to have a staff (already between 40 and 50 highly trained executives) over there to check our experts. It just does not add up to common sense.

The Senators of our various States should have seen to this but, rather as in the case of our Gift Duty Bill last year, it was dumped on to the Senate on the last night of the session and then the Senate adjourned. That is another good example of how really important legislation affecting the whole of Australia and involving many millions of dollars—almost second only to defence—is passed through in a matter of a few hours. The Senators gave reasonable attention to it, but it would appear to me, from reading through the whole of the debate, that many of them did not have copies of the Bill available to them, otherwise they would have noticed this rather incongruous position. Summing up, I would suggest that that is a further step to break down Federation. I say quite firmly that it is almost vicious centralization. Like my late colleague, the Hon. Alex Melrose, I must register my extreme disapprobation.

Returning to priorities again, I have been somewhat concerned at the priorities of some of the matters that we have had in hand. Again, these are matters concerning my friend the Minister of Roads and Transport. Some months ago the matter of clearways was discussed, and we were finally told that the Anzac Highway would be the first guinea pig to try this out. By and large I think it has been a success. However, what is the only criticism one has heard about it? Needless to say, it is my old friend, the juggernaut bus. Everything goes along smoothly at peak periods except for these huge buses. I am referring now not to their width (they are certainly too wide for modern traffic) but to their turning radius. These buses cannot, if stymied by anything in front of them, pull out in a reasonable turning radius; sometimes they cover two or three lanes. If anyone wants to test that he need only walk up King William Street at any hour of the day.

As I have said on many occasions—and I make no apology for it—this was a grave error by those who were responsible for letting the contract for those buses or making the recommendation in the first place. I do not expect the Minister to be an expert on this matter, and in fact perhaps it was a different Minister who handled this matter. I would not even know whether the Hon. Mr. Hill was actually responsible for the last lot of buses, and in fact I do not know whether their turning radius is smaller or larger than the previous one. In answer to a short question of mine, the Minister told me that the Municipal Tramways Trust was very pleased with them. Well,

as long as we in the general public are pleased I am not worried whether or not the Tramways Trust is pleased.

I was pleased to hear the Minister yesterday in such good humour as to suggest that he was quite with me on keeping these buses off the road to Elizabeth. At the same time, I point out to the Minister that here we have a dual roadway. I stick by the general principle of not letting them spread any further, but if they are to spread let them spread on a dual highway and keep them out of the Unley Road.

Reverting to the priorities of clearways, surely the clearways that should be pushed ahead with are through Nailsworth, on the Unley Road, and on the North-East Road where the Highways Department recommended no parking at peak hours for certain traffic. This recommendation has been overridden, as the Minister was good enough to inform me, by the local council. When it only affects a local council's extreme perimeter, where there are only a few ratepaying shopkeepers, I presume the council would not be very interested. I point out that a visual examination reveals a large shopping area with parking almost adjacent, at least within 100 yards, and there is no need whatever for these half a dozen cars (which one sees there at about 5 o'clock every night) to be parked there adjacent to our zebra crossings, which are frequently used.

I want to make a suggestion which I hope will receive consideration. We go to tremendous expense to develop these zebra crossings, but in addition we undoubtedly handicap the motoring public to a certain extent, because such a crossing is another place where we must slow up. We see thousands of vehicles a day on one or two of these main highways. Well, that is all right; we can do it; we go out of our way to make motorists slow up. However, we allow pedestrians to cross the road 30 yards away and hold the traffic up again. I went up the North-East Road at about 5 o'clock last Saturday week, when the traffic was not very dense. When we were pulled up at a pedestrian crossing—and it is perhaps just as well that we were—we saw lying on the road 50 yards farther on a man who had been hit by a car where there was no pedestrian crossing. Presumably, if he had crossed at the crossing, he would not have been hurt. I do not know whether or not he was fatally injured.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is not safe on that crossing at any time.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: This point should be considered. If we are going to allow

people to cross the road where they like, then allow them to and do not give them zebra crossings; but, if we give them zebra and school crossings, they must use them. If the Minister does not believe me, he should go to California and see how the people use the crossings there. If they do not, they get booked on the other side of the road. That is a small point I make on traffic.

Much propaganda is going on about safety in cars; it is almost world-wide. We have heard about the merits and demerits—I will not talk about “demerits” for the moment in view of the new system we are hearing about—of safety belts and head rests. One can argue in favour of or against safety belts. I believe that safety belts are an added protection but I have a far greater belief in the safety factor of car doors not flying open. If the doors cannot open in an accident and people remain in their cars, that is much more important in the modern vehicle. The sooner genuine cross bolts are designed for door frames so that the doors do not fly open, the better off we shall be. We must educate our people to realize that, if the brakes fail, the worst thing is to try to stop against a tree or stobie pole; that to roll them over is better. With adequate cross bolts, many lives would be saved so, the sooner we design our cars to have them, the better.

When cars are doing 50 to 60 miles an hour on an open country road (where many of our fatalities occur) some people with perhaps not 100 per cent sight but quite good sight are not sure whether a modern car is coming towards them or going away from them, particularly in the late afternoon at this time of the year. When I say that some people are not certain whether a car is coming or going, I mean at 300 yards away, not at 30 yards away. After all, 60 miles an hour is 88ft. a second which means a combined speed of 176ft. a second when two cars are approaching each other at that speed. A person with not very good sight would find it hard to observe exactly what was happening, especially if there was a fair amount of traffic on the road travelling at high speed. There is no reason why the front and back of these cars should not be more clearly identified; it is our fault if they are not.

It is with some satisfaction that I noted recently that the Chief Secretary was taking steps to assist country hospitals by reducing the contributions in some cases payable by councils by percentages and, where the hospitals are large ones, by turning them into Government institutions so that the local district council

would not be responsible for capital additions, as the years went by. I venture to say that this is all-important and, while the Minister has advanced to me certain arguments that it cannot be carried right down the line, I hope it will be taken down the ladder as far as possible because in some districts it has become quite an onerous burden on the council to meet these costs.

Reverting to priorities (I hope my words will be borne in mind by the Minister) we must watch from an economic point of view our state of priorities in the things we go ahead with. I hope that in this Council the matter of priorities will be given the greatest consideration when the order of legislation to come before us is determined, so that we do not have to consider important Bills in the last week of the session. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I, with other honourable members of this Council, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. Also, with all other honourable members, I congratulate His Excellency, Sir James Harrison, on his appointment as Governor of South Australia. I join in the welcome extended to Sir James and Lady Harrison and sincerely trust that their stay in South Australia will be happy for them and beneficial to the State.

It is pleasing to see that Their Excellencies have lost no time in visiting various centres of the State. I understand they arranged for a visit to Whyalla last week but, unfortunately, because of sickness His Excellency had to delay his first visit there. I hope he is now fully recovered from that illness and will enjoy good health during his stay in South Australia. I join other members in expressing my deepest sympathy to the families and relatives of the late Senator Laught, the Hon. Clarence Goode, the Hon. R. R. Wilson and Messrs. H. White and E. George, all of whom passed away during the previous 12 months.

My Leader, the Hon. A. J. Shard, expressed satisfaction with the progress of the building of Strathmont, which is expected to be opened some time next year. I am also pleased that the Government is pressing on with the project but, with a number of other interested people, I should like a complete assurance from the Government or the Minister concerned that the accommodation at the opening of the building will be sufficient for the number at present at Hillcrest and Glenside, which, I understand, is just over 150 inmates. If the Government can give that assurance, it will alleviate present doubts.

During my speech in the Address in Reply debate last year, I pointed out to the Government that it would be necessary for it to make an early start on the building of Elanora, which is a similar type of project to Strathmont; and, as doubts are already being expressed about the capacity of Strathmont, I ask the Government to give urgent consideration to the early construction of Elanora so that in the future this State will not again be faced with the situation that exists today for the mentally retarded people of this State.

I am not criticizing what has been done during the last few years by the Government in improving and assisting the wellbeing of the mentally ill of this State: I am merely pointing out that there is much to be done by the Government before it can feel proud of its efforts, efforts that were sadly lacking until a few years ago. It is because of that lack of effort and interest shown by the Government in the past that this State has now a long way to go before it can feel self-satisfied.

One thing on which the Government can be congratulated is being ahead of some other States of the Commonwealth by setting up a pre-school day training centre for mentally retarded children between the ages or three and eight years. This is a step in the right direction; it will give valuable training to these children and will assist them to enter occupation centres at an earlier age than they would be able to without this training. However, I criticize the Government for again doing too little too slowly for too few children. At present, the pre-school day time training centre at Prescott Terrace is catering for only about 20 children on a two-day attendance a week basis. I understand that at present there is a waiting list of well over 60 children seeking admission to this centre, with its limited amount of accommodation for the training of these children. I believe the Government is considering setting up a similar centre at Torrensville some time this year, which could reduce the waiting list to about 40. The part-time training is very helpful but it is far from being the ideal set-up. The attendance of these children between the ages of three and eight years should be on a full five days a week basis. I do not think the two-day week is sufficient. Although it does help a little, it is nowhere near enough, and the Government should take immediate steps to establish more centres throughout the metropolitan area. I think six or seven of these centres should be spread throughout Elizabeth and city areas before the situation would be anywhere near satisfactory.

As is the case with all other facilities that are provided, the setting up of these centres brings with it other problems. I refer to the transportation of these children to and from the centres. I know the worry that the transportation of mentally retarded children caused their parents when several occupation centres were established, and a similar hardship is being imposed on parents who have to transport pre-school children to this new centre.

I understand that a group of people who have formed themselves into a body called the Community Aid to the Intellectually Retarded have been working hard to get the Government to provide assistance, either by providing or subsidizing the cost of transport for these children to and from the centres, but so far they have not been successful. I trust that they will have more success than did the Mentally Retarded Children's Society when it made similar approaches to the Government to assist in the provision of transport. It took many years before they were able to break through. I hope the Government will not be so slow in assisting with the transportation of these children.

Not only a financial strain but also a physical strain is placed on the parents of these children, and so often this falls upon the mother of the child, who has to make the journey with the child to the centre. This added strain has a telling effect on the health of the mother and, in turn, this reflects on the rest of the family. I appreciate that the Mental Health Services are not anxious to buy into the question of transport because of the consequences that might ensue regarding the rest of their services. They consider that, if they provide transport for these pre-school training centres, probably other services such as the sheltered workshops will also require such transport. That might well be so, but the Government should do something to provide transport for these children.

If the Mental Health Services are not prepared to assist in the transport of these children, at least the Education Department should be able to arrange transport or to subsidize the transport of those children of five years or over. True, those children who are three years and four years of age will still be at a disadvantage, but at least children of five years of age or older could be assisted by the Education Department. The department could help the Mental Health Services in this respect until it felt it was able to provide such assistance itself for those people who required it. I ask the Government seriously to consider the request for assistance

in providing transport. Even if it is not prepared to help with the transport of all the children, at least the Education Department could transport those children of five years or over.

It is time that section 47 of the Education Act was deleted. That section places an onus on the parent of a blind, deaf, mute or mentally defective child, from the time such child attains the age of six years and until he attains the age of 16 years, to provide an efficient and suitable education for such child. This is completely opposite to what is provided for the so-called normal or physically disabled child: the department provides the facilities, but the onus to provide a suitable education for these other children is placed on their parents.

This section should be deleted because it discriminates between the parents of these children and those of ordinary children. The section is outmoded and harsh, and it can cause concern and hardship to a section of the community who, through no fault of their own, are already suffering grave hardship. Although the Government is making some provision for these children, this onus on their parents should be removed from the Act so that the Government cannot at any time escape from its responsibility of providing assistance for this type of child. It is regrettable that the Education Department appears to be continuing along the same lines as it was following in 1954 regarding the provision of teaching facilities for the mentally retarded.

The Kent Town and Barton Terrace occupation centres, both of which are older-type houses with small rooms and are overcrowded, have very little ground room for expansion. As a result, some delay is caused for parents who wish to enrol their children at these centres. The department should provide a modern-type building equipped with all the latest facilities for the training of the mentally retarded. It is wrong for people to believe that this type of person will be forever a burden on the community. With proper training, a large percentage of these people can be taught to do various types of work and, as a result, can be very useful in industry. They can in turn relieve the Government considerably regarding the provision of social services or institutions for them. If these people were to receive such training at an early age, and if the training continued until they reached 16 or even 20 years of age, the Government would in the long run save much expenditure.

This State is well behind all other States in relation to the number of psychologists it has in proportion to the school population, and this position should be quickly rectified. At the end of March last year, for every 20,000 schoolchildren New South Wales had 5.4 psychologists, Western Australia had 5.2, Victoria had 2.8, and South Australia had only 1.5. The Psychology Branch here is doing a good job, but it is handicapped because of the lack of psychologists on its staff. I trust that the Government will act quickly to relieve this position. It is also unfortunate that neither university in this State has the same post-graduate training courses for psychologists as exist in all other States except Tasmania.

I was pleased that my friend and colleague, the Hon. Mr. Kneebone, drew attention yesterday to the need for more assistance for the dyslectic child. Probably between 3 per cent and 5 per cent of children in our schools today are handicapped as a result of dyslexia. I believe that remedial classes should be established for this type of child and that psychologists should be made available to assist in their training. Also, more speech therapists should be available. I understand that the department could at present have four speech therapists on its staff but that it has only one.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Where can we get them from?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is a good point, but I believe it is the Government's responsibility to see that it gets speech therapists. The Government should be in a position to send people to other States where training courses are available.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It does.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: If the Government had shown any initiative in this regard it would have had no difficulty getting cadets for this training. I urge the Minister to ensure that the Government takes steps to send cadets to other States to receive such training. In that way, there would be no shortage of speech therapists in the future. It is done in other fields; therefore, it can be done here. We can get them if we really want to do so.

I turn now to a matter that is very worrying to Municipal Tramways Trust conductors. Plans are well in hand for a big changeover to one-man buses. I believe that a major change will be made in about October of this year. Obviously, as a result of the proposed change, conductors who for many years have given good and loyal service are worried about what will happen to them. They tell me that



they have received no assurance whatever from the trust concerning what will happen to them and, consequently, they do not know whether to leave their jobs now. I ask the Minister to give a clear assurance now that they will not be thrown out of a job. I realize that some conductors will probably be used as ticket sellers on the streets, but it is not known what will happen to the others.

I was not very happy with the reply that the Minister gave yesterday about the proposed Adelaide-Elizabeth bus service. He said he thought that private enterprise would operate this service. Following another question, he told me that he would take the matter back to Cabinet and let it consider the point I had raised, but I detected a little of the old master's touch (I refer to Sir Thomas Playford). When Sir Thomas was going to grant a deputation anything he would always say, "Yes", but if it was not going to get anything he would say, "I am not a one-man bus operator, so I must refer it to Cabinet." I suggest that the Minister already knows to whom the Elizabeth bus service will be allocated. Yesterday he said that the M.T.T. buses were too wide, and he used this as a reason why the M.T.T. could not operate the Elizabeth bus service. I cannot understand why the Government is making these excuses in view of the fact that the Playford Government gave the trust a special dispensation to alter the width of its buses.

Today, we heard the Hon. Sir Norman Jude say that it does not matter about the width of the buses on that route because it is a dual highway. I point out that these buses travel on the narrowest roads in the metropolitan area, yet the Minister is saying that the buses are too wide for the Elizabeth route! Buses at present being used at Elizabeth are 8ft. 6in. wide: they were used previously by the M.T.T. and then sold to private bus operators. Yesterday the Minister said that the width limit might be made 8ft. 2½in. I do not know whether a mistake was originally made and, because of that mistake, the Government is considering altering the permissible width.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It is to conform to international standards.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I accept that, but apparently in some instances the private bus owners are already conforming to international standards and not conforming to the present system in this State. So, the excuse given by the Minister is very poor. Yesterday the Hon. Mr. Hart said that an M.T.T. service to Elizabeth would upset the internal bus

service there, but I suggest that an Adelaide-Elizabeth service has nothing to do with the internal service. Indeed, I can see no reason why the trust should not set up an internal service in Elizabeth. Why should a bus depot not be established at Elizabeth? It is an expanding city. Elizabeth will need a good internal bus system and the M.T.T. is the best body to provide it. The term "bus service" implies service to the public, and the community expects to pay for a service. When a service is handed over to private enterprise, its only object is to make a profit, not to give service to the people.

When the Minister was considering the question of Elizabeth transport, he boarded a train to go to Elizabeth to see under what conditions Elizabeth people travelled. He then said that the people did not have much to complain about. Obviously, Elizabeth people would have twice as much to complain about as the Minister had, because I understand he made the return trip by car, which had gone up to Elizabeth at the same time as the train had taken the Minister. This seems to be quite a habit for Liberal Ministers in regard to railway travel. At the time of the centenary celebrations at Gawler, the then Minister of Transport went to Smithfield in a big chauffeur-driven car, boarded a train there, and got the publicity that he had travelled by train. True, he travelled by train, but he did not make the trip from Adelaide to Gawler by train.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Are you going on the train on Friday week?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It would do us good to have another ride on a train. I am impressed with the shelters provided at various bus stops through the city; I understand they have been provided by the Adelaide City Council and not by the Municipal Tramways Trust. However, I think an approach could be made to the trust to make these facilities a little better by seeking permission of the Adelaide City Council to place bus time tables inside the shelters for the benefit of the travelling public. A number of people are not sure at what time the next bus is likely to come along, and may hurry to the bus stop only to find they have to wait a further 20 minutes for a bus. Within that time they would be able to do one or two little messages if they were aware of the exact schedule of the bus concerned.

In Western Australia I noticed a similar type of shelter, but facilities were available to enable bus time tables to be exhibited. I ask the Minister if he will give consideration to

this matter or, alternatively, suggest it to the M.T.T. to see if a similar service could be provided in South Australia. While in Western Australia I also noticed (and here I should mention that I am not as lucky as some Ministers in that I cannot get an over-sea trip), and this in spite of the apparent opinion of some Ministers about other Ministers going overseas—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Where would you like to go?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: If we took notice of the Minister, who used to get up and beg the Ministers of the day to refrain from going overseas we would never have a Minister overseas.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He has not got away.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not think his conscience would allow him to go. The day he uses his conscience we shall be all right, but up to now it has never been used.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Then you reckon I have got one?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, I think it is brand new—never been used.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is developing.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I might say a little more about that later. I also noticed in Perth that bus conductors and ticket sellers used a ticket-printing machine when issuing tickets. This machine had a dialling device on it similar to that on a telephone, and the conductor would dial the number according to the value of the ticket required; this would be printed on to a roll of blank paper similar to that used in an adding machine. The Western Australian conductors believe this is a much faster way of issuing tickets, and it is thought that it would be much cheaper than the present system operating in South Australia that provides for tickets being printed and sold from blocks of tickets.

With the method at present in use in Adelaide it is frequently found, especially on cold mornings, that conductors tear off two tickets instead of one and may be left with the second ticket unless able to make a sale later. I have spoken of this to a number of conductors in this State and to the Secretary of the Tramways Union; they consider, as I do, that it would be much quicker and simpler to issue tickets under the Western Australian system. I think the trust is trying out a similar type of device, or a different

type on the one-man buses at the present time, but it does not seem as simple as the system I have mentioned.

New South Wales is at present testing a machine that prints the ticket on the spot, but instead of dialling the required figures a press-button machine is used. It is believed there that this is quicker than the dialling type. I am certain that the M.T.T. would be well advised to examine the possibility of using this type of ticket dispenser, both from the cost-saving angle and the speedier issuing of tickets.

I would also like the Minister of Roads and Transport to use his influence with the M.T.T. to see whether the present bus stop in Grote Street, which is less than 12 yards back from West Terrace on the southern side of Grote Street, could be moved 40 or 50 yards farther back. I agree that buses can cause a hazard on the road, but it is found in peak periods that not only M.T.T. buses use the stop mentioned but also private buses. If the stop were moved that 40 or 50 yards back it would enable traffic to turn left at that intersection with ease instead of being stuck behind a bus at the bus stop and waiting for that bus to either set down or pick up passengers.

Last week I drew attention to the actions of certain doctors at the Royal Adelaide Hospital who appeared to be exploiting workmen's compensation cases by directing injured patients from the casualty section of the hospital to private hospitals. Today I see that the Australian Medical Association has recommended that industry should send a patient direct to a doctor, but that is an entirely different matter. Once a patient arrives at casualty, then I believe such a patient is entitled to treatment there and should not be sent to a private hospital. Since that time I have had my attention drawn to other unsatisfactory practices adopted by some doctors. Complaints have been received from the Salisbury, Elizabeth and Christies Beach areas where doctors have formed themselves into medical groups. At Christies Beach, where such a group has been formed and called the Onkaparinga Medical Group, the service is exceptionally bad. I understand the group consists of eight or nine doctors.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you opposing such an amalgamation of doctors?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I think it is satisfactory if the parties concerned act in the way that it is intended such a group should act. I understand the group was set

up to relieve some doctors of strain through pressure of work, and I have nothing against that type of clinic provided the service is there when required, but this is not happening with the Onkaparinga Medical Group. A resident in the Christies Beach area reports that his son collapsed at school and when he wanted to take the lad to the doctor he was informed he would have to make an appointment for two days later. It seems that it is necessary to get sick in accordance with the time tables of the doctors. Other residents report that when they have been away from work for one day and want to see a doctor in order to obtain a certificate to present to an employer, it is not possible to do so because of the requirement that appointments to see a doctor must be made two days ahead.

There was recently an accident at Chrysler's foundry at Lonsdale resulting in a number of employees being badly burnt when an explosion occurred. The guard was unable to get a doctor, and the employees had to be treated by a sister from an oil refinery nearby. These actions by the doctors are not good enough. I wish to make it clear that I am not "knocking" all doctors, but merely the actions of a small minority of doctors, as such actions react to the detriment of all doctors. I trust that the A.M.A. will pull its members into line. Yesterday the Hon. Mr. Hart referred to Cabinet Ministers going overseas. I again point out that he is out on a limb.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You cannot talk about anything else.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Minister heard me talking about the M.T.T. and the doctors a short time ago, and at one stage the honourable member could not talk about anything else but Ministers going overseas; now there is plenty to talk about because of the large number of Cabinet Ministers going overseas. It is not long ago when so many Ministers were away that they could have held a Cabinet meeting in London because more Ministers were available there than here!

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: One at a time! I have answers to all the questions, but I would prefer them to be asked one at a time.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There was one member overseas who could not have joined the Cabinet.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: But he could have advised the Cabinet, and Cabinet

could have come to a proper decision if it had invited that member to attend such a meeting, and that member would have been available at any time if a legal officer had been required. If he had been called in, his suggestions could have been accepted as good advice. The Hon. Mr. Hart referred to the benefits arising from these visits overseas by Ministers. The Premier, whose department looks after the industrial development of this State, makes big announcements when he is overseas, and these announcements usually finish up something like a sketch I have here depicting a firm which advertised that it wanted the supply of a Chitty Chitty Bang Bang disposal unit. It called for three tenders, in accordance with its normal practice, and it finished up in a similar way to the way in which the Premier's statements and projects finish up. The first tender, called from America, was worth \$1,000,000, and it is like that! The second quote was obtained from Japan, which halved it and made it \$500,000. The Japanese said they could do the same job but that a modification would be necessary, and it finished up like that! In accordance with its practice, it called for a third tender. It went locally for that and it got a quote of \$50 for the same project. Again, it was necessary to have modifications, and it finished up just like that! And to me it looks like what is used by the average person when the call of nature arises. It could do the same job, and the price was only \$50.

This is the kind of thing we get as a result of the Premier's visit overseas. We hear of big projects costing millions of dollars to establish and employing hundreds of people, but by the time the Premier returns home modifications have been made and we find that perhaps the manager of a firm is going to come here and look our country over at some time in the future. Yet the Hon. Mr. Hart says that the State is benefiting a great deal from the Premier's visit overseas.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We are getting some Chitty Chitty Bang Bang from the honourable member for nothing.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: If they had gone for the fourth quote they may have been able to get it done for less than \$50, but there would still have been modifications, just as there are modifications of the announcements made by the Premier from time to time. What do we find in regard to one visit by the Premier which was highlighted in the press? He visited the Geisha girls in Japan, and he stuck his foot in and came out with a hole in his sock, according to the

report. Was he trying to impress on the Japanese that it was necessary for them to set up a knit-wear industry in South Australia? We did not get that result.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins said he was pleased that the Government, prior to the last election, had not promised pie in the sky. These are the honourable member's own words. I am pleased that the honourable member said that, for I agree with him that this Government, before coming into power, did not promise pie in the sky. I can assure the Hon. Mr. Dawkins that everybody else was pleased that the Government did not promise pie in the sky, because even the promises it did make have not been given effect to. We are pleased that the Government did not promise too much. It promised us Chowilla, but that went down the drain within 12 months. Things which we got but which the Government did not promise were increases in prices and charges. One such impost, as the Hon. Sir Norman Jude mentioned this afternoon, was the receipts duty of 1c in each \$10, similar to that operating in Victoria. The Premier threatened that this might be extended to cover wages and salaries. The Government did not promise this, and the Hon. Mr. Dawkins was pleased that it did not promise it. The Government imposed a stamp duty of \$2 on certificates of compulsory third party motor insurance, and we were not promised this; a gift duty at rates comparable with those levied in other States; and an extension of the present hire-purchase duty of 1½ per cent.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Did you oppose gift duty?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No. I am pointing out that the people were not promised these increased charges. However, things promised to us, like Chowilla dam, have gone overboard. Apparently the more the Premier might have promised the more of these things he would have foisted on us. We have the contribution to Consolidated Revenue of 45 per cent of the profits of the State Bank so that it is unable to lend to many people who want to build homes. We have an increase in public hospital charges and charges in mental hospitals—something entirely new, and something which is opposed by the majority of the people in this State. Other financial burdens are increased taxes on bookmakers' turnover, and stamp duty on betting tickets. These measures were taken without the Government's having given any warning at election time. It said it would remove the winning bets tax, but it

did not say it would add an extra burden in the same field, plus seven other taxes. We find that fishing licences have been raised by 100 per cent.

The Hon. C. R. Story: And they will go up again.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We find that bus fares have been increased to the extent that the average family travelling to and from the city by bus must pay more than \$1 a week extra in fares. Rail fares have been increased by an average of 13 per cent; bread prices have been increased by between 1c and 2c a loaf; and increases of up to 10 per cent have been made for joinery products. The cost of living for the December quarter rose by 35c, which was the second highest of any Australian capital city. Price control has been lifted in a number of areas. The Hon. Mr. Kneebone said yesterday that the Government was keeping this on only as a bit of a gimmick. The fact remains that there is no Prices Branch now, as such, for it is now under the control of the Treasury.

In addition, we have had rent increases of Housing Trust houses and Government-owned houses generally. These are the sort of thing that were not promised by the Government. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Dawkins that he should be pleased that the Government did not promise too much. As I say, it promised Chowilla, and it told us that the Government was going to get on with the job. Apparently, Government members were going to sharpen up their picks and shovels and build the dam under their own steam; never mind about the rest of Australia. The Government said, "We will build Chowilla."

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It was said that it was the No. 1 priority.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, yet we are questioned when we say that the Government has misrepresented the position. The Government is only in power because of its misrepresentations. One Liberal member said they were in Government because of Divine guidance. Well, I suggest that the image of my Divine guider looks nothing at all like Tommy Stott. If that is the image of the Divine guider, then my faith has been shaken considerably. The Government is in power because of the misrepresentation that took place prior to the election. According to *The Voice of South Australia*, the Labor Government was imposing too many taxes and the Liberals were going to reduce taxation. As I said, many increases were applied in this Government's first Budget in 1968.

We find that at the end of the first 12 months of this Government's term the Premier—not the people's Premier, of course, but the Premier of the Stott-Hall Government—admitted on television that being the Premier was much easier than being a Leader of the Opposition. However, immediately following that he appoints two Under Secretaries to do a job that he himself said was very much easier than that of the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He only did that to keep them quiet; they were rebels.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, and many other things.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He did it just to keep them quiet.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, it was not just to keep them quiet. The idea was that one of them must be right. The other day one of the Under Secretaries came out and said, "We will make Chowilla an election issue." However, the Premier, after he had got some reaction to this suggestion, and after he had been asked, "Why don't you do it?", came out and said that Chowilla would not be an election issue. Well, one of them must be right, and this will enable one or the other in the future to say that he was right. The L.C.L. is very good. It does not want anybody—

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: "It is very good"—that is interesting!

The Hon. A. J. Shard: At one of our Party meetings last night, I admired something it did.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The L.C.L. makes the comment that it was not wanting the position to be misrepresented in any way. It has this political commentary in the *Advertiser* of May 17, 1969, under the heading "Fact and Fiction". It says:

The A.L.P. suggested in this column last week that comparison be made between the service which was available to the public under the Dunstan Government and that which is available under the present Government . . . By comparing the figures for 1967 (the Dunstan era) and those for 1968 (the Hall Government), the following information is evident. The number of sitting days during the period of the Dunstan Government was 57; during the Hall Government, 68. The total number of sitting hours were, respectively: A.L.P.—365½, L.C.L. 399½. . . . Not infrequently we find it necessary to collect mis-statements made, it is hoped, in all innocence by our Opposition colleagues. It is never wise to stretch information which is based upon referable facts.

Now let us look at the real facts of the matter. Those people in the L.C.L. who produced

that commentary (I do not know whether it was the Minister of Roads and Transport, the Chief Secretary, or somebody else) were dragging out something that would be misleading to the people. They took the first session of the Hall Government and compared it with the last session of the Dunstan Government. It would have been fairer to take the first session of the Hall Government and compare it with the first session of the Dunstan Government. If they had, they would have found that for the first session of the Labor Government there were 82 sitting days for the House of Assembly and 70 sitting days for the Legislative Council, in 1965-66. This compares with only 68 sitting days in the House of Assembly and 61 sitting days in the Legislative Council, under the Hall Government in 1968-69. That would be a fairer comparison.

They could also have made a comparison of the last session of the previous Liberal Government with the last session of the Dunstan Government. In that case, we would find that in the last session of the Liberal Government (in 1964) there were 37 sitting days in the House of Assembly, while the Legislative Council extended itself to sit on 33 days. I am pointing out that we do not want the misleading statement by the L.C.L. in this commentary to the effect that the L.C.L. itself says that it does not want any misleading statement. However, it got into the habit of misrepresenting the position prior to the last election, and it is continuing to do so today. In the last session of the last Labor Government (1967), there were 57 sitting days for the House of Assembly and 51 sitting days for the Legislative Council. So much, therefore, for the "information based upon referable facts".

The Premier was most concerned about the doctors in this State raising their fees to correspond with doctors' fees in other States, saying they were not justified in doing so. Yet his own Treasurer introduces taxation and, in his Budget speech, says it compares with Victoria's, "hat it comes into line with that of the other States. However, the Premier refuses the doctors the right to increase their fees to an extent comparable with what obtains in the other States. When pressure was applied to the Premier to have an inquiry into doctors' fees, he said, "No; we cannot do that at all." He was asked why. He replied, "I am big enough to say they should not compare their fees with those of other States but not to hold an inquiry".

The Minister of Roads and Transport was very touchy when it was pointed out to him

why many people were leaving this State at present. It was pointed out that some people had left this State previously as a result of a national disaster, but the Minister of Roads and Transport was not happy to go along with that. Yet we find a publication brought out by the Institute of Public Affairs asking, apropos the reason why people are leaving this State at present, "Which is the wealthiest State of Australia?" If we had been listening to the Hon. Mr. Hill, we would have thought that South Australia was the wealthiest State because the present Liberal Government is in power, as a result of 57 per cent of the voters voting against the Government! In this publication, under the heading "Quiz" we find:

Q. Which is the wealthiest State of Australia?

A. In terms of personal income per head, Victoria leads with \$1,628. Then come:

New South Wales and Australian Capital Territory . . . . .	\$1,589
Western Australia . . . . .	\$1,450
Queensland . . . . .	\$1,381
Tasmania . . . . .	\$1,351
South Australia . . . . .	\$1,342

So we can see that South Australia is at the bottom of the list. Yet the Minister tried to imply yesterday that everything here—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What is the date of that?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: February-March, 1969.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is an article in today's paper about somebody coming back to South Australia.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes; he packed up and has now gone back. So, although the economy of the other States is good and the people there are prosperous, the Premier does not think that South Australian doctors' fees should be the same as those in other States. However, he is still most anxious to see that all forms of taxation are comparable with those of the other States. The Minister of Roads and Transport, when in Opposition, was keen enough to quote the percentage of unemployed, when Labor was in power and when there was a drought. He was more interested in the percentage of unemployed then than in actual figures. It was pointed out to him that the number of unemployed in 1966 was 2,000 fewer than the number of unemployed in 1962, but the Minister was not interested in that.

I suggest he look at percentages as at the end of May. If he does, he will see that, in spite of the L.C.L. Government, the drought being over and conditions in other States having improved,

there is only one State in Australia with a higher percentage of unemployed than South Australia—and that is Queensland. If he still wants to insist on percentages, I will go along with that position. It does not matter whether the Minister wants percentages or not. He was not interested in figures: he was interested only in percentages.

The Hon. Mr. Rowe attempted to give all the credit to the present Government for the improvement in the present financial position. He obviously forgot that at present the Government is spending very little on pumping water from the Murray River, the lifeline of this State, whereas when the Labor Government was in power, many times as much as \$2,000 a day had to be spent on pumping water. He also forgot the fact that there has been a better production yield and that everybody in this State is better off. He cannot give any credit for that to the present Government. Not only that but the Chief Secretary had, only less than five minutes before the Hon. Mr. Rowe got to his feet, said in his second reading speech on the Appropriation Bill:

On September 5, 1968, against the background of accumulated deficits totalling \$8,365,000, the Government presented the 1968-69 Revenue Budget, which proposed a nominal surplus of \$21,000 for this year. However, as then indicated, it was known that new wages and salaries awards were bound to become effective during the year, and in fact two major determinations—in a national wage case and in the matter of a teachers award—were then pending. Accordingly, the realistic forecast was for a significant deficit unless the Commonwealth Government could be prevailed upon to make additional grants available or there should be some quite unexpected lift in State finances.

At that time the Minister did not inform us that this was not a realistic approach to the Budget.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He gambled on his big brother in Canberra, who came good. However, if he had not done so he would have been in a mess.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes. He said we would have a nominal surplus, yet last month he said that that was not a realistic forecast.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Before the debate was finished we were told there would be a deficit of \$1,500,000.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It would have been a lot more than that, yet the Minister is prepared to tell us that the Government does not give a realistic forecast when it is bringing down the Budget. Its attitude is, "Let us publicize that we are going to have

a nominal surplus at the end of the year, and then we can tell the public that it was not a realistic forecast anyway."

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Hear, hear!

The Hon. C. R. Story: You are a good duo!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: At least we have an audience, which is a little baffled because it knows that its position is insecure and that it will not be in office for more than another 18 months. The Government knows that it has no right to hold the front benches. The Chief Secretary continued as follows:

There have been several variations from the original estimates for individual items of receipts and payments, but overall the prospects are now for a result quite close to a balance. Briefly, the adverse impacts of additional wage and salary awards amounting in all to about \$4,000,000, and of losses in revenues of about \$1,000,000 due to late implementation of new taxes and charges, together with other net short-falls of revenues of perhaps \$750,000 . . .

I suggest that some of that \$750,000 could have been made up from what the Government saved as a result of the amended gift duties legislation. When the Hon. Mr. Rowe wanted to give all the credit to the Government, the Chief Secretary said the major improvement had been in the Commonwealth grants. Had that not been the case the Government would not have had anything good to report, so the Hon. Mr. Rowe's timing and information were bad. When the Labor Government was in office it was told that it should not go to the Commonwealth Government, cap in hand, for financial assistance. Indeed, Labor members were asked at that time how we could expect the Commonwealth to provide us with assistance, yet this has come about because the Commonwealth Government has come to the party.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: So you admit that there has been some improvement.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not feel my position the least bit improved when my increased water account comes in or when I have to travel on the bus and pay an increased fare because I have left my pass at home. If the honourable member thinks they are improvements, he has a shock coming to him.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You said the improvement occurred as a result of the Commonwealth Government assistance.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I did not say that. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that there had been a major improvement in the Commonwealth grants that had been made

available to this State. That means that any major improvement that might have been achieved had nothing to do with the State Government. Perhaps it had something to do with it in some of the more minor matters, because it is true that the Government's financial position was improved slightly when it turned off the pumps at the Murray River pumping station. Any Government would have obtained money from the Commonwealth Government at that time because the latter is facing an election this year. Therefore, honourable members should not use that as a criterion. Had it been next year they would still have been down the drain.

I refer now to His Excellency's Speech. He was a little unlucky to have had to read such a lot of trash as was put before him by the Ministers of this State. It was so drab and uninteresting that it did not even hit the front page of the *Advertiser*, which would be the first time that has happened for many years. That is what the people and our leading newspaper thought of the Government's programme for the coming year. Because the *Advertiser* was not prepared to refer to any aspects of the speech on its front page, I do not think I should mention any at this time.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You haven't done a bad job though.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am interested in the conference of L.C.L. delegates that will be held in this State next Friday. It will be held behind closed doors, unlike the convention that was held recently by the Australian Labor Party at Hindmarsh, at which the doors were left open to members of the press and television, as well as the public.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: And Mr. Harradine.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: He has to be a delegate to be one of the conference. We do not even know who will be at your conference because we have not received any information in that regard. However, we have received information that the Chief Secretary had a brush with the Premier at the last conference. The Premier must have said, "Let us have 20c each way. I will say that there should be full adult franchise for the Legislative Council and you can oppose it. In that way I can appear strong and the Legislative Council can throw out that type of rubbish which the people want." What a way that is to do business!

We understand that if the female student has not gone from the front steps of Parliament House by Friday she will be removed forcibly

by the police. Because extra security assistance is required at the L.C.L. conference at Pennington Terrace so that no-one can get inside and hear what goes on, the authorities want to have all possible men there, including those who might be used out the front of this place. It is a pity that the L.C.L. does not open its doors to the public. Of course, we know that if it did it would receive only 25 per cent of the votes compared with the 42 per cent or 43 per cent that it receives at the moment. I support the motion.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I rise very quietly to support the motion and I thank the mover and the seconder for their fine speeches. I join with them and other honourable members in welcoming His Excellency and Lady Harrison to our State and in expressing our appreciation of His Excellency's first opening of Parliament.

During the months since the last session ended we have lost many colleagues and friends, none more deeply regretted than the loss of Senator Keith Laught, who was truly a great South Australian. He served his country in war and in peace, and he was always a man of great courage. While in the Western Desert during the early days of the Middle East campaign he contracted a severe spinal affliction which caused him many years of sheer physical agony. During the last 18 years of his life he served his State in the Senate, holding many important positions, none of which he enjoyed more than his membership of the Council of the Australian National University. His interest in and sympathy for the young Australian is well known. No young person approaching Senator Laught, were he aspiring for a place in the Antarctic team or more humbly applying for, say, a Gowrie scholarship, was ever refused help. There are today countless young Australians who owe their position in life to the practical advice and encouragement given them by Senator Laught. We are all the poorer for his passing.

We are constantly being told that this is the day of youth, and we are constantly being exhorted to make provision for youth, yet the reports from our courts indicate that more and more young people are coming before them as a result of a wide range of escapades, criminal and otherwise. This may suggest that in these days of comparatively short working hours and long leisure periods our youth is not being properly provided with worthwhile facilities and activities designed to promote a healthy and satisfying approach to life. There is no doubt that much of the trouble among our young

people today comes from too much unoccupied time and aimless pursuits. The old 18th century adage "Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do" seems to be more true today than in our forefathers' day.

I say all of this because I believe that we are all prepared to give lip service to the requirements of our new ways of living, but we are not prepared to take the necessary action or to spend the money. I wish to refer to an organization which was established for the purpose of meeting this very special need (namely, to provide our people with healthful activities and useful training in general fitness and, for some, a training in leadership). I refer to the National Fitness Council, established by the Commonwealth Government in 1939 and supported financially by it ever since. Currently the annual Commonwealth grant is \$35,326 for the payment of staff, running expenses, the development of camping, and for assistance to local, youth and sports organizations. In the past triennium ended June 30, 1969, \$30,190 was also provided by the Commonwealth Government to subsidize capital development on camps on a \$1 to \$2 basis.

The South Australian Government began to contribute in 1948, and it currently contributes about \$50,000. Since 1961 a further grant was made by the State Government "for the training of leaders and the establishment of clubs", which grant since 1963 has also been at the rate of \$50,000 a year. The National Fitness Council of South Australia, on which I have served as a Parliamentary representative for some years, is attempting to encourage the setting up and growth of numerous bodies for sporting and other physical activities on the broadest possible basis. It has put some money and a vast amount of time and energy into the establishment of camping areas, playing fields, sports halls and training rooms; it has distributed grants to almost innumerable organizations from Boy Scouts and Girl Guides to church groups, sporting clubs and youth groups throughout the State; it has set up facilities in sports grounds in many suburban and country centres.

It has conducted innumerable courses, through the Outward Bound school and through the Duke of Edinburgh's Award Scheme, in the beginning of which scheme South Australia was a leader among the Australian States. All of this was done under the aegis of the National Fitness Council of South Australia which needs, if it is to do the job that was envisaged for it, much greater funds than it is now getting. Apart from



all the work I have detailed in the last few minutes, this council has been responsible for other important duties. It has arranged since 1954 four surveys of the recreation areas available in the Adelaide Planning Area, a task which might seem to be more logically a matter for the Local Government Department or the State Planning Office, which uses the findings but has not the staff to do the work.

Another important service rendered by the National Fitness Council to the community is the providing of camping facilities for the Education Department. Of the 19,679 bed-nights recorded in 1968, 25 per cent were represented by school parties. The value of school camping is being recognized more and more, and the National Fitness Council knows how important it is to have more camps, such as the one at Mylor, available for schoolchildren in the immediate future.

Service to country districts is difficult. Learn-to-play courses, leadership courses, coaching and umpiring courses need to be conducted in country towns just as well as in suburban areas. Someone should permanently be on the spot to follow up the training; with limited funds and an Adelaide-based staff, travelling to various centres has proved too costly. Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania have already set up regional officers who are on call all the time and able to make national fitness a reality in their country districts. Why cannot we in South Australia follow their lead?

Who does the work of the National Fitness Council? Although it has a small paid staff under a competent, enthusiastic and far-seeing Director, an enormous amount of time on the planning and administrative side is given in an honorary capacity by a large group of the State's leading citizens on its council and on its many subsidiary committees. I have been amazed at the complete unselfishness of many busy men and women who have given their talents and time completely free to South Australia because they see the need to help our young people.

To come to the heart of the matter, over recent years the National Fitness Council has been receiving from the State Government about \$100,000 for all its activities. In a population of over 1,000,000, this amounts to about 10c per capita. It seems a very meagre amount when the need is clearly so great. The effect of this very small support for national fitness can be seen in the case of the camps and hostels where it is not possible

to have proper maintenance. I can give honourable members one example of having to depend on the part-time services of a pensioner who acts as caretaker only to a valuable property because we just have not the money to pay the salary of a trained officer. This type of economy is ultimately very uneconomic for our State as a whole.

In fact, I would suggest to the Government that 10c per capita is a totally inadequate amount for the administration and operation of such an organization for the objects and tasks that have been put on it. I say this with an urgent belief in the necessity for what can best be described as useful and healthy spare-time activities for all young South Australians. I must emphasize that in the National Fitness Council, money is most carefully used. I have told honourable members of the work that we do—work with an insufficiency of staff. Recently, through the good offices of the business school of the Institute of Technology, a survey of the administrative and clerical sections of the organization was made, and the report was closely studied by the council members with a view to higher efficiency and money-saving methods.

I reiterate that this is an efficient organization, not a wasteful one. It is an organization doing an honest job on behalf of the State and the nation. Frankly, we see here again an institution trying to make bricks out of straw. Consequently, I ask the Government to give very serious consideration to the matter of acting on behalf of our youth and making available further money for national fitness work.

I wish to refer again to a matter about which I asked some questions in this Council recently: that is, the matter of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles selling through his department information which I consider should be confidential to his department. When a person in complying with the law supplies to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles his name and address, together with details of the transfer of a motor vehicle, he may rightly presume that the information is given solely for the purpose of complying with the demands of the law and of facilitating the functions of the department in carrying out that law. I have said previously that I consider the practice of a Government department selling information about private individuals and their possessions to be unethical and pernicious. The fact that it has been claimed that this practice has been going on for 30 years or so

does not appear to me to alter the gravity of the situation.

In reply to my recent question, the Minister referred to this copyrighted information being sold. It seems pointless to me to suggest that lists which have been sold to commercial trading houses for "sales analysis and promotion" (to use the Minister's words) can be in any way notably restricted. The statement that "There is at present an investigation in progress into possible leakages of this copyrighted information and use by unauthorized people" (to quote the Minister again) would be looked upon by most people as childish unreality. I lay emphasis upon this as a result of complaints made by irritated constituents who have been pestered by motor trading houses with proposals for service contracts or for trade-ins or for the sale of their vehicles, all as a result of details having been released unnecessarily (and in no way in the necessary performance of his duties) by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. One complaint came from a person who had received just such approaches from a firm in New South Wales—so much for copyrighted information! I therefore request the Government to examine this abuse of facilities and to terminate this very unsatisfactory practice.

I think in this stage of our development we may well pay attention to the whole matter of safety of information. We are in the process, both in commercial houses and public departments, of developing systems whereby vast quantities of personal information are to be fed into computers and storing and analysing machines. We will shortly be facing the problem that there are large computers in our midst storing information about individual persons from many sources, and all of this information will be available on recall. Honourable members will realize the implications of this—pieces of information have been fed into one machine by a number of users, whether they be Government departments or commercial houses such as banks, insurance companies, credit houses, traders, tailors, or bookmakers; in fact, by almost anyone one can name.

Are we to face a future where on demand for a fee some huge computer will divulge all the details of one's physical, mental and commercial life, and this without one's consent or knowledge? This is reality, and harsh reality at that. None of this cloud cuckoo land stuff about copyrighted lists: this is a problem which all lawmakers will have to face.

Shared pools of information and shared facilities for storing knowledge may undoubtedly be economic. They could also be devastatingly revealing, and this goes for public-owned ones as well as those operated by private individuals. I suggest that if we are lax in small matters as at present, then certainly we will find ourselves in the hands of an uncontrollable tyrant in later years.

I have been impressed by the widespread interest and belief in the necessity for more daylight to be shed on the debates and decisions made by local government bodies. In brief, most people desire that proceedings of councils and corporations should be conducted as open to the people they represent as are the proceedings of Parliament. I trust that the Minister of Local Government and the Government will give this matter most serious consideration.

The Governor's Speech indicates that in this session we may be asked to consider a wider range of legislation than in recent sessions. I was most interested to hear the Hon. Sir Norman Jude today express his views in this regard. Since I entered Parliament 10 years ago, we have had some horrifying experiences of rushed legislation. As all honourable members know only too well, rushed legislation frequently entails poor consideration, poor amendments, and quite often unsatisfactory laws. I request that the Government take early action to ensure that as many Bills as possible be prepared soon enough to receive proper attention by Parliament.

Finally, I congratulate the Government upon its success in revitalizing commercial activities in this State. I hope that we will shortly see considerable development in the fields of secondary industry, mining, and metallurgy. Certainly, there has been a noticeable increase in faith in South Australia and enthusiasm for the welfare of the State. With a new Festival of Arts coming close, we will have a wonderful opportunity to prove to other parts of Australia the high intellectual standards and capabilities of the people of South Australia as well as to give a very clear indication of South Australia's great future development under a wise and progressive Government. I support the motion.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.18 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 31, at 2.15 p.m.